THE

PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1870.

No. II.

ART. I.—*The Element of Time in Interpreting the Ways of God.*—"*One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.*"

THE schemes of the Divine Government are doubtless all formed in infinite wisdom and goodness, and must, therefore, necessarily be holy, just, and good. But, why should creatures like us expect to comprehend them so perfectly as, in all cases, to perceive their goodness or their wisdom? They concern a whole universe. They reach through eternity. To beings of our limited capacity it may be impossible to give so complete a view of many of the vast designs of God, that no darkness or clouds shall surround them. Why should they not often prove baffling to our reason, and full of mystery? Besides this, the Lord intends to exercise and prove our faith.

What is true of the great purposes of the Divine Government, should seem to be also necessarily true of the great lessons embraced in the essential doctrines of Revelation. The Fall; the ruin of mankind by the sin of their first parents; the union of the two natures—the Godhead and Manhood—in the one person of Christ; the satisfaction of Divine Justice by the sacrifice of Christ, instead of the punishment of the

sinner:—doubtless there are mysteries in these which man cannot yet fathom; and questions may be asked which we are, as yet, unable to answer. The counsels of the Lord are, in many cases, too deep and too far reaching for our full comprehension. If so, it is at least idle for us to presume to sit in judgment upon them, or to try to alter, or evade, whatever he reveals concerning them. We may greatly err in so doing. We may do immense mischief to our own souls, and to the souls of our fellow-men. We may greatly dishonor God.

Probably, also, many things are dark to us at present, not because of our want of intellectual capacity, but because of our brief experience. Time has been wanting to unfold the scheme sufficiently to our comprehension. Wait till the day reveals it; and, if it be best, what we know not now we may know hereafter; and perhaps what is now dark shall then disclose brighter glories than we are as yet able to imagine.

The Apostle Peter calls us to the consideration of this value of time, in forming our judgment of the Divine providences. On the delay of threatened judgments there come scoffers, saying, "Where is the promise of his coming? For, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." They forget how the old world perished in the deluge. They do not believe that the same heavens and the earth are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. On the other hand, the people of God, looking to the completion of some promised scheme of glory and beneficence, and seeing the wicked long triumphant, and the righteous suffering long affliction, sometimes give way to impatience, and cry, "How long, O Lord, how long?" But the delay, either of judgment or of promised blessings, is no evidence of slackness on the part of God. Often he delays judgment because he is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. If judgment had always been speedily executed, how many who are now saved would have been lost? Had Saul of Tarsus been cut down while breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the church, it would have been just: but what a revenue of praise and glory to God,—what songs of salvation over all the earth and

in heaven would have been lost! And, as to the delay of promised blessings, the harvest comes when it is ripe. In the mean time, there must be the toils of the husbandman, and days of sunshine and of storm. God is not unfaithful. He does not forget. His purpose is not changed, nor defeated, nor delayed. "The vision is for an appointed time: but, at the end, it shall speak and not lie. Though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come; it will not tarry." The apostle, therefore, calls us to the consideration of this element of time, in forming our judgment of the Divine providences: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

To us, time is a matter of great account. Ten, twenty years, is a great stage in the career of human life. But the Lord, in the eternity of his being, and the immensity of his plans, counts not time. From infinity it matters not whether you take away ten, or ten times ten thousand millions. A drop of water may bear some proportion to the whole ocean; a grain of sand to the bulk, not only of our earth, but to the aggregate bulk of all worlds and suns in the universe. But millions of ages bear no proportion to eternity. The scheme of man's recovery from sin has already advanced six thousand years, during which we can trace one purpose of Jehovah. Prophecy unfolds long ages yet to come, ages of blessedness and glory, —after the world's redemption, before that part of the scheme limited by time shall be finished. Then the world shall be consumed and vanish away: but the glories of redemption have then but just begun. The short-lived actors in these transitory scenes are to outlive this earth and these heavens. The transitory events of this earth are to exert their influence in another world, ages without end.

All these vast schemes of time and eternity God beholds at once. Amid changes which to man appear naught but confusion and chaos, the Lord sees order and plan. Man faints and is discouraged. God looks on unmoved, beholding in every thing parts of his stupendous and perfect scheme. When this shall be completed we may wonder and adore. Indeed, to us, these schemes may never be completed. They may be, in

eternity, only unfolding more and more the wonders of the infinite God, and the amazing reach of his eternal purpose.

Designs which lie wholly within the scope of ten, twenty, or fifty years, are not altogether beyond our comprehension. Yet these are, to the greater purposes of God, only subordinate and comparatively insignificant: for when they seem to us to have spent their force and to have done their work, a hundred or five hundred years after they are seen to have relations, and to bear an importance and significance in the great scheme, which no mortal could have dreamed possible while the events were transpiring. After-ages discover that the history of the world turns as much upon unnoted and apparently trifling events, as upon things which in their day filled the hearts of mankind with expectation or with dread for the destinies of the world; till at length we begin to doubt which shall be in the end most pregnant with mighty results, the overturning of an empire or the fall of a sparrow. As we trace out the works of God our vision enlarges. We learn to connect apparently isolated events with great schemes extending over thousands of years; to trust God, and to judge nothing before the time. Now nothing is insignificant. If the bow is drawn at a venture, Jehovah guides the arrow; and, as yet, Jehovah alone comprehends the design, and the results depending. We begin to see how important it is that the Lord should work all things after the counsel of his own will; that not a mote floating in the sunbeam should stray beyond his control; and that the very hairs of our head should all be numbered. We begin to see that our lives are too short to judge of schemes which show their significance only after the lapse of ages. The period will arrive, in our eternal existence, when a thousand years will be to us what one day is now. We shall look back and count thousands, myriads, millions of ages; and the period will seem short. Doubtless we shall then be able to comprehend many of the Divine providences which now, to most of mankind, seem dark or painful: and they may appear clearly to be wise and glorious, beyond what man has as yet been able to conceive.

Let us try to illustrate these things more clearly. It is said that some insects of this world have a mere ephemeral exist-

ence. They live one day, and expire. Suppose such an existence endowed with human capacities; differing from man in nothing save in the brevity of its life. How impossible it would be for such a creature to comprehend many of the arrangements so familiar to us: *e. g.* of our seasons. One lives his day in the spring: the earth is beautiful, but where is its food for man? Another passes his day of existence in summer: how poorly does he judge of the unripe fruits and grains? Another passes his day in autumn: and cannot comprehend why mankind are laying up the productions of the earth in store-houses. Another lives his day in the winter: what a dismal world it is to him? Another spends his day in some terrific storm: what a judgment he forms of the cheerlessness and chaos that reign in this lower world!

A child, among us, soon learns, that, as the sun goes down, and darkness and damp mists rest upon the chilly air, the sun is once more to resume his circuit in the heavens; and that day and night are to run their rounds according to the appointment of a wise and beneficent creator. But if man were, like some insects, ephemeral, these things he could not know. Sunset would be to him like the end of the world. Or living only in the night, or in winter, or in some terrific storm, he could not understand the divine order and harmony of these things. He would be unable to discern the glorious and beneficent design, by which the Creator makes the night, the winter, and the storm, parts of his orderly and excellent plan. What is the world to such a being? It is night! It is winter! It is storm! He sees no wisdom. He comprehends no goodness. He discerns no consistent and glorious plan in the creation and government of this world. Give to such ephemeral existence all the intellectual capacities of men; let their reasoning powers be developed to the full; only by the brief period of their existence shut them out from nature's book of knowledge; and even the simple and beneficent arrangements of day and night, and of the seasons, would be beyond the limits of their comprehension.

It is true, that if you give them letters, some philosophers may begin to record their observations; and when these records shall have accumulated for as many centuries as have

passed between us and the ancient Chaldeans, some Copernicus, or Newton, or Kepler, may arise, who, after long and painful deductions, may unfold the law of the vicissitudes of day and night. He may speculate, that perhaps in future ages the period may arrive when observations and science shall avail to elucidate the laws of cold and heat alternating at distant periods: discover an arrangement of seasons, and tell, like bards of old, why the winter suns hasten so much to dip themselves in the ocean. To such beings, literally beings of a day, such discoveries would be as great as those of our proudest astronomers.

Some discoveries of modern astronomy seem to intimate that our conceptions of time and distance have hitherto been but the conceptions of ephemerals, in comparison with the grander views now opening upon us. During the thousands of years that the heavens have been observed by men, the stars, excepting a few wanderers, have been regarded as relatively fixed. With some slow vibrations of the entire heavenly sphere, recurring after vast periods, and—as one of our own astronomers has well expressed it,—"beating the seconds of eternity,"—the same heavens look down upon us, in the same arrangements in which they looked down upon the ancient Chaldeans. At length it seems to be determined that our system of suns and worlds is moving with immense rapidity, in an orbit which will require millions of ages to complete the circuit, and yet with an apparent motion so slow, that centuries are required to make the change perceptible. What then are our old conceptions of distance and time?

Now suppose creatures who live through, and comprehend, the great years of the entire revolving system of our universe; and who measure their lives by the march of revolving ages. They may comprehend things in the purposes of God, in which we can, as yet, trace neither wisdom nor plan. Things which are most painful to us may to them appear most glorious. Nor is it unlawful to suppose that there are such creatures; creatures who shouted for joy when these worlds were made, and who count it but yesterday since they came to announce the glad tidings of a Saviour's birth. Indeed, if they have never sinned, and know no death, what matter if their

year comprehends so many millions of ours? And if they witnessed, and remember, the creation, the career, and the final conflagration, one after the other, of many such worlds as this; such periods will be familiar to us too, if we ever reach the heavenly inheritance. Then we shall understand what an apostle meant, when, so many ages before the end of the world, he said, "Brethren, the time is short!" Yes, *Time* is short!

Now, if beings, literally beings of a day, would be so lost and confounded in our simple change of seasons, and even in our vicissitudes of day and night;—if we in our turn are lost and confounded amid the vast machinery and vast revolutions of the ages which measure the years of sinless beings,—how poorly are we qualified to sit in judgment on the plans and ordinances of the most high God! They comprehend immensity! They embrace eternity! The insect of a day sees a little, and failing to grasp the entire plan, which would fill him with wonder and adoration, he forms his judgment from what he sees. He rashly judges his Maker; blames the constitution and government of this world, fills his soul with murmuring and discontent, and dies! We readily see his mistake. His existence is too brief for knowledge. He has no faith in the Divine wisdom and goodness. Are *we* in no danger of similar mistakes when we fancy that we can find out the Almighty unto perfection? Can we venture to sit in judgment on God; and that too from what we see in our brief day spent amid winter or storm? Suppose we do see difficulties in the history of the fall, and in the ruin of all mankind by the sin of their first parent, so that "by the offence of one, judgment comes upon all men to condemnation;" the counterpart of the "justification of life" which comes upon all believers in Christ? The difficulties are not removed by rejecting the account given in the Bible. The mournful part of our native depravity and ruin belongs not to any one scheme of Christianity alone, but to Christianity itself; and not to Christianity alone but to every possible form of Theism. Nor do we remove, or evade, the difficulties by interpolating into the scriptural account any explanations or provisoes to satisfy our reason in our present state of knowledge. On the contrary, such

explanations and provisoes, however well meant, and whatever difficulties they have seemed for the moment to evade, are soon found to do no more than simply to introduce some new, and still more baffling, element of disturbance. Either they necessitate a change in some other important doctrine, or in some way they break the harmony and integrity of the scheme of salvation which God has revealed, and whose harmony and integrity are essential to the greatest power of Divine truth over the conscience and the heart of man. Is it not the safest and most reverent course, to limit ourselves to a fair and natural interpretation of what God has written, without attempting to vindicate the Divine justice and goodness by any additions or explanations of our own; which additions or explanations may in the end prove the greatest possible obscuration of the Divine justice and goodness?

A profitable lesson may be learned from a slight survey of the many attempted explanations of the existence of sin and misery under the government of One who is Almighty, and of perfect wisdom and goodness. It has been assumed that men are competent to explain why God did not prevent all sin. Some have supposed that he was unable to do so without departing from a proper moral government. Some have maintained that he chooses that men should sin, as the necessary means of the greatest good. Most of the attempted solutions have assumed a defect either in the Divine power or in the Divine goodness.

Epicurus reasoned thus: "God either wills to prevent evil, and cannot; or he can, and will not; or he neither can nor will; or he both can and will.

"If he would, but cannot, he is imbecile; which is no property of Deity. If he can and will not, he is malevolent; which is equally abhorrent to Deity. If he neither can nor will, he is both malevolent and imbecile; and, therefore, not God. If he both can and will, then whence are evils? or why does he not take them away?" Epicurus concludes, therefore, that there is no God.

Leibnitz supposed that the world would have been less perfect, if sin were wanting in it; and that, hence, there was a "necessity of God's bringing about the origin of sin."

Against such a view others supposed the problem solved by showing that sin is wholly of the creature, and no part of the Divine method or strategy. But even so, does it solve the problem? may it not be asked, further, did not God care to prevent it? or was he not able?

Others supposed that sin is necessarily incidental to any—at least to the best—moral system: and asked, "Who can prove that sin *will* not be, when for aught that appears, it *may* be?"

This did not affirm directly that God is *unable*, by any proper method, to prevent sin in a moral system; though it had no validity as an argument save on the assumption of such promises.

This necessary contingency, and so a possibility of sin beyond the power of God to prevent it in a moral system, has been by others stiffened out into an absolute certainty. Thus (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., 1856), it is insisted that we *must* solve this problem, but may not waive the solution by saying, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight," for till the problem is solved we cannot know that we have a Father in heaven; nor "that what seems good in his sight is at all worthy of him, or kind to his children;" nor, till we solve this problem, can we conclude as against the atheist, "that coming light will vindicate the witness of sin and misery against the superstition of an assumed deity." The affirmation is then made without further reasons than as a matter of pure rational insight, that there will be sin so long as God deals with his creatures "*according to what is due to himself:* in other words, *If God always deals with finite spirits, according to the principles of honor and right, there will be sin.*" But how can man know that, in all possible worlds, and among all possible creatures, God is unable to prevent sin without violating the principles of honor and right? Or, admitting that he cannot (which we can by no means admit), how can we certainly know that among all finite spirits there will certainly be sin, as long as God deals with them according to what is due to himself: or, according to the principles of honor and right? There is no rational insight of man competent to see this.

Another attempts to solve the problem, both for men and

angels, by assuming that God never intended or deemed it possible that his commands should be obeyed, till sin and consequent suffering should have supplied the motives indispensable to obedience. He therefore supposes that the holy angels are such as have sinned; and that having learned obedience by the things they have suffered, they have been restored.

What is punishment? What is justice, under such a scheme? What can they be save shifts and pretences, rendered necessary as matters of policy, through some defect n the original constitution of man, or in the law which demands obedience? The scheme, accordingly, discards every thing like punitive justice, making sin only in itself a law of bad causation, demanding no further penalty, and requiring for the sinner no propitiation or redemption; but only that he be influenced to repent, and to restore himself to righteousness.

All these theories, from the Epicurean downward, seem to be based on the assumption that the existence of moral evil admits only one alternative, viz., that God is either unable, or else unwilling to prevent sin in a moral system.

But may it not be that God is entirely able so to control a moral system as to prevent all sin, with no violation of the principles of honor or right, and with no infringement upon the freedom or responsibility of his creatures, whenever he shall see it best to do so; and that he is limited by no want of power or of goodness, but only by the holy counsel of his own righteous will? May it not also be, either from some peculiarity in the cases themselves, or from their relation to the universal scheme of his providence in all worlds, or for some other reason, that he may see it best, in some cases, and in some worlds, to interfere; and not best in others? May it not be that he is in no case so straitened as to be beholden to sin as the necessary means of the greatest good; and that he does not choose that men should sin, but only that they should be left to their freedom and responsibility? May it not be also that he is perfectly sincere in forbidding, lamenting, and punishing all transgressions? *Why* it is best thus to permit sin, *i. e.*, not effectually to hinder it, we may not understand. We

do not solve the problem. Nor do we see any necessity of solving it. We have a Father in heaven, even though there are depths of Divine wisdom and knowledge which we are as yet unable to fathom.

So in the doctrine of Christ crucified, as a "propitiation through faith in his blood,"—"that God may be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus;" there are many still who see no satisfaction to the Divine Justice in this, but an utter overthrow and abandonment of every idea of righteousness and goodness. They deny the propitiation for sin. They deny the satisfaction rendered to the Divine Justice. They deny the need of any such propitiation or satisfaction. They make Christ a mere messenger of love and goodness; and his death the mere incident of such an errand; of no more significance or effect than as it moves the heart of man to tenderness and repentance. They do indeed remove "the offence of the cross." It is no longer odious to the modern rationalists, nor would it have been of old a stumbling-block to the Jew, or foolishness to the Greek. But in making the offence of the cross to cease, they have taken away the very elements of its power; they do indeed claim that they exalt its power over the human soul, by holding up pre-eminently Christ's tender sympathy, his holy example, and his bleeding love. But neither has the common doctrine of Christ crucified omitted these; nor exhibited them with less tenderness, nor insisted upon them as matters of less moment.

After all, there is no love exhibited in any mere sympathy and faithfulness, like that exhibited in Christ's dying to redeem us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; and bearing our sins in his own body on the tree. The peculiar and efficient power of the Gospel to draw men to the Saviour, and to bring them to repentance, lies not alone in the mere sympathy, and love, and suffering, which it exhibits; but most of all, in the reason and significance of that death; as it declares God's awful holiness and justice; his utter condemnation of all sin; the deadly character and desert of sin; the utter impossibility that God should indulge his love and save the sinner without some way in which he may "BE JUST;" preserving in all its integrity the holiness, the sacredness, the

vindicatory power and authority of his law. It is this that alarms the conscience. It is this that crushes down the soul under a sense of sin, and guilt, and ruin. It is this that makes the law a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. It is this alone that reveals the depths of the Saviour's sympathy and love. It is this alone that gives the deepest impression of the nature and need of holiness. It is this that magnifies the love of God in redemption, and that shows his salvation to be indeed a great salvation.

The other scheme, in taking away the offence of the cross, takes all this power away. It relieves the soul from the most painful impressions of the desert and punishment of sin, and of the awful and inflexible character of the divine law. It gives a low view of the righteousness which the law requires, when it sets the sinner to trust to his own attempts to raise himself to a personal righteousness which shall constitute his justification before God.

What constitutes the offence of the cross to some is proved by experience to constitute the very element of its power. Nor does Paul admit that they are the truly wise, to whom it is a stumbling-block or foolishness. It is so indeed to some, but only to "them that perish;" while to "them that are saved, it is the wisdom of God." "Howbeit," says Paul, "we speak wisdom to them that are perfect (τοῖς τελείοις)." To men of adult understanding and spiritual comprehension, the doctrine is not foolishness but wisdom. Oh, how full of wisdom! How rich in its revelation of the eternal harmony and combined glory of the Divine attributes of holiness, justice, mercy, and love! And has not the Gospel long proved itself in these, to be indeed the wisdom of God, and the power of God unto salvation? Is there then any ground left, on which the rationalistic objections commonly urged against the doctrine of the Atonement, may fairly be considered to be of any moment?

Does any one suppose that, nevertheless, such difficulties ought to be considered and removed before we may unwaveringly receive the doctrine? Nay, what the difficulties are is not the question, but whether God has, on a fair interpretation, unequivocally revealed it? Can finite beings ever be set free

from mysteries and difficulties, amid the plans and government of the Infinite God?

Suppose we see clearly whatever lies wholly within a sphere of one mile in diameter; and all that we fully comprehend is wise and glorious. But there are things, parts of which are apparent in that sphere, while the other parts lie mainly beyond it. These things, partly seen, appear dark and forbidding. We cannot reconcile them with the goodness of God.

Enlarge the diameter of our sphere to ten miles: the things partly seen before are now seen completely. The darkness vanishes. They are more glorious than any thing we had before conceived of. But by enlarging our sphere we have increased our difficulties. For now there are a hundred times more things lying partly within and partly without our sphere, and these more dark and difficult than those which disturbed us before; and, unless our faith keeps pace with the increase of our knowledge, it turns out true that "He that increaseth knowledge, increaseth sorrow."

Enlarge our sphere to a diameter of ten thousand miles; or to the sphere of knowledge open to an archangel. We have increased the number of things lying partly without and partly within our sphere, in the duplicate ratio of the increased diameter, and these things are still more wonderful and difficult.

Where shall we stop? Where shall we reach the point where we may grasp and comprehend all the plans of the Infinite God? Plainly, there can never be a point where, to creatures, clouds and darkness shall not be round about the Throne of God. Whatever be the reach of our knowledge, we shall still be obliged to *trust* God, because we cannot fully *know*. What necessity, then, for solving all mysteries, before we can know that we have a Father in heaven? Or for removing all difficulties, or for altering the fair import of what our Father teaches, before we can receive his teachings as the truth? These difficulties may reveal the richest glories, when our knowledge shall be but a little more enlarged. They may be difficulties only to our narrow views, our ignorance, our prejudice,—or worse,—to our wickedness. To such beings as

we, either the Divine glories must be limited to a narrow compass, or they must extend beyond our narrow vision. Somewhere we must have faith. Nay, everywhere we must have faith. And whatever God may do, or whatever he may reveal, there is ever enough known to him to warrant the most implicit trust.

Even the little part which lies wholly within the history of this world has, to us, many deep mysteries. Shut out from us the light of prophecy; let us read the Divine purposes only from human history; and what a dismal chaos does the government of this world, in many parts appear? What a chaos it must appear without the Bible? What can we judge of wars, of changes, of the rise and fall of nations, of the wisdom or order of these things, any better than the insect of a day can judge of the winter or of the storm, or of the utility of these to the earth, to its fruits, or to the salubrity of its atmosphere, or to the well being of the people who inhabit it? Close the volume of inspiration; let no voice from heaven reveal the connection of any great event with the Divine purpose, the Divine justice, or the Divine government; let no prophecy point to the consummation of a scheme of glory and blessedness in the ages to come; and what can the people of any age know of the meaning and utility of the events passing before their eyes? Had the Israelites in their bondage in Egypt known of no promise of deliverance, and of no covenant with their fathers, nor of any divine purpose in that sojourning in bondage; what judgment could they have formed of its significance or design? So, when they were passing through the wilderness, and in their subsequent history under the judges and kings, the eye of faith alone, trusting to what God had revealed, could see any order, or justice, or government, or goodness in the current events of their history while these events were transpiring. Such darkness rests upon our minds still, with regard to the long deferred destinies of India and China. Such darkness rests still on the government of a just and holy God with regard to benighted Africa. Why her long-continued blindness and woes? Why have wickedness and woe reigned so long in this world? Who could see any end, or hope, were it not that

God has declared that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea? Taught by revelation something concerning such a vast and beneficent design on the part of Jehovah, we do begin at length to see light dawning upon the otherwise dark and chaotic history of this world. Plans reaching from generation to generation, for thousands of years, seem to be verging toward their completion. Christ is manifestly setting up his kingdom. We begin to see how disastrous events had their part in preparing the way, or in hastening on the work. We begin to see that there has been a devising mind and a guiding hand. We begin to trace out the connection and design of events, which, as they were passing, seemed without order or law; as though mankind had been left the sport of chance, or given up, without guidance or control, to their blindness and wickedness. Who, that has intelligently read Edwards' "History of Redemption," has not felt his soul comforted and joyful as he has seen a chain of the Divine purposes running through the earth's whole history, marking Jehovah's reign and Jehovah's plan in every thing; and discovering in all things an ultimate bearing upon that one point—the glory of God in the redemption of a fallen world? Perhaps the time will come when the book of the Divine Providence in the government of this world will be completed; and what we have hitherto read, even in Bible history, shall be almost lost in the flood of light that shall then burst upon the vision of the sons of God. Nay, when this world's history is complete, then the Divine providences will hold on their way through purposes not yet imagined by mortal man, unfolding the glories of the Divine wisdom and goodness more and more for ever and ever. With what rapture, as the redeemed behold these things, will they shout, "Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"

It is interesting to see that, as men advance to a wider survey of the physical history of our earth, the same far-reaching purpose of God is apparent in the ages before man was made.

In this respect the comprehensive survey of Edwards, in his "History of Redemption," has its counterpart in the work of Guyot, "The Earth and Man." God was preparing the earth for man in the slow ages during which, in obedience to his

word, the waters were gathering themselves together in one place, and the dry land appeared. Continents, islands, headlands, all conformed themselves to the great design for man's development and trial; as though in God's book all the members of the great scheme were written while as yet there was none of them. Nor is there any end of wonders, of knowledge and wisdom open to the discovery of man, if he will but patiently trace the great design. During the period when the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep,—long, long before man was made,—could even the angels tell the meaning of the convulsions and throes with which the earth was heaving? In the hot, damp periods, while the beds of coal were forming, who could have told in these the purposes of the Creator? The metals and metallic oxides injected into the veins of the rocks, or mingled with earthy substances—who could have seen in these any significance beyond chance, or sport, or caprice? Yet without the waterfalls, caused by the upheavings or irregular deposits of earth; without the coal, the iron, the silver, the copper, the gold, where would have been the arts, the commerce, the development, the history of man! Nothing appears to have been left out of the Lord's plan! Nothing undesigned! Nothing without amazing foresight, and amazing reach of wisdom! Yet had beings like us stood by at any of these periods, what could they have comprehended of the wonders of Jehovah's works that were transpiring before their eyes? Very likely they would have said that chance or chaos reigns, and that such works are altogether incompatible with the wisdom and dignity of any Being whom they could acknowledge as God. Is it impossible that even the witnessing angels had such a trial of their faith? And then the slow process! and the delay even after the design begins to be manifest! There is doubtless wisdom in these slow processes; and yet wisdom that is not, to finite minds, immediately apparent. But beings like us must consider, that with the Lord there is no proper delay, but that with him one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.

In mercy to us, and probably to strengthen our faith, the Lord, in some subordinate purposes, permits us to see the be-

ginning, the middle, and the end of the plan. At the end we see the wisdom and goodness of the design; while at the beginning, or at the middle, we see nothing but darkness. Thus it was dark when Joseph was thrown into the pit; when he was sold into Egypt; when by a false accusation he was cast into prison. The lingering days of that imprisonment were dark; but they lasted not one moment too long. Had one of the links in the chain of Providence been omitted, Joseph might never have been ruler in Egypt, nor his father and his father's house been kept alive from famine. Joseph's faith must have been sorely tried, as he could not foresee the end of the Lord, nor the reason of these dealings. Yet that trial and chastening might have been necessary to fit him for his subsequent advancement to power; and without them his exaltation might have been his ruin for time and eternity. God meant it all for good. And see how the subordinate purposes of God entwine together, and interweave themselves with the great purpose of the main scheme. Joseph was blessed, his father's house was saved; but God was also preparing a history by which men may believe his goodness while as yet they are unable to perceive it. The benefits conferred upon Joseph and his family were, perhaps, as nothing, compared with the greater and more enduring benefits to them who read his history. Perhaps, even now, his heart rejoices and is glad; perhaps he thanks God, and will be forever grateful for those providences which at the time were so distressing, but which have been for ages bringing such a revenue of glory to God. They may be a blessing to mankind forever.

We must work while the day lasts. The night cometh when no man can work. To our purposes delay is often defeat or ruin. It is not so with Jehovah. A day, a thousand years is with him all the same. Thus, the Messiah is promised: he comes not till nations have risen and fallen, and a hundred generations are in their graves. Not that the Lord is slack or hindered, but that his plans required four thousand years. And when the Messiah comes, the world is not at once wholly redeemed. There is a part for Antichrist to act, and a part for false teachers and false prophets; the blood of martyrs

must be shed, their souls under the altar must cry, "How long! O Lord, how long!" The Lord has his reasons. It is not to be expected we should he able to comprehend them all. Perhaps it was fit, since men have transgressed, that sin should be allowed to show somewhat of its fruits. Perhaps it was best that men should behold not only the goodness but the severity of the Lord. Perhaps it was well to let the world see what meaning there is in the curse pronounced in consequence of transgression. There may be other, wiser, and deeper reasons, which we are not yet able to fathom, or even to conceive. But of these we may be sure, that the Lord is not slack as men count slackness, but that in his vast and perfect purposes one day is with him as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.

To us the Gospel seems to have made slow progress since the Saviour left the earth. But few of the nations are as yet even nominally Christian. Of these, a large part is under the power of a corrupt Christianity, which seems as serious an obstacle to the kingdom of Christ as paganism itself. Many people in lands called Christian, are utterly disobedient to the truth; or they give heed to schemes of faith which are any thing rather than the gospel of Christ. Of the remainder, who hold fast the form of sound words, and profession of godliness, how few are in all respects worthy examples of a pure and living Christianity? Need we therefore be discouraged? We may indeed find arguments enough in these to evince the exceeding sinfulness of man. The unfaithfulness and wickedness of Christ's people may be sufficient to account for this slow progress of the cause of salvation. It may not appear best to the Lord to work the mightiest triumphs of his cause by people whose hands are so unholy, and whose faith and zeal are so low. It may be better to suffer grievous errors to prevail, and fierce conflicts and terrible disasters or persecutions to take place, such as are to be precursors of the battle of the last day. Perhaps God's people must be so sifted, chastened, and purified. Then, at last, Zion may arise and shine, her light being come, and the glory of the Lord being risen upon her. Therefore, will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea. It

may be best that these corruptions and conflicts should be suffered for a time among God's people, that they, and all men, may understand by these the desperate wickedness of the human heart; the exceeding sinfulness of sin; and the just necessity for its severe condemnation on the part of a righteous and holy God. Certainly it will at length be gathered from these, that the reformation of a lost world is to be not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord. In some manner there will be made to appear the best reasons for this seeming delay. We have seen the slow preparation, when what we would have had done at once required a thousand years. Perhaps, when all things are ready, and the people of God duly prepared, the Lord will amaze us still more by the counterpart; and one day shall accomplish the work of a thousand years. Observe the Lord's husbandry: "There shall be a handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon." Nor is there any reason to suppose that the Lord's sovereignty is so dissevered from the responsibility of his people, that their unfaithfulness is no hinderance, or that their zeal and labor have not the most assured encouragement. We are not called to pray without faith, nor to labor without hope. There is no need of being disheartened by seeming adverse occurrences, or by seeming delays. Christ's kingdom is sure to prevail. The decree is declared. It is established by covenant, and by oath. Only let us be careful that none of the hinderances be found in us, and that our love and zeal may be approved; and then we may "Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him." Amid the darkness that veils his designs, we shall ever find enough to try our faith; so amid the brightest glories of his redemption we shall find mysteries still. But they are mysteries which, to the true child of God, need cause neither perplexity nor fear; but as his spiritual perception is enlarged, and new glories burst forth from these clouds of mystery, he may cry out with Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall

be recompensed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen."

Art. II.—*Pantheism as a Phase in Philosophy and Theory of History.*

As Providence maintains a positive theism in history, and a course of orderly events against all atheistic and naturalistic speculations, so against Pantheism and Polytheism it asserts with equal distinctness the infinite personality of the one true God. As a philosophy, Pantheism is more life-like and attractive to the cultivated, and has always been far more prevalent than Atheism.

The one finds no proof in nature or history of a Creator and Ruler of the universe. This blindness is so repugnant to the common sense of men, that few, even in speculation, venture upon it. The other, finding the evidence so abundant, wildly rushes into an extravagance of theism, and infers that every thing is God.

Pantheism is thus a profound theism against atheism; a broad positive against a narrow negative. It is, also, monotheistic against all the forms of polytheism. It includes, in a sense, those other doctrines of a natural theology —omnipotence, omnipresence, and a will-less divine sovereignty. The atheist is often a mocker and a blasphemer. The pantheist is neither; but meditative and reverent. The former is generally gross and sacrilegious; the latter, in these days of intelligence, is refined and philosophic. He lives in a state of dreamy, blissful nebulosity; of imperturbable placidity and contentment; in a gratulatory admiration of himself and of every thing else as divine. "Whosoever sees me," he says, "sees the divine, and whatever I see is divine."

The idea of *all* as God sprang originally from the notion of many gods. Multiplicity of divine beings in nature, by a natural transition, ran into the all-comprehending unity as the

sole and the all of nature. But, in this passage from the concrete to the abstract, the cardinal idea of personality was lost on the way; so that while polytheism stands with monotheism on the question of personality, pantheism, in its denial of a personal infinite being, goes over from both these to atheism.

The four fundamental principles of pantheism, as a phase in philosophy and theory of history, are the following:—

1st. God is an infinite and impersonal substance.

2d. God and the universe are one and the only substance, essence, or being.

3d. The universe, material and intellectual, is an expansion, emanation, or series of individuations of the one Infinite into the many finites.

4th. The tendency of all individuations of the primal unity is first, to consciousness and freedom in man, and then back to absorption in the impersonal One and All. The characteristic averment of the pantheistic scheme is, and has been in all ages, what is called the one-substance doctrine. This is its key-note, its corner-stone.

Here are the rudiments of a philosophy of the universe, physical, psychological, and ethical, which it is claimed solves all the problems of the finite and the infinite. It contains the seeds of a comprehensive realism, or of a fascinating idealism; of an absolute mathematical unity, or a mere metaphysical identity; according as its advocate is materialistic or spiritualistic. On the idealistic side, history is only a series of ever-advancing and receding shadows. On the realistic, it is an endless process of expansion and contraction—the individuation and reintegration of the One and All.

Since Providence, in its claim to a satisfactory rendering of the course of the world has this phase of philosophy to meet and dispose of, and as no system has had expended upon it more constructive skill, or contains such a combination of attractive and obstructive elements, a glance at its history is indispensable to a clear view of its true place and uses in the providential plan.

It first appeared as Brahminism—a philosophic system which has held in its strong grasp, for three thousand years, the teeming millions of India. Brahm is the central, imper-

sonal, unconscious substance and unity. According to the Vedas, Brahm is God, and God is one. "His oneness is so absolute, that it not only excludes the possibility of any other God, but likewise the possibility of aught else, either human or angelic, material or immaterial." It is not an object of worship or scarcely of thought—a something which makes the nearest possible approach to nothing, so near that modern refinements hold them as identical. Yet all things, sun, stars, earths, animals, and the souls of men, are individuated parts of this one, and alike infinite and eternal. The chief emanations into personal consciousness are Brahma the Creator, Vishnu the Preserver, and Siva the Destroyer. These are the main forces of history.

The soul, in its circumlocution from the emanating point, passes down into the form of beasts, birds, and sometimes even vegetables and minerals, and back again after almost interminable transmigrations, to be merged and lost in the infinite abstraction. This return process is a kind of regeneration, or a second birth, of which the emanation was the first,—the whole cycle constituting the soul's history.

"The Indian view of things," says Hegel, "is a universal pantheism—a pantheism, however, of the imagination and not of thought." The central and all-comprehending abstraction he defines as, "the nothingness of being." From this nothingness every thing goes out blindly, and blindly returns. This process is universal history,—nothing at the beginning, nothing at the end, and, by a logical necessity nothing in the middle. This central infinite passivity or abstraction is the acme of blessedness; and to obtain it by stagnating thought, the repression of every thing human was the ruling idea with that tropical lethargic mass.

Among the Greeks, this pantheistic philosophy hardly existed as a self-consistent form of thought. The Eleatics pitted some phases of it against the prevalent polytheism. Zenophanes affirmed God to be one, and that one the round world. Hence his dogma, "God is a sphere." It is ever unmoved and immovable, for there is nothing to move it; and never self-moved, for that would require it to become external to itself. It is not infinite, since that only is infinite which has

neither beginning, middle, nor end. Nor is it finite, for the finite is something limited by something else.

It is not strange that Aristotle called Zenophanes, "clownish."

Parmenides taught that the all is one; that the one is finite and real, and the many, only in appearance. "All *is*," says Heraclitus, "and all is *not;* for, though it comes into being, it forthwith ceases to be." Such meagre fragments of thought, though glittering in the firmament of knowledge, scarcely obtained the consistency of theory in ethics or history.

The next form in which pantheism appears as a moral force in history, is the Neo-Platonism of the Alexandrine School, which took its rise near the close of the second century. Its chief phase as a theory of history was its antagonism to Christianity. It combined against that all the elements of Indian and Grecian philosophies, all the dialectic subtleties and mysticism of Aristotle and of Plato, with so much of the Christian guise as would render it attractive to those on the verge of the Christian faith. Ammonius Saccus was its distinguished founder; but it included some of the most brilliant minds of the age,—minds that made the age brilliant,—Plotinus, Proclus, and Jamblicus.

As in the Hindoo pantheism, so here the identity of God and the universe underlies this more poetic and attractive scheme. "God is all things," says one of these writers; "he is both the things that are, and the things that are not: for the things that are he hath manifested, and the things that are not he contains within himself."

The Neo-Platonic school started with unity as the last analysis of deity,—an absolute universal one, neither personal, intelligent, nor existent. "The God that does not think," says Aristotle, "is not worthy to be respected." And yet this abstract unity was their ideal of the beautiful and the good. This non-existent Esse, by emanation, becomes first concrete in intelligence, the νοῦς or a spiritual world. Then by a further movement it passes into soul, or ψυχὴ which constitutes the psychical or outer world of life, and ultimates in matter as the gross or dregs of the Divine. And this tidal ebb and flow of the one substance is not a matter of thought

and will, for there is nothing of intelligence at the starting point.

History is the flux and reflux of this infinite ocean of substance, through the ideal straits and channels of boundless space—this one and all, passing through the tenses and eternities, in its transitions from unity to multiplicity, and back again—"the restless manifestation," says one, "of an eternal and ever restless force."

"But these manifestations," writes an acute and candid critic, "have no absolute truth or duration. History is then only a phantom. The individual perishes and passes into the universal, because individual. It is only the universal that endures. The individual is the finite, the perishable. The universal is the infinite, the immortal. To die, therefore, is simply to be free from the conditions of space and time, and to lose personality." "I am struggling," said Plotinus in his closing hours, "to liberate the divinity within me."

With these old heathen forces, those great thinkers at Alexandria and at Athens joined the issue against the new Christian power. They fought skilfully and valiantly, but they could not conquer. The dead abstraction of a One-All could not stand before the distinctly pronounced one, living, personal and Divine Being. Emanation gave way, in the circles of philosophy and science, as well as of theology, to the original and simple doctrine of creation; and the confused idea of one substance for God and the universe, yielded to the clear discriminations of Creator and creature, the infinite and finite; and the endless circle of blind, tidal forces, before a wise and all-ruling Providence in history.

"In no species of grandeur," says M. Taisset, "was the Alexandrine school deficient; genius, power, and devotion, have consecrated it." For three centuries it was a formidable rival to the greatest power that ever appeared on earth—the power of Christianity; and if it succumbed in the struggle, it only fell with the civilization of which it had been the last rampart."

But the struggle with this form of pantheism was a help to humanity, and in it a new step was taken in correct catholic thinking. Its fall was another testimony to the Providence

that is in and above the universe. The fighters on the side of theism and a providential history were made better swordsmen by the battles they fought on this field. They understood more fully the weak points of their old enemy, and the invincibility of their cause. Providence rules as completely over the philosophies that discard its sway, as in those that include it; for it moves on in all the philosophies and *above* them, making its own wise use of them. Pantheism, with all the accessories of Grecian acuteness and Roman judicial comprehension, could not answer the great questions that everywhere, in all ages, meet the thoughtful mind. Those it leaves as "a desert, whose only semblance of vegetation is mirage, without fruit, without flower, without vegetation; arid, trackless, and silent, but vast and fascinating."

For more than twelve hundred years this victory of Providence over pantheism attended the Christian movement. No counter-current of any moment is perceived in the flow of those centuries. Ripples, indeed, were visible, and single elements of the nebulous maze mingle here and there in the speculations of the schoolmen.

But in the middle of the seventeenth century, pantheism re-appeared in a system more logical, and of far greater mathematical exactness than had ever marked its history. It introduced an era in philosophy, and its influence in speculative circles has not yet ceased.

The Hindoo pantheism was cloudy; the Neo-Platonic, poetic and brilliant. But that of Benedict Spinoza was a structure of the most solid mathematical and deductive masonry. He was a Jew, thoroughly trained in Old Testament and Talmudic lore, and who, from his idea of every thing as God, is called by Novalis a "*Gott trunkner mann.*" He early discovered an acuteness in speculation which perplexed the Rabbis, and later, a philosophic audacity which offended them.

Finding himself menaced with excommunication, he withdrew from the synagogue, leaving the thunderbolt which had hung darkly over his head to spend itself in the air. The large black candles are lighted at the door of the Tabernacle, above the books of the Law. Execrations come forth

from the chanters on one side, and the trumpet tones on the other. The candles are then reversed and drip slowly into a vase of blood, in which, at the final anathema, the light is extinguished.

Meantime, the object of this direful consummation is quietly pondering the mysteries of his own being, and of the universe. "What am I? Whence did I come? Whither do I go? What is this around me and above me—the finite and the infinite?" These problems he solved to his own satisfaction, by a series of axioms, definitions, and propositions, of which the one-substance doctrine is the beginning and the end. The animus of his system will be best conveyed by a brief statement of its main principles.

First.—All substance is that which exists in itself, and can be conceived only through itself; and this substance is God, not gross, as matter, but the abstract essence of all things—God, and necessarily infinite. Def. III. VI.

Second.—This God-substance has attribute and mode: attribute, the very essence of substance and mode, an accident or variation of it. Def. IV. V. VI.

Third.—There cannot be many substances, but only one. Prop. V.

Fourth.—Substance cannot create, nor be created. Prop. VI.

Fifth.—All substance is necessarily infinite, for if any were finite, it would be limited by another substance, when there would be two substances, which is impossible. Prop. VIII.

Sixth.—Time has no more relation to spirit than to a circle or a triangle, man, as to his essential nature, never being older or younger.

These principles, according to Spinoza, are the rudiments of history, and the elements of all science.

The expansion of God's being into the universe, on this philosophy, is an eternal necessity, and consequently an eternal fact, which precludes all idea of freedom, beginning, or creation. The varied forms of nature, of animal life and intelligence, are only so many modulations, intonations, and vibrations of the one will-less and planless substance.

Hence by a logical necessity, it allows only a mathematical and soul-less ethics. To ascribe justice to God, is simply to see in him a reflection of ourselves, which is no more proof of such a quality in him, than if a circle should give to him the property of circularity, or a triangle conceive of him as triangular. Evil, because it cannot be a part of the divine essence, is a non-entity. "What in me is right," say the Spinozists, "is good, because it is God; and what is wrong is nothing, because it is not God."

History, as in all forms of pantheism, is the process of the infinite, unconscious impersonality, under the necessity of self evolution and involution, in an endless gyrating, rotating, and revolving universe, without beginning, problem, progress, or end.

But is this the true philosophy, the right rendering of the finite and the infinite? It is very simple, methodical, and mathematical. Yet it does not even look toward the solution of these problems. Its fundamental falsity is in its bald assumption of one substance as the starting point. Its most delusive fallacy lies in its definition of substance as *infinite*. Allow these two, and it is a compact and beautiful structure. It illustrates and explains every thing. Deny these, and it is a castle in the air, dazzling, but deceptive, which explains nothing.

How can the pantheist know that every thing is God, better than the atheist that nothing is? How does Spinoza prove that the world and man are not a new and created substance? By his sixth proposition that all substance is infinite, and as such, cannot create or be created. Why does he assert that cause and effect, subject and object are identical? For the simple reason that his system will not allow them to be otherwise, as a triangle does not allow its three angles to be either less or more than two right angles.

This figure of the triangle illustrates the cardinal vice of pantheism as a phase in philosophy and a theory of history—it is an error of method. It is purely deductive; and hence, assumptive. With Spinoza, it was a futile, though splendid effort to apply the principles of mathematics in the province of metaphysics, theology, and history. From a mathematical *point*,

geometry draws out with infallible accuracy, the whole mathematical science. In like manner, from this metaphysical idea of one substance, Spinoza deduces the whole material, intellectual, and moral universe. He allows nothing to enter the evolving process but the point,—the one eternally expanding and contracting substance.

But are matter and mind diverse only in form: a thought and a stone simply different *stages* in the eternal circle: love and a lobster unlike only in degree of refinement? Such a boundless generalization confuses every thing. It throws into chaos the most important discriminations between Creator and creature; freedom and fate; virtue and vice; order and anarchy.

"We have followed Spinoza step by step," writes the acute George Henry Lewes, "dragged on by his irresistible logic; and yet, the final impression left on our mind is, that the system has a logical, not vital, truth. We shrink back from the consequences whither it so irresistibly leads us; we gaze over the abyss to the edge of which we have been dragged, and, seeing naught but chaos and despair, we refuse to build our temple there." It has no more logical than real truth. It is false in first principles—no solid reasoning can be built upon them. Yet, M. Saissez, the learned biographer of Spinoza, declares that "the ultimate struggle will be, not between Christianity and Philosophy, but between Christianity and Spinozism, its strongest and most inveterate antagonist." And there is an important truth here; for, although essentially false, Spinozism is to a class of minds exceedingly fascinating.

About the middle of the last century, the essential principles of pantheism were gathered up by Emanuel Swedenborg and elaborately wrought into a remarkable philosophical scheme. In 1743, at the age of fifty-five, having received what he regarded, as a special commission from God, as the evolutionist of the spiritual sense of the Bible, he devoted the remainder of his life exclusively to the development of his system into what he conceived as the correct philosophy—the true Christian religion. Esse and Existere, substance and forms, emanations and conjunctions, spheres and atmospheres, innermosts and extremes, degrees of altitude and latitude, discrete and continuous, constitute the nomenclature and the

ligatures of his philosophy and theology. "His object," says one of his biographers, "was to open a new way through natural knowledge to religious faith."

Swedenborg, like Spinoza, assumes the one-substance doctrine as the starting-point in all his speculations and interpretations. Of this primal Esse or God, all things in the universe are only modes or forms. Person has no significance when applied to the infinite, for it *limits* the ideal to what is finite; and only *thing* extends it to the infinite. "Without the exclusion of person, the thought cannot," he says, "become universal and extend to the ineffable and the infinite."

Creation—the production of another substance—is held to be impossible and absurd, and emanation is brought in as the substitute. "God first made his infinite finite by substances emitted from himself." These, in concentric spheres and atmospheres, move outward, and cooling and condensing, form the spirit world, and ultimate in *matter*.

This identity of God and the universe is a pivotal axiom on which the Swedish seer's whole system is made to turn. "Whatever proceeds from an Esse, makes one with the Esse; because it is one from the Esse, and the one is all and all in the other as in itself." What proceeds from any one is himself. "God is man and the *only* man, no one is man but Jehovah alone." Others are men only "by derivation from him." It is not man's eye that sees, though it appears so, but the Lord's; for he alone lives and acts. If there existed in man one grain of will, the whole human race would perish.

Providence by emanation proceeds from God, and is called the proceeding divine,—an endless "operation" of the one substance going out from itself and returning to itself. History is a cardinal pulsation of the divine One-All from eternity to eternity, self-wasting and self-repairing; now sending out its finited particles through the spheres and atmospheres, condensing into matter, and then, by refining influx and infillings, drawing them back again toward conjunction.

Hence, the accredited providential history of the world for the first sixteen centuries is not accepted by Swedenborg as a record of physical events, but of merely mental and moral

processes. It is an allegory, and not a history of a literal creation, fall, and deluge.

The last phase of the pantheistic philosophy is the recent German. The skilful elaborators were Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel,—all building, as did the Swede, on Spinoza's foundation, and, for the most part, out of his material, though not all after his fashion.

Fichte, following the idealism of Kant, developed the one-substance into a mere phantasmal outer world. The mind creates whatever it is not, and then negates it as an illusion. The subject, the *me*, is every thing, and the object, the *not-me*, nothing.

Schelling reversed this method, and assuming the reality of the outer world ran into objective pantheism, in the identity of the me and not-me.

Hegel, dismissing both subject and object, and resolving every thing into the mere *relation* of being and not-being, something and nothing, matured a system of mental gymnastics which has been claimed by a few as Christianly theistic, while the majority of his pupils are open pantheists or atheists. History here, as in all pantheistic schemes, is more a chemical process than a course of intelligible, providential events. The one-substance in its first form, Hegel calls nature —God, spirit, soul, matter,—all is nature.

In this is an eternal molecular movement; a *primum mobile*, tending to emanation and *discrimination;* yet, unconscious and unfree. In a second stage, *spirit* is eliminated and reaches consciousness,—God becoming conscious of himself as an individual, or as finited in man. The third stage is a return movement and carries the spirit from conscious freedom and personality back to the universal and unconscious impersonality. God is man, and man, so far as he nullifies the natural, is God.

"God," says Fichte, "is the moral order" of the world, and personality has no significance except in the finite. Light, thought, being, is not mine, but God's; for every thing belongs to him and is God, and what is not God is nothing.

The most remarkable character in history, the truest and most representative man of the race, by some students in this

philosophy, is resolved into a myth; while the grandest events of his life are explained by magic or mental hallucinations. Emanation, development, flux and reflux of the one-all and all-one, this is providence, this history; and God-worship nature-worship, self-worship, all-worship, and nothing-worship —this is religion.

Art. III.—*Memoirs of the Life and Ministry of the Rev. Thomas Raffles, D.D., LL.D.* By Thomas Raffles, Esq., B. A. Second edition. London: Jackson, Walford & Hodder, 27 Paternoster Row. 1865. Pp. 515.

The late Dr. Raffles, of Liverpool, was one of the lights of the English pulpit. He needs no introduction to our readers, for his fame long since reached our shores. Indeed, it was from an American college that he received his degree of Doctor of Divinity. The work before us has been accomplished by his son, who, in this memoir of his father, has shown excellent taste and feeling. It has gone through two editions in England, but as it is not likely to be reprinted among us, we propose to furnish a succinct account of its subject, derived from the book itself.

Dr. Raffles, during a large portion of his life, kept diaries, and some extracts from them we expect to give before we conclude; but our readers will find that they reveal little in regard to his inward life. What he wrote down in regard to the secret exercises of his soul, if indeed he recorded any thing touching that matter, his biographer has withheld from public gaze, and has only given us what the writer penned with a willingness that others should read. This negative excellence which the volume possesses, would, of itself, we had almost said, be enough, in these days, to make us respect it highly; for there is now very little secrecy in this world. As a genial writer once said: "It is well understood that if a man gains a battle for his country, or writes a book for its entertainment, the penalty he must pay for it is the vulgar exposure of every emotion that he had ever written down for one near his heart,

and of every treasured thought and feeling that he had recorded for his soul's good." To write such a journal as that of the late Henry Crabb Robinson, one which shall embody instruction or information, designed either for friends or the public, is one thing; but to write a diary filled with accounts of one's secret religious experience, and of the results of the soul's self-scrutiny, intended for the writer's eye alone, is another thing, and is what should be eschewed, unless the writer could be certain, as he cannot be, that before his exit from the world he will have the opportunity, and, we may add, the grace, given him to commit all to the flames.

Thomas Raffles was born at the house of his father, Mr. William Raffles, in Princes Street, Spitalfields, London, on the 17th of May, 1788. His mother, an excellent woman, belonged to the body of Wesleyan Methodists. His religious impressions seem to have begun at an early age. He became a member of the Methodist society soon after the completion of his tenth year, and so continued until he was sent to a large boarding-school in Peckham, where he joined the Independent Church. In 1805, he entered Homerton College, an institution for the education of young men for the ministry among Congregational Dissenters, then under the care of Rev. Thomas Hill, as resident tutor, and of Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith, as theological tutor. In 1809 he was called to the church of Hammersmith, near London, and immediately entered upon his ministerial and pastoral duties. As a settled minister, he was from the first most abundant in his labors. One evening of each week he occupied some pulpit in London, and undertook, in addition, various week-day services. He began now to form the nucleus of the valuable library which, after many years, he accumulated, and which was especially rich in old and curious theological books. His fondness for antiquarian literature was maintained throughout his life. He delighted in poring over an old book-stall, and was familiar with every place in London where there was a chance that any thing curious might be met with. Topography was always a favorite branch of study, and he was in the habit of collecting materials for history, some of which have already been used by writers at whose disposal he placed them. Since the appearance of these memoirs, the

Rev. Dr. Robert Holley, now of London, has published, in two octavo volumes, a very valuable work, entitled, "Lancashire: its Puritanism and Nonconformity." He repeatedly refers to MSS. of Dr. Raffles, containing collections for a history of the Nonconformist Churches of Lancashire.

Dr. Raffles had been settled in Hammersmith about three years, when the Rev. Thomas Spencer, the youthful and gifted minister of Newington Chapel, Liverpool, was drowned while bathing in the river Mersey. The congregation, thus bereaved, requested him to supply their pulpit for a few Sabbaths, which he agreed to do, without entertaining, as it would appear, the remotest idea of ever becoming their minister. His labors, however, resulted in his settlement over them, for they invited him to become the successor of Spencer, and, after seeking the path of duty with much prayer and anxiety, he consented, and began his pastorate among them in the month of April, 1812. This conspicuous position he held for very nearly fifty years; and it may be doubted whether any Nonconformist pastor in England ever occupied a more important sphere of ministerial exertion and usefulness. At the time of his retirement from his stated ministry in Great George Street Chapel, in 1861, he was the patriarch of his denomination in the county. All his seniors who had occupied prominent positions had passed away, one by one, while he still survived, honored and beloved by all at the close of a long and laborious career, which had, throughout, shed lustre upon the religious body to which he belonged.

Before the death of the Rev. Mr. Spencer his congregation had begun to erect a new chapel in Great George Street, calculated to contain two thousand people. This was finished shortly after Dr. Raffles' settlement, and on the occasion of its opening, sermons were preached by the Rev. Wm. Jay, of Bath, and the Rev. Dr. Collier, of London. There were in Liverpool many members of the Established Church of England—and a few of them survive to this day—who gratefully acknowledge the debt which they owe to the faithful ministry of Dr. Raffles within the walls of Great George Street Chapel. For, at the time of his settlement in Liverpool, the state of religion was very different from what it subsequently became.

Owing to the want of evangelical preaching in the pulpits of the Established Church, many persons, avowedly holding the principles of that church, were in the habit of attending the ministry of Dr. Raffles.

His chapel immediately began to be crowded, and church-members constantly increased in numbers. And while his labors were blessed to the spiritual benefit of the hearers who composed his own charge, he was permitted to be useful to many others; for, in consequence of his popularity as a preacher, his services were constantly sought throughout the neighboring counties. And this gave him frequent opportunities of preaching the essential doctrines of Christianity to the ignorant masses, an employment in which he delighted. In looking over some parts of this volume, one almost fancies he is reading the life of an itinerant missionary.

With such frequent absences, his home duties were necessarily crowded into a briefer space, so that it would have been impossible for him to get through them had he not been an early riser and extremely methodical in all his arrangements.

He had been settled in Liverpool two years, and was but twenty-five years old, when he received an invitation to preach one of the annual sermons before the London Missionary Society. The invitation, which, after some hesitation, he accepted, came almost at the last moment for preparation, in consequence of the failure from illness of the gentleman who had been appointed to preach. It is interesting to read his own recollections of the occasion, written in old age, at the request of others. He says: "The missionary sermon was preached in the Tabernacle, Moorfields, in 1814. The cause of missions was at that time comparatively new to our churches, and there was a freshness and a power connected with it then, of which people now can scarcely form an adequate conception. The congregation on that occasion was immense. The spacious chapel had been crowded since four o'clock in the afternoon. A sermon was preached at the same time in the chapel-yard to the multitudes who still lingered there. I cast myself on the Divine help, and went to the service with a feeling of intense anxiety. The crowd was so great, and the

people were so thoroughly dovetailed one into the other, that it was with great difficulty, and only after a considerable lapse of time, that I could reach the pulpit. Then, when I ventured to open my eyes and look around me, the scene was truly overwhelming. The leading men in the religious world of that day were there gathered from all parts of the United Kingdom, and hundreds of ministers who seemed completely to fill the galleries, and who, with their sable costume, and, in many instances, venerable countenances, presented an appalling appearance to me, the pale stripling who was about to address them. Many a fervent prayer was, I believe, presented for me. After the first five or ten minutes, every thing like trepidation passed away. I obtained a perfect composure and entire mastery of my theme, and the vast audience was held in perfect and profound stillness and attention to the end. The delivery of the sermon occupied about an hour and twenty minutes. In another year it will be half a century since that sermon was preached, but the scene and all connected with it, is as fresh in my memory as though it were only yesterday, and my impression is that the challenge which I ventured to give at the close of the sermon was not premeditated, but the suggestion of the moment. I have often wondered how I could have had the boldness to utter it. I had been for some time occupied in answering objections to the missionary enterprise—at that time of day it was necessary on such occasions to deal with them—when I suddenly paused and said, 'And now is there still an objector in this assembly? if there be, let him rise! Pardon me, my reverend fathers and brethren (turning to the venerable group of the founders of the Society, who sat leaning over the front of the gallery behind me), your cause is bad if it will not stand this test. I wait the objector's charge!' For some moments I was silent. The stillness of the grave pervaded the vast assembly, and I resumed: 'What, none! then I congratulate you, ye directors of this noble institution! To be approved by so many thousands as are here assembled, must be animating to your minds. I congratulate myself; my work is done. But I am surrounded by friends; you are all true men to the cause I have this night espoused, and to attempt to

plead with you would be only to insult your understandings and your hearts.'"

It would have been interesting to read an account of this discourse, and of the effect which it produced, from the pen of some one who heard it. Much of course is left untold. Judging from all we have heard of Dr. Raffles, he must have possessed in an eminent degree a lively susceptibility of emotion, and this of itself was sufficient to make his speaking impressive. Such preachers of the gospel, and their number is not large, are highly favored. They have greatly the advantage of others. The preacher may be sincere, and he may have no little zeal and fire, but this peculiar susceptibility of which we speak cannot be acquired. It is a gift. But it is curious to remark the mistake into which people are sometimes led in regard to eloquent men who show much emotion in speaking. We once heard a lady eulogize the *character* of an able speaker, who, in this way, was apt to be deeply and tenderly moved, by saying, "he is a man of great feeling;" whereas those whose acquaintance with him was more intimate, knew that the nobler traits did not preponderate in his character, and that he was not remarkable for tenderness of heart, nor for much feeling for others. We cannot decide upon the character of any one from his transient emotions. But the nobler traits were prominent in the character of the subject of this biography, and, moreover, we fully credit the assurance of the author that popularity itself failed to change his loving and genial nature.

Dr. Raffles was settled for half a century over his church in Liverpool, and the labors of each year were greatly blessed. There was a steady, quiet ingathering of souls, without what we in this country call revivals. There was constant enlargement, and believers were not only "added to the Lord," but they grew in grace. This was a result which might have been expected from his ministrations, for his preaching was from first to last not only earnest, but thoroughly evangelical. Moreover he *visited* his people, not by fits and starts, but regularly and without ceasing, up to the very close of his ministry. Some idea of his zeal and faithfulness, as well as of his success as a Christian minister, may be

obtained from the following extracts from a few of his letters:—

"If I appear at present to neglect you, you must not complain, for if ever a poor mortal was driven by the multiplicity of his cares and concerns almost to desperation, I am he. Think for a moment of my situation. Two thousand people demanding my attention and time; three sermons every week to make and preach; sick every day to visit; Bible to prepare (for the printer) and the press almost every day to correct; innumerable letters to write, in answer to various applications from London and other places about preaching—I may say innumerable, when I wrote upward of ninety letters in the course of the last fortnight; I say, lay all these things together and you will have a picture of my present situation. I go to bed weary and rise unrefreshed; day and night, mind and body are all on the rack. . . . The world envies me, and in my exertions I am the envy of all; but my personal comfort is resigned; yet I labor in a good cause, and I acknowledge the hand that sustains me."

"——— This afternoon I was called to visit one of Mr. ——'s people. It was at his earnest request I was sent for. He is fast wasting away in a consumption. On my asking him how he felt in the prospect of death, he told me he was very composed; he had not committed any great crime, he had not done anybody any harm, and he had made up his account with God. I let him go on and tell his own tale, and then asked him whether he found the account balanced, or whether in any thing he found he was deficient? He said, 'Yes, for no man could say he was without sin; but still he had never done his neighbor any harm, and always endeavored to conduct himself with propriety. I said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,' is the second commandment, what is the *first?* 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;' have you kept *this?* Not perfectly, he acknowledged, though he had always striven to reverence the Supreme Being. 'Then,' said I, 'is it safe to stake your everlasting salvation on the second command, when you confess that you have failed in the first?' He paused, and was evidently confounded, and I embraced the opportunity to preach to him Jesus; when, after insisting on the depravity of the human heart, and the necessity of an atonement, I said, 'And now what is your hope?' 'I have no hope,' he said, 'but in Jesus Christ?' 'Do the things that I have said, then,' I rejoined, 'commend themselves to you as truth?' 'Yes,' said he, 'they do.' I was much astonished at his altered tone, talked further with him, and my satisfaction increased as I conversed. I prayed with him, and left him with the promise that I would see him again."

"——— Visited Mr. C—— again. His mind is still fixed on Christ."

"——— I have little worth communicating to you in the way of news. My ministry here, I have reason to believe, is still useful, and certainly the congregation, both parts of the day, has been much greater than in any former summer. Our church also still increases."

"——— It is Monday morning, and, after preaching three times and administering the sacrament yesterday, I feel more fit for a pillow, than for pen and paper. But my orders are, 'Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work.' And, indeed, I have every encouragement to work, for the numbers that attend, and the success that, under God, crowns my ministry, are

enough to arouse the most timid to activity, and inspire the most desponding with hope. Last night I addressed about 2,500 from the request of Moses—'I beseech thee, show me thy glory.' Six persons were received into the church at our last church-meeting, and on every hand the word of the Lord appears to have free course and be glorified."

"——— As the clock struck twelve last night, I rang the bell, having been on an errand of mercy, with the record of which I commence the new year."

"——— I ought to feel the deepest and most unfeigned gratitude to God that my ministry was never more prosperous than it is at present. We never had the chapel so completely crammed as it has been this winter. I have commenced a course of lectures on the doctrines of the gospel, and delivered the second lecture this evening. They promise to be very useful. My *pastoral* duties keep pace with my increasing congregation. Seven members were proposed for admission into the church at our last church-meeting; and, what with visiting the sick, baptizing children, burying the dead, attending committees, preparing sermons and preaching them, my time is wholly occupied. A few weeks ago I baptized twelve children at one time, and seven last Sunday. A stated charge of 2,000 souls is an awful and oppressive weight upon my spirits, and often, when I think of the account I shall have to render at the tribunal of God, I am ready to exclaim, 'Who is sufficient for these things?'"

"——— I have this week been to the district meeting of the County Union at North Meols. Preaching was not expected, but the place was crowded, the congregation being assembled by the proclamation of the bellman. In the evening the place overflowed. A simplicity approaching to that of primitive times prevails among the people. The eagerness with which the people flocked to hear the word, the deep seriousness, and profound attention which marked every countenance, were truly affecting."

"——— I am well worked with public labor. I preached last Saturday night, last night, and am to preach again at Surrey Chapel to-night. The congregations have been very large, particularly at Hoxton. It was not known in London that I had come, for some time, as I preached at Paddington the whole of the first Sunday, and Mr. Wilson kept his promise not to announce my coming."

The following letter to Dr. Raffles, which we here insert, is full of encouragement to all faithful ministers, for it shows that even when they see no extraordinary results from their labors, they may be doing an amount of good which they do not dream of:—"If prayer for those who do us good and wish us well, is our bounden duty, then how ought I to pray for you! To your preaching I believe I am mainly indebted as a means employed by that God who is rich in mercy, of preserving me from total declension and final apostasy, within a few years of your first coming to exercise your ministry in this town, and also of leading me in the way of truth until now—if, indeed, I am in that way. And for a considerable period of late, during which troubles upon troubles have been coming

upon me, and which do not seem as if they would soon come to an end, were it not for many of the subjects to which a compassionate Saviour has especially directed you, and enabled you to dwell upon in such a manner as to impart the most abundant encouragement and strength to my soul, I should be overwhelmed and sink the victim of despair. Still I am enabled to hope, and though I am a subject of nervous debility, etc., which produces much depression of spirits, and almost continual fear of death, and a looking too frequently to the dark side of almost every case, yet I am constrained to say that to your ministry I owe it in a great degree, that I am able still to trust—and at times to feel—that all is well, and to believe that all shall work together for my good, and that when I am sufficiently humbled, God will remove his chastening hand from me."

It was at an early period of his ministry in Liverpool that Dr. Raffles wrote the life of Spencer, his lamented predecessor. It reached its seventh edition in England, and many editions also appeared in this country. The last of these was published in New York, by Dr. Patton, with an introduction from his pen. The author often expressed his astonishment at the reception it met with. "Its usefulness," he writes to a friend, "has overwhelmed me; and when I consider that there are many, both in Great Britain and America, whom I have never seen, nor shall see in the flesh, who will have cause to all eternity to bless God that they ever perused that book, I am truly confounded and humbled. I am now most deeply conscious of the Divine goodness in leading me to publish it, though with how little faith and how much trembling it was committed to the press the Searcher of hearts knoweth. It has been the means of sending many pious young men into the ministry." Owing to the pressure of public and pastoral duties, the volume was written chiefly after midnight.

It was this production chiefly which made the author's name a familiar one in this country. Subsequently there were many on this side the water, who came to know him personally and to esteem him highly. His biographer writes:—"He was constantly visited by Americans, on their way to or from Europe. Many agreeable acquaintances, some of which ripen-

ed into friendship, were thus formed; for few came to Liverpool without finding their way, on the first Sunday after their arrival, into the chapel, and subsequently to the vestry in Great George Street. In the early part of this year, the Rev. Dr. Sprague, of Albany, U. S., arrived with a letter of introduction from the Rev. Dr. Spring, of New York. Dr. Raffles and Dr. Sprague had already corresponded while unknown to each other, except by reputation. They now became personally acquainted, and the friendship which was thus formed continued unabated to the last. In addition to the ordinary grounds for mutual esteem on which friendship is, for the most part, based, there was a strong bond of sympathy in an antiquarian taste, which was common to both. Dr. Sprague was a great collector of autographs; and an interchange of MSS. was constantly taking place, by which each enriched the other's collection."

Dr. Raffles, like his American antiquarian friend, made himself thoroughly acquainted with his own accumulations. Toward the close of the volume the biographer says: "The collection of autographs which Dr. Raffles had been gradually but steadily accumulating, had now become very extensive and interesting. He had, for some years past, been engaged, during the few spare hours which he could devote to the purpose, in arranging and illustrating them. In this task the editor had been his chief assistant, and among the happiest reminiscences of the past, is the memory of the evenings which he was now and then privileged to spend with his father, surrounded by his manuscripts, and agreeably occupied in investigating the past history of those whose autographs were from time to time before them for the purpose of illustration and arrangement. The editor soon became inoculated with the taste for biographical and historical research, which such an occupation can scarcely fail to create, and which his father did all in his power to foster and develop by amusing and instructive anecdotes, and remarks from his own large stores of information. To attempt a description of the contents of the collection would be quite impossible within the limits of this biography. One series alone consists of forty folio volumes, with illustrations, and there are at least as many quarto vol-

umes of various kinds, exclusive of an extremely rare and valuable collection, in seven volumes, of distinguished Americans."

The writer of this article will long remember the pleasure he experienced at the sight of some of these treasures on a visit to Liverpool, heightened as it was by the warm hospitality, the kindness, and genial manner of their owner, as he exhibited them to him for inspection. Strangers, whether from other parts of his own country, or from America, were sure to find themselves at his hospitable table on the morning following their introduction, when, with a delightful frankness of manner and the utmost Christian courtesy, he would in every way in his power lay himself out for their entertainment. We can never forget the keen interest with which we examined a little manuscript book, which he placed in our hands, perfectly circular in its form, each page of which, not including the margin, was only an inch and a quarter in diameter, and which contained the entire Koran, written in Arabic. It was worn on the arm of a prince, and a priest of Mahomet, from which it had been taken as he lay dead, after the storming of a citadel in Java, in 1816, while Sir Stamford Raffles was governor.

Doctor Raffles seldom came home empty-handed from any of his journeys, as his biographer tells us, and his friends throughout the country were only too well pleased to gratify him by procuring any interesting letters or other documents which they could obtain. In this way, for the most part, his valuable collection was gathered together. He purchased comparatively few autographs, but he attached to them portraits and other illustrations, at a considerable cost in the whole, which he had picked up from time to time.

With his antiquarian tastes he had a strong turn for the humorous. This trait of his character constantly showed itself in company, and it accounted for his irrepressible disposition to treasure up droll things in his memory. Many were the curious epitaphs which he could repeat, discovered by him in his rambles, and which his memory tenaciously retained. Few men were ever gifted with greater powers of attraction, and, notwithstanding his exceeding frankness, it is

not known that he ever uttered a word to give pain, or which could be construed into disregard for the feelings of others who might differ from him in opinion. He had the good sense which is a characteristic of his nation, joined to a child-like simplicity which prevented him from constantly taking care of his dignity, under the queer impression that he was husbanding his influence.

Before Dr. Raffles' settlement in Liverpool, the Congregational ministers in Lancaster County had established what is called the Lancashire Congregational Union, for the purpose of spreading religion in the rural districts. He soon became aware of its great value, and his attachment to it constantly increased. For the purposes of efficient work, the county is divided into districts, and each district contains a number of stations. Preachers and teachers are secured for all the stations, and the funds of the Union, raised by appeals to the churches and to benevolent individuals, are used for the erection of suitable buildings, chapels, etc., in the several stations, and for the support of the missionaries and teachers whose services are enlisted. In time the people learn to depend mainly upon themselves for the support of the gospel, instead of looking for aid altogether from the Union. Every year there is a meeting of the Union in one of the large towns of the county, when a report from each station is read, in regard to its religious condition, and also the report of the treasurer of the Union as to receipts and disbursements. These reports are afterward printed. There can be no doubt that the dissenting denominations of England, each of which has done so much in this way, or in similar ways to promote religion among the neglected population, have greatly stimulated each other in the good work. It will never be known how much the church of Christ owes to their labors. There are the clergy of the Establishment, and abundant provision is made for their support, but the instruction by their exertions of all the population in their parishes is not to be looked for. The people belonging to their parishes have ever been left, to a great extent, uninstructed, and were it not for the efforts of Dissenters, a large proportion of them would be in a state little above heathenism. And this, although so

many ministers of the Established Church are men of piety and worth.* Dr. Raffles soon formed a strong attachment to his co-laborers, members of the Lancashire Congregational Union. Their untiring exertions in many of the wild and scarcely civilized districts of Lancashire County, resulted in a degree of success altogether remarkable. He himself was a constant visitor throughout the length and breadth of the county. His office as secretary of the Union and his fame as a preacher laid him open also to numberless calls for services at the opening of chapels in the different stations, and the ordination of ministers. "Few can imagine," says one who worked with him in the same field, "what large demands upon his time and strength all this involved."

A considerable space is devoted in this volume to an account of the efforts of Dr. Raffles, in connection with other leading ministers, to found the Lancashire Independent College, near Manchester, an institution for the education of young men for the ministry among Congregational Dissenters. In bringing about the result he appears to have been especially active and influential; and before his death it was his happiness to see it fully established and flourishing. At first, no small amount of time was devoted to collecting funds for the college. No doubt there is a large class who feel no particular interest in knowing either the trials or encouragements which attend employments of this kind, but for some of our readers the following anecdote may have its relish:—"On one occasion, in company with Mr. Hadfield, he went to call on an old and wealthy, but somewhat eccentric gentleman, the late Mr. Samuel Lees, of Oldham. They found him at home, smoking his pipe, and after a while opened fire upon him in reference to the college. Dr. Raffles and Mr. Hadfield successively enlarged upon the prospective benefits of the projected institution, but apparently to little purpose, for all they could extract from Mr. Lees was, 'Weel, I mun gie ye a lift, I mun gie ye a lift;' but what was the extent of the lift was wholly left in the dark. Mr. Hadfield enlarged upon the

* The Rev. Baptist Noel's book, "Essay on the Union of Church and State," was published more than twenty years ago. It is still instructive and valuable. See the chapters on the "Effects of the Union."

mode of payment by instalments as very desirable, but Mr. Lees only said, 'Weel, I mun gie ye a lift;' adding, 'I've two causes at the assizes, I mun see how they turn out.' At length, the talking being somewhat exhaustive, tea was asked for, and brought; and after some more conversation the two visitors departed, Mr. Lees saying, 'Haply I might call some day at Mr. Hadfield's office in Manchester.' On leaving, Mr. Hadfield expressed an opinion not very favorable as to the probable result of the visit; while Dr. Raffles, on the other hand, said he would give £100 for it. Weeks or months rolled by, when, upon a certain morning, Mr. Lees walked into Mr. Hadfield's office, and, on being shown into the presence of that gentleman, he said, 'Weel, Mr. Hadfield, I've come about th' college;' and pulling out a large pocket-book, apparently well lined with notes, he said, 'You said you'd take it in 'stalments,' and inserting his finger among the notes, speedily pulled out one for £100, and presented it to Mr. Hadfield, saying, 'Here's th' first 'stalment;' then, taking another dip, he drew out a second note for the same amount: 'Here's th' second 'stalment;' and so with two other notes, till he counted out £400 down on Mr. Hadfield's desk in ''stalments;' and, having done so, he added, 'An' if ye want more, ye mun have it.'"

The biographer adds, "The story can be only very imperfectly told on paper. As Dr. Raffles related the incident, and threw into it his own rich vein of humor, it was inimitable." Dr. Vaughan was the first President and Theological Professor of the new college, and for several years Dr. Samuel Davidson, a biblical scholar and critic not unknown in this country, was the professor of Biblical Criticism and Oriental Literature. In 1855 Dr. Davidson was charged with holding views which disqualified him for his position in the college, and the controversy which arose in reference to the matter resulted in his resigning his Professorship.

Dr. Raffles entered into the benevolent enterprises of the Bible and Missionary Societies with all his heart, and, to promote the objects for which they were founded, he engaged with alacrity in any work which in the Providence of God he was called to perform, however arduous it might be. In order

to lend a helping hand, he was willing to travel and preach to the limits of his strength, and even beyond his strength. He was one of the directors of the London Missionary Society and it was at his suggestion that it sent out three missionaries, Messrs. Supper, Kam, and Brückner, to Java, with the view of establishing a mission on the island. They had been educated in Holland and Berlin, but had been consigned to that society. In the success of this mission he took a deep interest, and he furnished the missionaries with a letter of introduction to Sir Stamford Raffles, his cousin, who was at that time the governor of the island, and with whom he had already been in correspondence in relation to missionary enterprise in that portion of the globe.

The island of Java was in the possession of the Dutch up to 1811, when it was taken from them by the English; but the English Government's tenure of it was very brief, for it was restored by them to the Dutch, in 1815, by whom it is still held. It was by the advice of Sir Stamford Raffles that the expedition was fitted out against Batavia in 1811. He was, as has been seen, a relative of Dr. Raffles, and his name is frequently mention in the volume under review. He was a remarkable man. He was appointed an assistant clerk in the India House at fifteen. He afterward became chief secretary to the new government formed by the East India Company, at Penang. In 1809 he published an essay on the Malay nation. When Batavia was capturedfrom the Dutch, he was appointed lieutenant-governor of Java and its dependencies, and while he held the office slavery was abolished in the island. He published a history of Java, in two quarto volumes, with one volume of splendid plates, evincing much scientific knowledge and exquisite taste. He was afterward made lieutenant-governor of Fort Marlborough, the seat of the English government at Bencoolen, Sumatra, and remained six years in this position, emancipating the slaves here also. He established the British settlement at Singapore, and founded a college there for the encouragement of Anglo-Chinese and Malay literature.

It was to labor among the Chinese emigrants in Java that the three Dutch missionaries were sent to that island by the London Society, for these compose a large part of the popula-

tion. Supper died in Batavia in 1816. Brückner joined the Baptist Society and continued his exertions, amidst many difficulties, on the island for some years. Since these missionaries first went to Java, a number of devoted servants of Christ —English, Dutch, and German, as well as American—have toiled on the ground.

Large portions of several chapters of this volume are occupied with Dr. Raffles' graphic descriptions, in letters to his friends, of his visits to interesting spots in his own country, as well as on the Continent and in the East. His love of nature was intense, and he could not help writing about all he saw. There can be no doubt that his periodical absences from his public services, for the purpose of change of scene and relaxation, were the means of prolonging his useful life, and preserving the freshness and elasticity of his powers. But even when he journeyed, he engaged, whenever it was possible, in his work of preaching.

He published an account of one of his tours on the Continent, which went through five editions, and which for many years was even used as a guide-book. He used to tell the following story in reference to it:—

"On one occasion, as I was travelling out of Lincolnshire into Lancashire, I was put down at the Tontine Inn, Sheffield, at the close of a long summer's day. I went, as my custom was, into the traveller's room, and, having secured my bed, sat down in the midst of a large company, and began to ponder the question—tea or supper? In the midst of my musing, a gentleman entered the room, and looking round, said, 'Will any gentleman take supper?' That settled the matter; I accepted his challenge, and supper being speedily on the table, we sat down *vis-à-vis* to enjoy it. I found my companion very intelligent and communicative, and we talked freely on various topics; when at length he said, 'I had a very delightful tour lately on the Continent—my wife, my wife's sister, and myself were the party. We went to Paris, Geneva, Chamouni, down the Rhine, and by the Netherlands, etc. We had all the tours with us; but somehow I like Raffles' tour best of all. I think he only describes what he actually saw, but I believe there are many who describe what they did not themselves see. And there is something so like in Raffles' descriptions, they bring it all to my memory as though I had seen it only yesterday. Did you ever see the book? But, by the bye, were you ever on the Continent?' 'Yes,' said I, 'I have been on the Continent.' 'Were you in his direction at all?' he added. 'Yes,' I answered, 'the very tour he took, I took.' 'Oh, then,' said he, 'you are a judge; what do you think of it?' 'Why,' I said, 'I agree with you; I don't think he does describe any thing but what he saw.' 'And then,' he continued, 'it is so cheap! There's ———, he has spun it out into two volumes: he might very well have put it all into one. I

have Raffles' book in my trunk: it is a nice travelling companion, and every now and then I take it out and read a bit, and then I travel over the ground again, and it is all fresh and vivid in my mind. That Raffles, I believe, is a Dissenting minister, at Liverpool.' It may be supposed that I was not a little amused as well as gratified with all this, and much more passed between us, but I preserved my incognito till we parted for the night, when I said, 'Will you allow me, before I say good-night, to tell you how much pleasure you have afforded me by the testimony you have borne to the correctness of Raffles' tour?' 'What!' said he, 'is he a friend of yours?' 'Perhaps,' said I, 'the closest friend he has, for I wrote the book.' '*You* wrote the book!' he said with considerable vehemence. 'Do you mean, sir, to tell me that Dr. Raffles did not write the book himself?' 'No,' I replied, 'I don't mean to tell you any such thing, for I know that he did write it himself; nevertheless I say again, I wrote the book.' 'You don't mean that you are Dr. Raffles?' 'Yes,' I said laughing, 'I do, and I'll stick to that.' 'What, have I been all this time talking to Dr. Raffles?' 'Yes,' I replied, 'you have.' 'Well,' he exclaimed, 'I do hope, Dr. Raffles, that I have said nothing that could give you pain.' 'No, sir,' I said, 'quite the reverse; I have had many testimonies to the correctness of that book, but they have been from persons who knew that they were addressing the author, but your testimony is, in my esteem, of greater value than that of all the rest put together, for it is perfectly impartial.' 'Well, Dr. Raffles,' he said, 'it is kind of you thus quickly to relieve me of the dilemma in which I have placed myself. The fact is we were all really much indebted to you for the information and pleasure we derived from the perusal of your book.'"

Not a few illustrious names are brought before us in these pages. Near the close of his life, Dr. Raffles, at the request of intimate friends, committed to writing a few autobiographical recollections, and these include an account of interviews with some of these celebrities. Our readers will no doubt be entertained with the following relation of his intercourse with Rammohun Roy, the Hindoo scholar, whose arrival in England, in 1831, caused such a sensation in certain circles:—

"I had the good fortune to be twice in company with that remarkable man, the Rajah Rammohun Roy. A benevolent errand in behalf of his countrymen brought him to this country in the year 1831;* and though it is more than thirty years ago, I have a perfect recollection of the man, and of his conversation. What astonished me most was the wonderful acquaintance which he had—so accurate and so minute—with all our institutions, and habits, and history. One of the occasions on which I met him was at dinner at Mr. Cropper's [he was a Quaker friend of Dr. Raffles], at the Dingle. I sat next to him at table. Nothing very remarkable occurred in the conversation during dinner, but, immedi-

* He was accredited to the British court by the king of Delhi, to make a representation of grievances, and, though not recognized officially, he was successful.

ately after the cloth was drawn, a carriage drove up to the door, bringing the celebrated phrenologist, Dr. Spurzheim, and another gentleman, to call on the Rajah. They were ushered into the dining-room, and a chair was placed for Dr. Spurzheim immediately opposite the Brahmin. The Doctor was scarcely seated, when the Brahmin said (I wish I could give the deep tone and broad pronunciation with which he spoke; any thing said by him must lose much by the absence of that which can't be transferred to paper), 'But I must have a word with this philosopher; I was a member of the Phrenological Society of Calcutta for two years myself, but they all fell to quarrelling among themselves, so I left them; but you say the head—it is formed with the bump, the conformation, the figure, and that the bump, the conformation, the figure does indicate the character, the habit, the disposition of the mind. You say so; well! you shall meet with a man who lives to be twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years old, and then he change, he quite change, he become another man. Now his head, does that change?' 'Oh, yes,' said Dr. Spurzheim, with a strong German pronunciation, 'and you shall meet with some men that do change, but there are many more that do not change.' 'Oh, yes,' replied the Brahmin, 'there are many men that never change You may find five hundred men that do not change, five thousand men that do never change; but if I find fifty men, five men, that do change, and their head it does not change, my fifty, my five go to prove that your system is not universal.' Dr. Spurzheim's friend then related the case of a boy, who was a bad boy, and grew up to be twenty, and till that time was a pest to society; but, when little more than twenty years old, he changed, and became an altered man, and the bumps on his head went down till they were entirely lost. The Brahmin listened most earnestly, till the gentleman ceased to speak, and then he lifted up his hands as in astonishment, and said, 'So the bump it go away!' 'But,' Dr. Spurzheim cried, 'don't you believe the fact?' 'Oh, yes,' he replied, 'I must believe the fact, as the gentleman says so; but, it is a very remarkable fact, and very much to your purpose.'

"The other instance in which I had the pleasure to meet this most interesting man, was at breakfast in my own house. On that occasion I invited men of various religious opinions to meet him, and there were about thirty persons present. The conversation was very lively and well-sustained. The Brahmin exhibited wonderful shrewdness. 'Ah,' he said, 'you say that you are all one in Christ, all brethren, and equal in him. Well, you go to the cathedral at Calcutta, there you see a grand chair of crimson velvet and gold—that is for the Governor-General of India; then there are other chairs of crimson and gold, they are for the members of council; and then there are seats lined with crimson, they are for the merchants, etc.; then there are the bare benches for the common people and the poor; yet you say we are all one in Christ; but if the poor man—whose seat is *there*, on that bare bench—if he go and sit down on the crimson velvet chair of the governor-general, they will break his head! Yet you are all one in Christ!' Some one was about to expound this matter to the Brahmin and explain the impropriety of any one taking the seat of the representative of majesty. But the thing was too good for our Quaker friend, James Cropper, quietly to let it go. He so thoroughly sympathized with the Brahmin's view of the matter, that he could not refrain from interposing. 'Nay, nay,' he cried, 'thou must not seek to put aside the force of our friend's remark;' so the Brahmin and our friend James had the matter entirely to themselves."

Dr. Raffles lived to see our terrible conflict for the preservation of our national existence, but there is nothing in this volume to show whether his sympathies were on the side of the Unionists, or dis-Unionists. While the war was in progress he wrote to his American friend, Dr. Sprague, as follows:—"I thank you for your photograph. It tells of advancing years, though I trace the resemblance to what my memory retains of your appearance, when I had the pleasure of seeing you last. Shall I never have that pleasure again on this side the grave? I can scarcely expect it, for should you visit this country again—which, indeed, you told me some time ago you had the purpose of doing—unless it be very soon, I cannot reasonably entertain the prospect of being here to see you. But we shall meet, I trust, in a better land! I am truly glad to have so good an account of yourself from your own pen. You have been a hard worker with heart, and brain, and tongue, and pen, and God has enabled you to work well and to good purpose, and you will leave behind you works for time and for eternity that will render you immortal! I am glad to find you don't anticipate a long continuance of this dreadful war. May God speedily send peace!"

In 1862 Dr. Raffles resigned his pastoral charge of the Great George Street Church, his bodily infirmities rendering the performance of regular duties impossible. He said, at that time, to a friend, "I have known nothing all along save Jesus Christ, and him crucified, and that which has supplied the burden of my ministry is dearer to me now than ever." He preached occasionally after his retirement. At the close of his last sermon, he experienced so much pain and exhaustion that it was some time before he could converse, though during the delivery of the discourse, the spirit of the aged servant of God triumphed over the infirmities of the flesh. The sermon was one of great power and tenderness. On the 17th of May, 1863, he peacefully breathed his last. His funeral was attended by clergymen of various denominations, including many ministers of the Church of England. The Mayor of Liverpool and many of his fellow-townsmen followed the funeral *cortége*, at the head of a long line of carriages, and it was estimated that 50,000 people lined the route of the procession.

Considering the reputation enjoyed by Dr. Raffles as a preacher, and the multitude of his admirers, we are surprised to find that the descriptions contained in this volume of the character and style of his public services are so few. The following is an account written by an American gentleman for a religious newspaper:—"At the appointed hour of service, a large, portly man, with full and ruddy countenance, and in full clerical dress, ascended the pulpit. After a hymn, he read the 24th chapter of Matthew, with great pertinency and pathos of expression, in silvery and subduing tones. From the first opening of his lips, he seemed moved from his inmost soul. I could have imagined, though ignorant of the cause, that the deep fountains of feeling were opened within him, and that some mighty sympathies were working there. And I thought, too, that the congregation were ready to be with him in feeling. But I knew not the occasion. 'Is that Dr. Raffles,' said I, in a whisper, to the gentleman on my right? 'Yes, sir,' was his answer. After the usual introductory services, and a prayer which breathed the soul, and which seemed a fellowship with heaven, the following text was announced. 'Therefore, be ye also ready, for in such an hour as you think not, the Son of Man cometh.'

"'Nearly twenty years have rolled away since I have had the pastoral charge of this congregation,' said the preacher, and these were his first words after reading the text,—'and never have I been called to mingle my tears with the bereaved of my charge in any instance for a work of death so astounding to private and public sympathy as in the late and ill-fated doom of the *Rothsay Castle*.' And here, at the end of the first sentence, the secret was all opened to me, and I felt myself at once a mourner with the mourning, for I had passed in full view of the scene of death, and heard the story, for the first time, this very day. Three members of Dr. Raffles' church were of the number who perished, and this evening it had devolved on the pastor to stand up before a mourning people to tell the story, and try to impress them with the practical lesson of the awful event. And he did tell the story in the outset, the simple story, as the exordium of his sermon. He briefly noticed the character of those they mourned, traced

the pathway of their spirits through the stormy waves of the ocean to the haven of eternal rest; and then applied himself to the proper theme of his text, in application to his hearers—'Be *ye* also ready.' Never did I see an audience so perfectly spell-bound by the voice of a man. Occasionally, in the progress of the sermon, the Doctor was powerful beyond description; his thoughts and manner, and the tones of his voice all befitting each other. The interest of the occasion was itself intense, and when the 'Amen' was pronounced, the perfect stillness which had reigned for the hour was succeeded by the singular bustle which an instantaneous change of position in every individual of a great congregation, after having been long chained by eloquence in fixed and motionless attitudes, produces."

An attendant on the ministry of Dr. Raffles could not fail to remark his strong attachment to the doctrines of grace. The Saviour, and redemption through his blood, were constantly exhibited in his preaching. It was a favorite saying of his, that in every sermon there ought to be something which would teach any ignorant person who might happen to be present the way of salvation through the atonement of Christ. When a friend, in conversation with him, expressed the opinion that people were pretty well enlightened on the doctrines, and needed to have the practical truths presented to them, he admitted the latter part of the statement, and then said, "If I were preaching a sermon such as you speak of, before I closed I would give it a *twist*, so as to bring in Christ and his great salvation." A consideration which greatly favors this view is, that though the exhibition of the particular truth which the anxious sinner most needs to know may seem to do no good at the time it is presented, yet very frequently its saving effects are experienced years afterward. Prayer should be incessantly offered by the people of God, that the Holy Spirit would apply the truth lodged in their souls to their conversion and salvation.

We do not think that Dr. Raffles' preaching was characterized by frequent formal exhibitions of the denunciations and threatenings of the Word of God against the impenitent. Whether he erred in this we pretend not to say. The explicit-

ness and frequency with which the terrors of the Lord should be declared depend on the state of the congregation. It should be borne in mind that, though conscience of itself often teaches most powerfully precisely what the law declares in regard to the punishment due to sin, and more effectually than any preacher can, yet, when the question is asked, "How shall man be just with God?" both reason and conscience are silent. Is it not then pre-eminently the official duty of every ambassador of Christ to show what the Bible teaches on this subject? Though he may leave some things unexplained, yet is he not solemnly bound so to instruct his hearers in regard to free justification through faith in Christ's righteousness, that it will not be his fault if any of them do not clearly understand it? And then it is to be remembered that the cross is not really held up, the gospel is not really preached, unless it is exhibited in such a way as is adapted to make the sinner conscious of his danger, and his wants, and extinguish every hope he may entertain of salvation out of Christ. When David exclaims, "Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me so that I am not able to look up," and again, "While I suffer thy terrors I am distracted," he says all that is necessary to show us that he believed in a future state; the idea of an eternity and its retributions is wrapped up in his words. And in like manner the terrors of the law and all those considerations which address themselves to men's fears, are assumed to have an existence, and are really taught when the *glad tidings* are proclaimed to men.

Though gifted with remarkable fluency, yet it was not often that Dr. Raffles appeared as a speaker on the platform. He had a great dislike to speech-making. The only duty, his biographer tells us, he would willingly undertake at a public meeting, was that of chairman. For this he was peculiarly well qualified by his admirable tact, by his universal popularity, and by his thorough knowledge of business.

This volume is a large one, and many of its details are more especially interesting to Dr. Raffles' personal friends, and those with whom he was associated in the work of his life; nevertheless it contains much that is of interest to the general reader, and we feel indebted to the author for the instruction and

entertainment which we have derived from its perusal. The public was informed by Dr. Schaff, on his recent return from Europe, that when he was present at the last annual convention of the Congregationalists of England, that body manifested the most cordial interest in the coming council of the Evangelical Alliance to be held in this country next fall. Were Dr. Raffles living he would be second to none in sympathy with it. At the meeting for the formation of the Alliance, which was held in Liverpool, in 1845, he joined in the movement with his whole heart, and he ever afterward watched its progress, and did all in his power to promote its success.

Art. IV.—*The Relation of Adam's First Sin to the Fall of the Race.*

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. By J. P. Lange, D.D., and the Rev. F. R. Fay. Translated from the German by J. F. Hurst, D.D., with additions by P. Schaff, D.D., and the Rev. M. B. Riddle. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869. The portion relating to Romans, v. 12–21, from page 171 to page 199 inclusive.

In a recent number we called attention to this work, and its great value. We have nothing to unsay of the high commendation then bestowed upon it. It is, in our view, foremost among the volumes of this series of Lange's Commentary which have yet appeared, and a thesaurus of learning and suggestions in regard to the exegesis of this epistle, which no student of it can afford to be without. We mentioned that in the comment on Rom. v. 12–21, Dr. Schaff freely controverts the views, and what he considers to be the views, advanced by this journal and its conductors. He also canvasses, at considerable length, the views of various parties, schools, theologians, exegetes, and commentators, in regard to this passage, and the doctrine of original sin as determined or affected thereby. His obvious design is to note every thing of import-

ance relative to the subject that has been maintained by any prominent commentator, divine, or school of theology. We therefore avail ourselves of the opportunity thus afforded, to dispel some current misconceptions respecting the subject, and to say some things which we judge the present occasion opportune for saying in support of what we deem the scriptural view. It is a very small part of what we intend, to correct mistakes of Dr. Schaff concerning any principles entertained here or elsewhere. Indeed, as will soon appear, in most essential points we welcome him as an ally. We simply improve the opportunity presented by his unique and encyclopediac survey of the subject, to repeat in a form suited to the exigency, the standard answers to objections, which have been oft refuted only to reappear and reassert themselves, as if they were alike unanswered and unanswerable, since, until answered again, they will assume the air and authority of incontrovertible truths. We refer to this portion of Lange's Commentary, as giving Dr. Schaff's analysis of original sin, because, whatever others have contributed to it in the original text, or as translators and annotators, the final exegetical and doctrinal shaping of the whole is effected by the comments and discussions of the editor-in-chief. He winds up his able summation of the case with the following just and striking statement, which will not be forgotten or ignored by any competent thinker on the subject:—

"Most evangelical divines are divided between the Augustinian or realistic, the federal or forensic, and the Arminian theories, or they look for a still more satisfactory solution of the difficult problem by a future Augustine, who may be able to advance, from a deeper study of the Scriptures, the knowledge of the church, and reconcile what now seem to be irreconcilable contradictions. It should be remembered that the main difficulty lies in the *fact* itself—the undeniable, stubborn, terrible fact—of the universal dominion of sin and death over the entire race, infants as well as full-grown sinners. No system of philosophy has ever given a more satisfactory explanation than the great divines of the church. Outside of the Christian redemption, the fall, with its moral desolation and ruin, remains an impenetrable mystery. But immediately after the fall appears, in the promise of the serpent-bruiser, the second Adam, and throws a bright ray of hope into the gloom of despair. In the fulness of the time, according to God's own counsel, he appeared in our nature to repair the loss, and to replace the temporary reign of sin by the everlasting reign of superabounding grace, which never could have been revealed in all its power without the fall. The person and work of the second Adam are the one glorious solution of the problem of the

first, and the triumphant vindication of divine justice and mercy. This is the main point for all practical purposes, and in this, at least, all true Christians are agreed."—P. 195.

The question before us is, what is the relation set forth in Scripture, of Adam's first transgression to the fall of our race, to the "undeniable, stubborn, terrible fact of the universal dominion of sin and death over the entire race, infants as well as full-grown sinners?"

It will further our present method of reaching an answer to this question, to exhibit, first, the answer given by the standards of the Presbyterian Church which we adopt as our own; secondly, that given by Dr. Schaff, and *as* compared with the former in their several points of agreement and difference; thirdly, a similar presentation and comparison of the answers given by various adversaries of the doctrine we maintain, especially by those claiming to be Calvinists, who have most signalized themselves by vehement and unresting opposition to it; and, finally, to sum up the conclusion of the whole matter.*

On the teachings of our standards we observe—

1. That it asserts a covenant with Adam wherein God stipulated life (which includes perfect and perpetual holiness and blessedness) on condition of perfect and personal obedience; and death (which includes every form of evil) on condition of disobedience. That such a stipulation was made with Adam, whether called covenant or not, is past all doubt. The threatening "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," involved the correlated promise, thou shalt surely live, in case of perfect obedience. What the threatened death meant is made clear in the evils actually inflicted for the first transgression. The life impliedly promised to perfect obedience clearly involves the contrasted inestimable benefits. Where disobedience was death, so obedience was life; "the man that doeth these things shall live by them." By the constitution of his nature man is unalterably bound to perfect rectitude. But it is only by special promise that the rewards promised to Adam for obedience, or the evils threat-

* See *Confession of Faith*, chap. vi., 1–6; also vii., 1–2. *Larger Catechism*, Quest. 21–26; *Shorter Catechism*, Quest. 15–19.

ened for disobedience, especially as the issue of a trial in one single act, could be insured to him. And this is all the more so, if we consider what will be shown to be conceded by all with whom we are now dealing, that the benefits and evils stipulated to himself as the consequence of his obedience or disobedience were to be extended to his posterity—which is the obvious doctrine of our confession, and, as we believe, of the Scriptures.

2. It is undeniably the doctrine of our standards, that this stipulation with, or appointed trial of, Adam, was not for himself alone, but for his posterity; so that, whatever the event and consequences of his trial, penal or otherwise, should be to himself, they should be the same to all his offspring. So the Confession of Faith avers that "life was promised to Adam, and, in him, to his posterity, on condition of perfect and personal obedience." The Larger Catechism, "the covenant being made with Adam, *as a public person*, not for himself only, but for his posterity." The Shorter Catechism also says, "the covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity." This moreover appears in the fact that precisely the same evils have been inflicted on their posterity which were inflicted upon Adam and Eve for eating the forbidden fruit; that it is declared, in the word of God, that "in Adam all die;" that "by one man sin entered the world and death by sin;" and that, "by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation."

3. In this transaction Adam acted representatively for his posterity, being constituted a "public person" in order that he might so act in their behalf. Our first progenitor was put in this position on account of his being the "root of all mankind," thus containing them seminally and potentially. It was fit that the federal head and representative should be the natural head of the race. Literally and personally, the sin of eating the forbidden fruit was "their (our first parents') sin." So the obedience for which life was promised to themselves and their posterity was their "personal obedience." Their act herein was that of their posterity, not literally and personally, but constructively and representatively.

4. The death threatened and visited upon our first parents

and their posterity was not merely corporeal or physical death, whether immediate and at once complete, or seminal and to be afterward fully realized, but such that they thereby "fell from their original righteousness, and lost communion with God, and became dead in sin and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body," that "the same death in sin and corrupted nature were conveyed to all his posterity proceeding from him by ordinary generation," and that "from this original corruption of nature, whereby we are indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, proceed all actual transgressions."

5. This death, the punishment of Adam's first sin, thus shown to include all penal evils, was visited upon his posterity because "they sinned in him and fell with him in the first transgression," he acting for them as a "public person" on the terms of a covenant made with him for himself and them also. It was a penal visitation for their sin thus committed in him. "The guilt (obligation to punishment) of this sin was imputed (reckoned to the account of), and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to, all their posterity."

6. It was the *first* transgression of eating the forbidden fruit, in which Adam fell, and his posterity sinned and fell with him. The first and fontal element in original sin is "the guilt of Adam's first sin."

7. Original sin is the guilt or obnoxiousness to punishment of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness and the corruption of man's whole nature, whereby he is indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good.

8. This estate itself, viz.: of native corruption, is itself sinful, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it. Our standards recognize no sinless or guiltless original sin or native depravity.

Thus they teach that Adam being the root and natural head of our race, was constituted its covenant and representative head, so that, in his first transgression, he was on trial not only for himself but the race; that in his sin they so participated, not personally, but representatively, that they are counted to have sinned in him; that with him they bear its penalty, in the loss of communion with God, of his favor, and

of original righteousness, whence arise the sinful defilement of our nature, corruption of all our parts and faculties, and the domineering bondage to sin. Thus they account for the fall, degradation, and misery of our race. The curse causeless does not come. It is the penalty of the sin of our progenitor imputed to us, because, standing on trial for us, we "sinned in him and fell with him in the first transgression."

The Realistic View, as maintained by Dr. Schaff.

In presenting and discussing Dr. Schaff's view of original sin, and of the relation of Adam's first sin to the fall of our race, it is not requisite to our present purpose, if we had the space, to go into any minutiæ of grammatical criticism or verbal controversy, beyond what is involved in showing, 1. How far he agrees with us; 2. How far he concedes our principles, when he claims, or seems, to differ; and 3. What is the exact and only real point of difference, and with which view the weight of evidence and argument lies. What is true of his presentation is substantially true of that of Dr. Shedd, and realistic Augustinians generally.

1. Dr. Schaff maintains that Adam, in his first transgression, was on trial, not for himself alone, but for the race. "It was *man*, or human nature, which we have in common with him, that was put on trial in Adam," p. 176. So, he holds,

2. That all men sinned in Adam, as their head and representative. He says: "We hold that all men sinned in Adam, not, indeed, personally by conscious, actual transgression, but virtually and potentially; in other words, that Adam fell, not as an individual simply, but as the real representative head of the human race," p. 179. Still further, he maintains that παντες ἡμαρτον, in Rom. v. 12, means, not that all became sinful, or had a sinful nature, but that they sinned in act, which was, and could only be, in the first sin of Adam, p. 177. Moreover, he says that παράπτωμα, in verses 15, 17, 18, is "not a sinful state, or condition, but a concrete, actual sin, . . . by which Adam fell." The same also of παρακοη, verse 19.

3. Dr. Schaff maintains that death was inflicted on Adam

and his posterity in punishment of his sin, and that it includes every form of penal evil. After stating that, "There are three kinds of death: (1), the death of the soul, which is properly the first and immediate effect of sin, since sin is the separation of the soul from God, the fountain of life; (2), the death of the the body, which is the culmination and end of all physical malady and evil in this world; (3), the *eternal* death of soul and body, which is also called the second death," he says: "In one passage (Rom. v. 12), death hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, as also Rom. vii. 21–23; vii. 5; 2 Tim. i. 10; ὁ θάνατος is as comprehensive as ἡ ἁμαρτια, its cause, and as ἡ ζωή, its opposite. It embraces all—*all physical and moral evil* as *the penal consequence of sin;* it is death temporal and spiritual, viewed as one united power and principle ruling over the human race. That the Apostle meant physical death is clear, from verse 14."—P. 176.

4. Therefore he holds that the present reign of sin and death over our race is in its originating cause,—the punishment of Adam's first sin, wherein we "sinned in him, and fell with him in the first transgression."

5. Therefore, also, that this sin is imputed or reckoned to the account of their posterity, so that they are condemned, and punished for it. That he avowedly holds to some sort of imputation, appears from his saying that, "the new school theology of New England has gone to the opposite *extreme* of rejecting imputation under any form."—P. 193.

6. Not only so, but this imputation of Adam's sin can be no other than immediate. The imputation is, indeed, on the ground of virtual, not personal, participation in it by his posterity. It matters not what the ground is, the imputation of that sin is none the less immediate in his theory, than on the more exclusively federal, which he opposes so strenuously. It is in punishment of that sin which, as immediately participated in by the race, is immediately imputed to it, that it is afflicted with that death, which "embraces all physical and moral evil, as the penal consequence of sin." We do not understand Dr. Schaff to object so much to immediate imputation, as to "*exclusive* immediate imputationism."—Pp. 192–3.

7. Hence, we see not how his view comes short of that of our standards already quoted, viz., "The covenant being made with *Adam*, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him in the first transgression." "The fall brought mankind into a state of sin and misery." The sinfulness of that estate, where into man fell, consists in the guilt (obnoxiousness to punishment) of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin, together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it."

Where then is the difference between Dr. Schaff and ourselves? And what inspires his frequent, earnest, and even vehement protestations against what he, with others, considers the "Princeton" view? We will now attempt briefly to get at the true answer to this question.

He says: "Legal representation seemed to offer an easier vindication of Divine justice than the Augustinian view. It involves, undoubtedly, an element of truth, but, if detached from the idea of moral participation, it resolves itself into a mere legal fiction, and greatly enhances the difficulty of the problem, by removing the best reason for imputation."—P. 194. What is this "moral participation" in Adam's sin, which Dr. Schaff insists on as the necessary basis of legal representation? It is not merely what is implied in his acting as our representative. It is something more required to warrant his righteously acting in that capacity. What is this something? Dr. Schaff espouses what he considers the Augustinian theory, which he pronounces "realistic." He says:—

"The AUGUSTINIAN or REALISTIC theory of a real, though impersonal and unconscious, participation of the whole race in the fall of Adam, as their natural head, who by his individual transgression vitiated the generic human nature, and transmitted it in this corrupt and guilty state to his descendants by physical generation. As an individual act, Adam's sin and guilt were his own exclusively, and are not transferable to any other individual; but as the act of mankind in their collective, undistributed, and unindividualized form of existence, it was virtually, or potentially, the act of all who were germinally or seminally contained in their first parent, as Levi was in the loins of Abraham. (Heb. vii. 9, 10.)* Persona

* But how did Levi pay tithes in Abraham? Not literally, but representatively. Ebrard says *in loco*—"That he does not mean an *absolute* participation by

corrumpit naturam. Natura corrumpit personam."—P. 192. It is evident that Augustine did not teach, as he is sometimes misrepresented, a *personal* and *conscious* coexistence and coagency of Adam's posterity in Adam and his fall (which involves the contradiction of existence before existence), but simply a *potential, germinal* coexistence. The *genus homo*, or human nature, which he represented, was not a receptacle of millions of human beings, but a single simple essence which became manifold by propagation. As in the doctrine of the Trinity and of the person of Christ we distinguish between nature and person, so also here. Our human nature was on trial in Adam and fell in him; consequently, we all fell as partaking of that nature, and share in his guilt."—P. 178.

So Lange says, "Paul evidently views the human race as an organic unit."—P. 173. Says Dr. Schaff again: "The human race is not a sand-heap, but an organic unity; and only on the ground of such a vital unity, as distinct from a mechanical or merely federal unity, can we understand and defend the doctrine of original sin, the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness. Without an actual communion of life, imputation is an arbitrary legal arrangement."—P. 179.

"The *purely federal* school (from nominalistic premises, according to which the general conceptions are mere names, not things,—subjective abstractions, not objective realities) denies the Adamic unity of the race in the realistic sense; consequently, all participation of Adam's descendants in the act of the primal apostasy; yet it holds that by virtue of his federal headship on the ground of a sovereign arrangement, his sin and guilt are justly, directly, and immediately imputed to them."—Pp. 193-4. "Dr. Hodges' hostility to the realistic Augustinian view, proceeds, I think, from a misunderstanding; he does not distinguish between a virtual or potential, and a personal or individual coexistence and coagency of the race in Adam,"—P. 194.

We think these quotations sufficiently disclose the real and only point of difference,—a realistic oneness of the race, so that the act of one is literally and really the act of all, being maintained by Dr. Schaff, as not only true, but of the utmost importance to account for the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. This the "purely federal school," with multitudes besides, does not see its way clear to adopt. But as Dr. Schaff and others at times get aside of the real issue, or evince a misunderstanding of our position, we will premise a few things to prevent misapprehension.

Levi in the paying of tithes,but only such a participation *in a certain sense*, not a participation in the act as such, but only in the results and *legal consequences* of it, seems to me to be indicated by the clause ὡς επος ειπειν, which is added to δεδεκταωται, etc., etc.

1. The question is not whether there is an organic or vital connection of the race with Adam. This all admit, who admit that the race is descended from him by ordinary generation. The federal school do not hold the race to be a "sand-heap," or embrace any "atomistic" conception of its unity. Those who have such conceptions of the unity of the human race can defend them if they see cause. That is not our mission, nor do such objections to the federal theory touch us.

2. Nor is the question whether this natural and vital connection of the race with Adam is the reason and ground of his being constituted their federal or representative head. He is made their covenant head, doubtless, because he is their natural head. This renders it fit that he should be appointed to act for them, as well as himself, and bring upon them as well as himself the consequences of his action. It is according to the ordinance of God, as evinced in his word and providence, that, in ways innumerable, parents should represent children, act for them, and involve them in the consequences of their conduct for better or for worse. So he visits the iniquities of the fathers upon their children and shows mercy to them that love him unto thousands of generations. As rulers properly represent and act for their constituents, so do parents rightfully stand in a like relation to their children in things innumerable, irrespective of any appointment on the part of the latter. The federal or representative school have almost universally found the reason of God's constituting a federal headship, in a prior natural headship, as appears in various quotations made by Dr. Schaff from Turrettin and others; but they have maintained that the ground of the imputation of his first sin to his posterity is that therein Adam acted in his federal or representative capacity. Thus our own standards, which have been sufficiently shown to hold the federal view, refer to Adam's being "the root of mankind" as the ultimate ground of the whole arrangement. It is common for the old Reformed symbols and theologians to refer our being in "the loins" of Adam as implicated with the special covenant made with him. Turrettin, in a familiar passage quoted by Dr. Schaff, says:—

"Adamus duplice vinculo nobiscum junctus est ; NATURALI, quatenus pater est, et nos ejus filii. (2.) POLITICO AC FORENSI, quatenus fuit princeps et caput representativum totius generis humani. Fundamentum imputationis non est tantum communio naturalis, quae nobis cum Adamo intercedit—alias omnia ejus peccata deberent nobis imputari—sed precipue moralis et federalis, per quam factum est, ut Deus cum illo, ut cum nostro capite, foedus pefrigerit. Unde se habuit in illo peccato, non ut PERSONA PRIVATA, sed ut PUBLICA et REPRESENTATIVA, quae omnes suos posteros in actione illa representabit, cujus proinde demeritum ad omnes pertinet."

3. Before the seventeenth century, and to some extent since, the Augustinian divines, including Augustine himself, had not sharply defined and distinguished between the federal and realistic views, or between mediate and immediate imputation. Hence they were often confused or inadequate in their modes of stating these points. Dr. Schaff says that within the Augustinian system, "both kinds of imputation are held in fact; but the distinction was not made before the seventeenth century. Participation is assumed as the ground of imputation. Native corruption is itself sin, and likewise punishment for guilt incurred in Adam's sin. Hereditary guilt coexists with hereditary sin; man is condemned, both on account of the act of disobedience which he committed in the loins of Adam, and for hereditary depravity."—P. 192. It hence results that quotations from many of those writers, for or against the realistic or federal theories, are often very unsatisfactory and inconclusive. They may speak of our sinning in Adam because we were in his loins, and thus were the one Adam who sinned, when all that they meant to hold or say was simply what we have set forth in the last paragraph, viz., that Adam was made our representative, because he was our natural head, or that while we are condemned for our native corruption, this, in their view, "was likewise punishment for guilt incurred in Adam's sin," which supposes immediate imputation of it, whether on federal or realistic grounds. Turrettin explains the statement of Augustine, "in illo uno (Adamo) multi unus homo erant," to mean, "unitate non *specifica* vel *numerica*, sed partim UNITATE ORIGINIS, quia omnes ex uno sunt sanguine, partim unitate representationis quia unus personam omnium representabat ex ordine Dei." These quotations from Turrettin bring us to the precise point in issue. It is whether

the unity of the human race is "numerical," or, whether all the members of the race are one substance or agent, numerically, so that the act of one is the act of all: and, therefore, when Adam sinned all sinned, not merely as represented in him, but really and literally because "generic human nature," the one numerical substance common to all the race, acted in each act of Adam, and so sinned when he sinned. Now, if this could be admitted, it would solve the whole mystery of original sin. The condemnation, fall, and ruin of the race are simply the punishment for its real, actual, and culpable participation in Adam's first sin. The attractions it offers on this account to thoughtful minds, if it be once admissible, come in aid of the tendency to realistic thinking, to which minds of a certain constitution are always predisposed. It is, *mutatis mutandis*, just as Dr. Schaff says of the legal representation theory in view of other minds: "Legal representation seemed to offer an easier vindication of Divine justice than the Augustinian view." But this realistic view is exposed to the following insuperable objections:—

1. It directly contradicts the intuitive convictions and normal consciousness of the human mind. All men feel that the bond involved in unity of species, or of descent from a common parent, is intimate, and, in some sense, vital and organic. But the relation of parents to children, of distant ancestors to their descendants, of our first parents to their remotest posterity, however close, is not that of numerical oneness, so that they are all one substance, agent, or being, and what one does all do. However any may speculate themselves into such a conviction, the spontaneous judgments of the race which regulate their normal thinking, speech, and action, are all against it. No man acts on the supposition that his own act is the act of his children, or of other men, much less of all men. No one believes that, however just, on account of community of origin or descent from a sinning ancestor, may be sufferings inflicted upon his posterity in certain cases for his sins, yet, that it is so on account of any real participation in those sins; or that his acts are, really, their acts. Indeed, this is so obvious, that Dr. Schaff expressly disclaims as a groundless charge of adversaries, "a personal and conscious coexistence and co-

agency of Adam's posterity in Adam and his fall (which involves the contradiction of existence before existence), but simply a potential or germinal coexistence. The *genus homo*, or human nature, which he represented, was not a receptacle of millions of human beings, *but a single simple essence*, which became manifold by propagation. As in the doctrine of the Trinity and the person of Christ we distinguish between nature and person, so here." We sinned in Adam then, not personally, but only, as partaking of "a single essence," human nature, now diffused by propagation through the millions of our race, sinned. Who can recognize any ground of guilt and condemnation merely on account of what this "single essence" did six thousand years ago? Or who can believe that the myriads of our race are one "single simple essence," however manifoldly diffused? We fear if the fall of our race in Adam is left to this solution, it were better to leave it unsolved. Nor is the case relieved by the illustration from the Trinity. If it were just, the Trinity ceases to be a mystery. The unity of essence and plurality of persons is precisely that which exists among men, and there is no more that is incomprehensible in it than in the plurality of human persons having a common humanity. Is this all the mystery of the Trinity? What is this common humanity? Is it one substance numerically? Or is it not, rather, resembling qualities depending on a common origin? Dr. Schaff speaks of denying "the unity of the race in the realistic sense" "from nominalistic premises, according to which the general conceptions are mere names, not things,—subjective abstractions, not objective realities." Such nominalism as this is not the only alternative to realism. The general conceptions which represent the resembling qualities of the race, represent real qualities which belong to men, and not mere names. They stand not for fictions but realities; not, however, the reality of philosophic realism, or the numerical oneness of substance of the descendants of Adam or of all the individuals in any other class.

2. As Turrettin observes, on this theory all the acts of Adam are ours just as much as his first sin. They are the acts of the *genus homo*, a "single and simple essence" common to him and all his posterity. The "one offence," or first sin to which the

Scriptures and the church attribute the fall of our race, has no more to do with it than any other sin, except that it is chronologically first in the series of his transgressions. All his other sins are as much those of generic humanity, and as much corrupt it, as this. Not only so, but if all our race have in them a "generic humanity" not merely of resembling qualities and a common origin, but which is one numerical substance pervading all, whereby the act of the first man is the act of all, then not only are all his acts the acts of every other man, but the acts of each and every man are the acts of each and every other man. The merit and demerit of each belong to all. All personal identity and responsibility are utterly confounded and vacated. These objections seem to us insuperable.

3. The theory, as put by Dr. Schaff and others, fails to furnish the relief in regard to the fall of the race in Adam's fall, for which it is adduced. For, as we have seen, they assert that there was no "conscious" or "personal" "participation" of Adam's posterity in his sin. This would imply that they "existed before they existed." How a "participation," which was neither conscious nor personal, and before actual existence infers blame or guilt in them for Adam's first sin, or accounts for its imputation to them as a ground of punishment, unless on account of some special constitution or covenant constituting him their representative, we cannot understand, nor do we believe the unsophisticated human intellect can understand it.

4. The last objection which we shall now stop to specify is that arising from the whole parallelism between the condemnation of the race through Adam's sin, and the justification of believers through the righteousness of Christ. The realistic scheme imputes the sin of Adam to us because of our literal and real participation in it. In like manner, then, we must be justified by Christ's righteousness, because it is literally ours—because we have such a oneness with him that we *really* have performed those acts of obedience which he has performed. Thus we are justified by inherent righteousness, not solely by another's righteousness, imputed to us and received by faith alone. This vitiates the entire doctrine of gratuitous justifica-

tion through Christ. Nor does Dr. Schaff meet the case by telling us that "the analogy of forensic justification is not to the point, for the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to the impenitent, but only on the subjective condition of faith, by which Christ is apprehended and made our own."—P. 194. But how made our own? So that his acts are literally our acts, and his righteousness ours inherently? Never.*

For these and other reasons we find ourselves unable to accept the realistic hypothesis of the derivation of the fall of the race from Adam's first sin. In this we believe ourselves at one with the immense majority, not only of Calvinists and Augustinians, but of Christians. Of the sufficiency of these reasons our readers must judge. But if they are well founded, they eliminate philosophic realism from the true solution of

* As might be expected from such fundamental principles, these writers sometimes betray a teudency to confound justification and sanctification, and to regard them as one and the same Divine work. Lange says: "Justification is essentially a pronouncing righteous, but by the creative declaration of God; therefore it is also a making righteous, in the sense that it is a communication of a new principle of life, yet in such a way that this new principle of life must ever be regarded as the pure effect of Christ, and not in any way as the cause of justification."—P. 138. We find other passages equally wanting in exact discrimination between justification and initial sanctification mingled with much very precious truth on these great subjects. Compare with Schaff's definition of justification on the next page, which concludes thus, "the sinner being one. with Christ, no longer lives unto himself, but, the grace of Christ enabling him, unto Christ, who died for him, and rose again. THIS IS JUSTIFICATION." On p. 129, he speaks of "righteousness communicated to the believer for Christ's sake in the act of justification by faith. It is both *objective*, or inherent in God, and realized in Christ, and *subjective*, or imparted to man."

See also Dr. Schaff on Justification, in his first volume of *History of the Apostolic Church*, edition 1853, section 162, p. 638.

"The justification itself is (1.) negative, the judicial sentence of God, in which he pronounces the sinner, for the sake of Christ, free from the curse of the law, from the guilt and punishment of transgression,—in other words, the forgiveness of sin, pardon; (2.) positive, the imputation and *actual communication* of the righteousness of Christ to the penitent, believing sinner. If we would not involve God in inconsistency and falsehood, we must carefully guard against the notion of an empty declaration, and must necessarily suppose that the objective state of things corresponds to the judgment of God; in other words, that God actually *makes* the penitent sinner righteous in imputing and imparting to him the righteousness of Christ, renewing him by the Holy Ghost, and placing him by faith in holy vital communion with Christ."

original sin. This being done, Dr. Schaff and such as he are brought into complete harmony with ourselves.

We now pass to consider the different phases of the opposition to the federal theory which has formed one of the distinctive features of the so-called New England theology—intending to signalize the important concessions consciously or unconsciously made by the Old and the New School types of that theology. Leaving out of view for the present the elder Edwards, whose great treatise on Original Sin vacillates between mediate and immediate imputation, between the strictly federal theory and the "root theory" of Stapfer carried so far into realism as to confound all ideas of personal identity, and of which Dr. Schaff correctly enough says, "his main object was to defend the doctrine of native depravity by the theory of identity; *i. e.*, a divinely constituted oneness of Adam and his race, by which his posterity should be born in his moral image, whether good or bad, according to the law that like begets like," (p. 193), we pass to the statements of some representative divines, who articulated the New England doctrine after it had crystallized into a definite anti-imputationism. Before the time of Dr. Taylor, the doctrine was that, by a divine constitution, according to which living things propagate their kind, and like begets like, Adam transmitted the sinful nature incurred by his sin, to each and all of his posterity, at their birth; that for native sin, thus propagated, they were condemned from birth; but that they were punished for Adam's sin not immediately, but only mediately, inasmuch as this corrupt nature consents to, and thus contracts the guilt of that sin. What they stoutly contested was, that the visitation upon the race for Adam's sin was of the nature of punishment for it, or that it was made penal by the covenant or representative relation of Adam.

The New Haven School, while conceding the transmission of a depraved nature, as a consequence of Adam's sin, denied that this native corruption has the quality of sin; yet maintained that it insures the certainty of sinning in all individuals of the race as soon as moral agency begins. This school, too, are exceedingly strenuous in denying that this corruption of nature, and consequent certainty of sinning, although the

consequence of Adam's sin, are the *penal* consequence of it. But with all this, in both the foregoing forms of New England hamartiology, the following extracts will show how difficult it is for those claiming to be Calvinistic, to miss the truth, even while opposing it. We quote first from Dr. Samuel Hopkins, the founder of Hopkinsianism:—

"The covenant or constitution, in which Adam was considered and treated as the father and public head of his future posterity, was more than *mere law*."

"The covenant made with him was made with all mankind, and constituted him the public and confederating head of mankind, and he acted in this capacity as being the whole, and his obedience was considered as the obedience of mankind; and, as by this Adam was to obtain eternal life, had he performed it, this would have comprehended and insured the eternal life of his posterity. And, on the contrary, his disobedience was the disobedience of the whole, of all mankind, and the threatened penalty did not respect Adam personally, or as a single individual; but his whole posterity included in him and represented by him. Therefore the transgression being the transgression of the whole, brought the threatened punishment on all mankind."—*Hopkins' Works*. Boston edition, vol. i., pp. 292–5.

Again he remarks, on Rom. v. 12–21: "Here Adam is asserted, in the most plain and strongest terms, to be constituted the public covenanting head of mankind, so that sin, condemnation, and death came upon all his posterity by his disobedience."—P. 295. He argues the same thing also from the fact that the precise punishments threatened and inflicted on Adam actually fell on all his posterity. It would seem difficult to state all the elements of the federal or representative system, including the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and their condemnation and punishment therefor, more explicitly. Yet Hopkins elsewhere argues that the first condemnation of the race is for their own personal sin, transmitted by natural derivation from Adam.

Smalley, a leading New England divine, and opponent of those who resolve all moral character, and some of them even the soul itself, into a chain of exercises, uses the following language:—

"Now he (God) hath seen fit to create at first only one man and one woman, to be the progenitors of the rest of human kind—to create them in perfect maturity of natural powers, and in perfect rectitude of disposition—to place them under as good external advantages for persevering obedience as could reasonably be desired; and to ordain that their probation should be instead of the probation

of all men; that if they persevered and kept their virtue through the time appointed, all descending from them should be born in a state of confirmation, and be exposed to no further trials; that if they fell, all their descendants should be brought into existence in a fallen condition like theirs. . . . Human nature has had a fair trial in its most perfect state. We know, or might know, that had we been tried in innocence, as Adam and Eve were, and been left as they were left, we should have sinned and fell as they did. All the ends of a trial of innocent human nature on a constitution requiring sinless perseverance as the condition of life, are sufficiently answered by the trial of our first parents. Wisdom requires no more. And, in point of justice, what can be the objection?"—*Smalley's Sermons*, Hartford edition, pp. 186–7.

Yet he repudiates the imputation of Adam's sin in the very words in which he acknowledges its repute for orthodoxy, and its general acceptance as the doctrine of the Scriptures. He begins his discourse on this subject in the following terms: "Of all the articles of faith which have had the reputation of orthodoxy, or have generally been supposed to be plainly taught in the Holy Scriptures, none, perhaps, have made more infidels, and none appear harder to reconcile with reason and common sense, than the doctrines of imputed sin and imputed righteousness."—*Id.*, p. 169. But he insists that Adam stood on trial for his posterity, so that the consequences of his sin to himself also befell them. Were they not penal? But Dr. Smalley answers himself elsewhere. He contends "that all men were brought into the present fallen state by the fall of one or both of our first parents, is evident from the continuation of the very same curse that was denounced upon them—as to the temporal part of it at least—to the present day." Then, after reciting it as given,—Gen. iii. 16–20,—he asks:—

"Now, when we see every part of this sentence so exactly executed still on the sons and daughters of these first human transgressors, have we not the most sensible evidence that their offspring were included with them, thus far, at least, in their original condemnation? And if, as to the present life and temporal death, we are evidently dealt with according to the sentence passed upon our first parents, what reason have we to think that we were not, according to the original constitution, to be dealt with in like manner relative to the life to come? It is no easier to reconcile with reason and justice our being involved so far in the bitter consequences of their sin, as we certainly at present are, than it is our sharing all the fruits of man's first apostasy."—Pp. 176–7.

Now, if Adam so stood on trial for his posterity, as their representative, that they were included with him in the origi-

nal condemnation, and suffer the curse visited upon him, and the sentence executed upon him in punishment for his sin, is also inflicted upon themselves in its unnumbered evils and woes, have we not given us all the elements of the federal hamartiology?

But he finishes the complete and utter refutation of his opposition to the imputation of Adam's sin, in his argument to prove native depravity, from the sufferings and death of infants. He says: "If sufferings may be supposed in God's moral kingdom when there is no imputation of sin, the ground is given up of ever knowing the Divine hatred of any thing in his creatures, by his righteous judgments inflicted on them either in this world or the world to come. Therefore, the common painful dissolution of infants plainly avers that they are some way sinful in the sight of God."—P. 174. But is not the evil of a corrupt and sinful character, transmitted to all our race at birth, which deserves and suffers God's wrath and curse in all miseries, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, according to Smalley's view, an evil far worse than any of the mere physical pangs which it causes? And if it "may be supposed where there is no imputation of sin," does it not sever the *nexus* between sin and suffering in moral beings, and confound moral distinctions by referring the most dreadful of all visitations upon man to the mere sovereignty of God? It is no answer to say that Adam's nature having once been vitiated by his sin, this vitiosity and sinfulness are transmitted by the laws of natural propagation. Who made these laws? Besides, punishment may as truly be inflicted by the operation of natural laws as in any other way? Do not the drunkard, glutton, and debauchee suffer dreadful punishments for their sins in the mere operation of natural laws on their own constitutions?

The New Haven divines say that all who bear the name of Calvinists will unite in the statement, "that Adam was not on trial for himself alone, but that, by a Divine constitution, all his descendants were to have, in their natural state, the same character and condition with their progenitor."—*Christian Spectator*, 1830, p. 343. This surely puts the representative character of Adam unequivocally. But they differ from Dr.

Smalley, and other preceding New England divines, in regard to the sinfulness of the corrupt nature transmitted from him. They deny that this inborn corruption is of the nature of sin, because they admit nothing to be sin but acts committed in violation of known law; but they insist that it causes a certainty of sinning in the first act of moral agency in the case of all men, or as soon as moral agency begins; that this dire certainty of sinning is the consequence to all Adam's descendants of his sinning when on trial for them as well as himself. But they differ from us, not only as from Smalley, when they deny the sinfulness of our hereditary corruption, but still further, in denying that these consequences of Adam's sin, involving a depraved nature, the certainty of sinning, and consequent death, and other woes, are penal. Though flowing from Adam's sin, they are not the punishment of it.

In, by far, the ablest, most authoritative, and elaborate discussion which ever proceeded from the New Haven divines on this subject (we refer to their article in controversy with this Journal, published in the *Christian Spectator* for June, 1831, and entitled, "*The case of the Rev. Mr. Barnes, Biblical Repertory on Imputation*"), they maintain most strenuously, that, while differing from us as above shown, as to what the consequences of that sin to his posterity are, yet as respects the relation of those consequences to his sin, they differ from us only in words. They pronounce it in capitals, "SOLELY A DISPUTE ABOUT WORDS," p. 301. What words? They tell us *imputation*, *guilt*, *punishment*. Are these applicable to Adam's sin as related to his posterity, and as the ground on which its consequences to himself are inflicted on them? "In what, then, do they (Princeton and New England) differ?" Ask these divines, and they answer, "Not in the fact that these evils are a consequence of Adam's sin; but simply and solely whether they are properly termed the punishment of his posterity." And so, *mutatis mutandis*, they state the case in regard to the terms imputation and guilt. "It is agreed, then," they say, "that certain evils come on Adam's posterity, in consequence of his sin; and the question now before us is, whether this fact is to be resolved into the sovereignty of God, or to be accounted for, by asserting that

these evils are brought on beings who have not yet sinned, as a *punishment* for the sin of *Adam*. We prefer the former view of the subject."—P. 33.

In answer to the objection that the present condition of Adam's posterity, even according to their view of it, with an inborn bias which insures in each and all of them the dread certainty of sinning, is such as to preclude a fair probation, unless they have had it in their first progenitor; they argue that such certainty of sinning in all the race is not inconsistent with a fair trial. They ask, "How does it appear that a trial, which will certainly result in sin, is not a fair trial? Was not the trial of the angels who fell, as well as that of our first parents a fair trial, and did not God know that they would sin? If that certainty of sin is inconsistent with a fair trial, then in the case of any being who will sin, a fair trial is impossible. In respect to every being who sins, there was a previous certainty that he would sin. According to this objection, then, *no being who sins can have had a fair trial.* . . . . What our brethren intend, when they say, that, for probation to be fair, it must afford as favorable a prospect of a happy, as of an unhappy conclusion, we are unable to discover."—P. 353.

We think that this is, at best, special pleading, and betrays the extremity of the position taken. Surely, a trial of sinless angels, in which some fell, and vastly more stood, or the trial of a single individual, resulting in his fall, implies no presumption of a trial under unfavorable prospects and unequal chances preponderating against him. And the antecedent certainty to the Divine mind as to the way in which they would abide their trial, alters not its intrinsic nature or chances. But when untold millions are put on trial, with an inborn bias and attendant circumstances as render it certain that they all, without exception, will fall, is this a fair trial? Does it give an equal chance of standing or falling? Is not such a certainty theoretically and practically inconsistent with a fair probation? In one of the noted passages of their *Review of Taylor and Harvey on Human Depravity*, trying to account for the uniform development of sin in our race from the constitutional propensities of our nature, these divines say: "If

the temptation presented to constitutional propensities could be so strong in the case of Adam as to overpower the force of established habits of virtue in the maturity of his reason, how absolute is the certainty that every child will yield to the urgency of these propensities, under the redoubled impulse of long-cherished self-gratification, and in the dawn of intellectual existence? *Could the uniform certainty of the event be greater, if the hand of Omnipotence were laid on the child to secure the result?*"—*Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 367. And is that a fair probation, whose failure in every case of unnumbered millions is, by the constitution of God, made as certain as his omnipotence can make it? And is the infliction of so dire an evil upon the posterity of Adam better accounted for as an act of simple sovereignty on the part of God, or as punishment for the sin of their first parent, when on trial for them as their representative, in whom they had a fair probation? But we are not left to the mere gropings of our own reason in this matter, which, however it may accept, and be relieved by, the scriptural solution of our fall in Adam, never could have invented it. The word of God teaches not only that all suffer the consequences of Adam's sin, but that these consequences are the penalty of that sin for which "judgment came upon all men to condemnation."—See Rom. v. 17, 18. All the explosive rhetoric which so many writers pour out upon the federal, or what they call the "Princeton scheme," recoils with tenfold force upon their own. They do not get rid of the awful evils inflicted on the race. They only attribute these evils to the mere sovereignty of God, inflicting them without any probation.

Besides, it encounters other difficulties. How are the sufferings and death of infants to be reconciled with the sinlessness which this scheme ascribes to them? In the article just quoted from, they reply—"The answer has been given a thousand times; brutes die also." We think they have hardly given it since, and, probably, they found their scheme gained nothing by it.

But we know no adequate answer that has or can be given. The language of Smalley, already quoted, cannot be gainsaid. "If sufferings may be supposed, in God's moral kingdom,

where there is no imputation of sin, the ground is given up of ever knowing the Divine hatred of any thing by his righteous judgments inflicted on them, either in this world, or the world to come. Therefore, the common painful dissolution of infants plainly proves that they are some way sinful in the sight of God." He proceeds to argue the same thing from infant baptism—"For there can be no occasion for baptizing any but sinners, in the name of a Saviour and sanctifier."

If we are not mistaken, we have shown that the various theories of original sin, or of the relation of Adam's first sin to the sin of the race, which have been devised to avoid the difficulties in the federal hamartiology, rather increase than obviate them, while they labor under the disadvantage of being less in harmony with the obvious sense of Scripture, the methods of Providence, and a Scriptural soteriology. With the realistic Augustinians, like Drs. Schaff and Shedd, we are in entire harmony, except in their realism as set against covenant representationism. They can and do adopt in sincerity the essential truths in regard to original sin, even to the minutest *ipsissima verba* of our confession. Doing this, we are at one with them, until they press their realism against the federal scheme. Then we feel called to show that we gain nothing and lose much in substituting this solution for that of Turrettin and most of the Reformers.

In conclusion, we offer a summation of the whole subject, which may present the strength of the latter system in a new light. We believe that, if not held in all of its parts by any given majority of Christians, each of its separate elements is held by its own majority of them.

1. The vast majority, not only of Calvinists, but of Christians, hold that the race so had its probation in Adam's first trial, that it fell in his fall, and the consequences of his sin to himself passed over to his posterity.

2. The majority hold that his descendants did not sin in him really and literally.

3. A great majority hold that death is the penalty of sin, and includes every kind of penal evil.

4. A great majority hold that death thus extending to soul and body was visited upon Adam and his posterity, by

virtue of "a judgment unto condemnation" for his first sin.

5. A great majority hold that Adam's sin was so reckoned to the account of (imputed to) the race, that its loss of the Divine favor and communion with God, and, by consequence, its lapse into sin was a visitation in judgment for that sin.

6. A great majority believe that evil inflicted on moral beings for sin, in support of law, is punishment, and that the present degradation of our race came in this way.

7. A great majority believe that Christ bore our sins, only as he bore their penalty, became a curse for us, and had the chastisement of our peace laid upon him, and hence that sin may be so imputed to or reckoned to the account of those who did not personally commit it, that they shall bear its penalty. If this is possible in one extraordinary case, it may be in another.

8. A great majority believe that Christ is the second Adam, of whom the first was a type, inasmuch as being condemned for the sin of the first Adam, we are justified by the righteousness of the second. "As by the disobedience of one, many were made sinners, so, by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous."

Herein are found the elements of the true doctrine of original sin. They might almost claim the *semper, ubique, ab omnibus.*

These pregnant words of Pascal cannot be gainsaid. "It is astonishing that the mystery which is furthest removed from our knowledge (I mean the transmission of original sin) should be that without which we can have no knowledge of ourselves. It is in this abyss that the clue to our condition takes its turns and windings, insomuch that man is more incomprehensible without this mystery than this mystery is incomprehensible to man."

ART. V.—*The Witness of Paul to Christ.* By Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, "Boyle Lectures for 1869." Rivingtons.

THE Boyle Lecturer is limited to the task of "proving the Christian religion"—so runs the will of the illustrious founder—"against notorious infidels, viz.: Atheists, Theists, Pagans, Jews, and Mohammedans, not descending lower to any controversies that are among Christians themselves." Has Mr. Leathes transgressed the limits assigned him in entering into controversy with those who deny that the resurrection of Christ is vital to Christianity? Is the denial of Christ's resurrection equivalent to giving up Christianity? These questions are pertinent here, because Mr. Leathes has been blamed for his strictures on the views of Dr. Davidson. The latter, in the second volume of his "Introduction to the New Testament," takes the ground that "Christianity does not fall with the denial of the resurrection, especially as the fact is reported in a manner so contradictory and susceptible of different interpretations." Mr. Leathes argues that Christianity rests on a dogmatic basis, which a man cannot forsake without forfeiting the Christian name. He considers it, therefore, within his province, as Boyle Lecturer, to dispute the position taken by Dr. Davidson. It is somewhat surprising to find the *Contemporary Review* (Broad-church as it is), under the editorial care of Dean Alford, taking Mr. Leathes to task, and advancing the sentiment that "we have no right to deny that any man is a Christian who says he is." This is certainly a new application of the doctrine of *homo mensura*. There may be room for difference of opinion as to what is the *minimum* of Christian knowledge and belief which will entitle a man to rank as a Christian, but there can be no doubt, surely, with regard to the fundamental character of the doctrine of the resurrection. Reducing Christianity to its lowest terms, this doctrine will be found of such vital importance, that to deny it is to repudiate the religion of Jesus. It might be considered unjust to class the deniers of the resurrection among the "notorious infidels" whom Boyle had in his mind, to wit:

Atheists, Theists, Pagans, Jews, and Mohammedans, and yet it is certainly true that the controversy is not one "among Christians themselves." We have, to be sure, the authority of Mr. Morell for speaking of "Unitarian Christians," and by men of his school we should be thought very illiberal. But, inasmuch as the entire scheme of redemption derives its significance from the union of Godhead and humanity in the person of Christ, we cannot consider those entitled to the name of Christians who believe that Jesus is still in his grave. A Socinian theology finds the doctrine of the Resurrection inconvenient, and a theology which denies the penal and vicarious character of Christ's death would not be the loser if the doctrine were taken away. We do not mean to impute to Dr. Bushnell any doubt in regard to Christ's triumph over the grave, when we say that his theory of the atonement would be more consistent without the doctrine of the resurrection than with it. The moral influence theory stands in no need of a *Divine* Redeemer, and, therefore, would be none the weaker if the proofs of Jesus' resurrection were untenable. If Christ's work was only to set an example and manifest his sympathy for men, it might reasonably be argued that the scope of his mission is not curtailed by denying his resurrection. But believing, as we do, that his death was a penal and substitutionary sacrifice, we are compelled to regard his divinity and resurrection as fundamental truths. We cannot, therefore, throw open the door of liberality so wide as to regard every man as a Christian who says he is one. On the contrary, we consider it one of the most dangerous features of current infidelity, that it gains respectability and countenance by being baptized with a Christian name. Christian people are greatly imposed upon when they give shelter to ideas of infidel birth, because they come recommended by men who call themselves Christians.

We are, to a great extent, indebted to the epistles of Paul for our uncompromising views regarding the cardinal doctrines of the faith. Paul was the chosen instrument through whom the Holy Ghost gave full expression to these doctrines. We are correct, therefore, in regarding the Apostle of the Gentiles as the greatest stumbling-block in the way of all advocates of

"advanced views." Heterodox theologians of every shade would breathe more freely if the way were clear to dispose of the Pauline writings.

In dealing with the thirteen epistles attributed to Paul, the enemies of evangelical theology have three courses open to them. They may endeavor to prove (1) that the epistles are forgeries; (2) that they have been misinterpreted; or (3) that Paul alone is responsible for the teaching embodied in them.

Any one of these would serve the cause of Rationalism, and each has been perseveringly tried.

The first has the advantage of being more thorough-going and destructive. For, if it can be proved that the epistles usually attributed to Paul are forgeries, that puts an end at once to all appeal to them. Renan, in that case, might feel greater confidence in saying that "Paul is coming to the end of his reign."

The task of meeting the attacks of destructive criticism belongs to those who have made New Testament introduction a specialty;—and has been accomplished with a thoroughness which sets the question at rest in the minds of all who are not obstinately prejudiced. In fact, it requires but little critical learning to perceive that the conclusions reached by critics of the school of Baur are of the most arbitrary kind. To determine beforehand what Paul ought to write, and then condemn nine well-authenticated epistles because they do not meet the critic's idea of Pauline authorship, is, to say the least, a very high-handed proceeding. Yet this is, in plain English, just what has been done.

The point, however, which concerns us in this article is, that there are four of Paul's epistles which the most reckless critic acknowledges as authentic. We take up our New Testament with all the more confidence when we know that even Baur admits that the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians came from Paul's pen. Negative critics have halted too soon in their work of destruction, and, singularly enough, have left unquestioned the very epistles which contain the most pronounced expression of Pauline doctrine.

We are willing to test our convictions regarding the fundamental doctrines of Christianity by these epistles. Is it possi-

ble to cite the Apostle Paul as an advocate of the advanced views of sin and the atonement, by a fair interpretation of these four epistles? Have Christians been reading Paul with a veil upon their faces, as the Jews read Moses? Have the doctrines of original sin and vicarious sacrifice been perpetuated from century to century, through a persistent mistranslation of the New Testament? Matthew Arnold asserts distinctly that "Protestantism has misinterpreted Paul, and is based upon a blunder." He adopts the second of the three courses which we pointed out. Is he right? We cannot answer the question in detail. A few words must suffice.

It is important to remember that what Paul said is one thing; and the authoritative value of what he said, quite a different thing. The one can be determined by an appeal to the grammar and the dictionary; the other involves an inquiry into Paul's claim to be an accredited messenger from God. Strangely enough, writers sometimes get these two questions confused, and even Matthew Arnold, in his articles published some months ago in the *Cornhill Magazine*, while laboring hard to show that the Apostle Paul did not teach the doctrines usually ascribed to him, really rests his case against evangelical theology on the ground that the Apostle had imported into Christianity notions which he had acquired from Judaism.

Now the question is not whether any abatement is to be made from Paul's teaching on the ground of his educational bias, but whether the doctrines ascribed to him are really to be found in his pages. The two facts on which all Paul's teaching turns, and which give shape to all his utterances, are the literal death and resurrection of Christ. Whether he had sufficient reason for believing these doctrines, or whether he believed them at all, does not alter the fact that they are of prime importance in his epistles. To give them a secondary place in his system, as Matthew Arnold does, is to betray strange ignorance of the system. The key to the Epistle to the Romans is the seventh chapter, Mr. Arnold tells us—a chapter which is inferential from beginning to end. The primary ideas of Paul's teaching, as we learn from the same writer, are the spiritual dying and rising with Christ of the believers—ideas

which could have no significance, as the most careless reader may see, but for the *literal* death and resurrection of Christ, of which the Apostle had been previously speakiug. This artifice of interpretation has been adopted by Mr. Arnold in order to get rid of the doctrine of justification by faith. It shows us the real strength of our position as advocates of evangelical theology, that a scholar of Matthew Arnold's standing, in order to assail it, is obliged to look for Paul's leading doctrines in the metaphysical application of Christ's literal death and resurrection to the spiritual state of believers. So with regard to the words which Paul uses respecting the atonement. It does not change their meaning to say that Paul was so saturated with Jewish ideas that they influenced his conceptions of Christianity. The very point we are at is the meaning of the words, and an evasion like this only increases our confidence in the generally received interpretation. And of as little avail is it to say that these words of sacrificial and expiatory import are figures of speech. If it be only a question whether we are to interpret Paul figuratively or literally, further argument is unnecessary. For to suppose that Paul's strongest utterances, his most didactic deliverances were all figurative, and at the same time give him credit for speaking seriously regarding the issues of another world, is palpably absurd.

There is yet another refuge for those who deny the system of evangelical truth taught in Paul's epistles. It may be said that, admitting these epistles to be the work of Paul's hand, and admitting, moreover, that the received interpretation of them is correct—after all, we had these doctrines only on Paul's authority. It is still a question whether Paul did not invent them, or was not himself the victim of imposture.

The lectures of Mr. Leathes are intended to meet objectors of this class. His object is, not to combat the opinions of critics, but to show that, after making all the admissions they demand, the structure of Christian doctrine is untouched.

The thesis which he endeavors to establish is as follows: "*It is not possible to account for the phenomena which the writings and the history of Paul present to us, except upon*

the supposition of certain facts which are substantially those of the gospels."

Making now a general acknowledgment of indebtedness to the author under review, we shall, in what follows, endeavor to express in our own way the substance of his argument, and so avoid the necessity of making frequent quotations and references.

The historical apparatus on which this discussion depends, consists of the Acts of the Apostles and the four epistles already mentioned. On their united testimony we learn that the leading features in the character of Paul, as we have been accustomed to regard him, are true. That he was a Jew of Tarsus, a Benjamite, a Pharisee, an enthusiastic lover of the Law of Moses; that he had been a malignant enemy of the Christians, and that, at one period of his life, he did his best to destroy them, are facts which we have on his own confession. It has been said that the representations of Paul's vehement persecution are exaggerated. This is done, of course, in order to remove the difficulty occasioned by the contrast between Paul's life before and his life after conversion, when the attempt is made to explain his altered course by natural circumstances. The Scripture statements, however, must strike us as particularly calm; and, unless we had a theory to sustain, it would never occur to us that there was any disposition on the part of the sacred writers to exaggerate Paul's persecuting tendencies.

We pass, then, to Paul's conversion. That a great change came over him, from some cause or other, we have no reason to doubt. Even Mr. Jowett assures us that there is no fact in history more certain or independent than the conversion of Paul? How was it brought about? Suddenly or by degrees? Did Paul gradually come to the conclusion that the balance of truth was on the side of Christianity, or did he, by some sudden revulsion of feeling, pass through all the distance that lay between uncompromising Judaism and uncompromising Christianity? The latter, we shall say, if we attach any importance to the Apostle's own version of the story. In broad daylight, as he approached Damascus, he and his party were encompassed by a brightness greater than that of the midday

sun, and a voice fell in distinct tones upon Paul's ear. Instead of prosecuting his journey as he had begun, he was led into Damascus stone-blind. He went in the enemy of Christ; he came out the servant of Christ. There is little need of asking whether the circumstances attending Paul's conversion were natural or supernatural. The very weakness of rationalism is shown in the shallow and gratuitous assumption that the occurrence was an earthquake, and that Paul's blindness was the result of an epileptic fit.

"It was not the first thunderstorm to which he had been exposed, nor, possibly, even the first earthquake; and he seems to have been a man of considerable nerve, judging from what we are told of his conduct during the shipwreck in the Mediterranean, when he appears to have been almost the only one of the company who was calm and self-possessed. So that it is impossible that any natural convulsion of this kind would have produced on him the effect recorded; while it is no less unlikely that a fit of epilepsy, catalepsy, or any thing else, would have been followed by a total change of mind and revulsion of feeling—in short, would have made him a Christian from being a Jew."

He had ample time, during his three days' blindness, to reflect on the transaction; yet, at the close of that time, he was none the less persuaded that he had been face to face with Jesus. His impressions, moreover, received remarkable confirmation by the vision which appeared to Ananias, who went to Paul on the strength of it, and administered to him Christian baptism.

If, then, the occurrence was not a natural one, as we are forbidden in the nature of the case to suppose, the voice which Paul heard was the voice of Jesus, and the words which are recorded as passing between Saul and his Master, not only furnish the key to the Apostle's after-career, but are testimony beyond dispute to the literal and bodily resurrection of Jesus.

In Acts xiii. 38–9, we read:—"Be it known unto you, therefore, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe on him are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses."

The comparison between Christ and Moses in this verse is in favor of the former. The position is laid down, and afterward taught at greater length, that Judaism and Christianity

are absolutely incompatible. How was Paul led to impute to Christ the power of forgiving sin? How did he come to express such dissatisfaction with the system in which he was brought up? He knew the "ins and outs" of Judaism, as Mr. Leathes says, and therefore does not speak from ignorance. He recognized the divine origin of Mosaic legislation, and never spoke disparagingly of it. He was well aware that none but God could forgive sin, and therefore only the most decided evidence could have convinced him that this power resided in Jesus of Nazareth. Some "exceptional facts," there must have been in connection with the life of Christ which warranted Paul in setting aside Moses to believe in Jesus. What these facts were it is not difficult to determine. The Apostle gloried in the cross of Christ. But why? Why has the symbol of shame become the symbol of glory? The only possible explanation is the one which the Apostle himself gives. Jesus was set forth to be the propitiation for our sins. He was made sin for us who knew no sin! This explains Paul's determination to know nothing among the Corinthians save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. But Paul could have had but little confidence in a Redeemer who was still in the bonds of death. We are safe in saying that he could not have renounced Judaism unless he had believed in the Resurrection. So he declares that Christ was not only "delivered for our offences," but "raised again for our justification." And he assures the Corinthians that if Christ be not risen, their "faith was vain, and his preaching also vain." The ascension and second coming of Christ have a very important place in Paul's creed. "Every line he ever wrote bore witness to his habitual consciousness of Christ above him as the author of all grace and the supreme dispenser of all power." He, at least, was "always confident, knowing that while he was at home in the body he was absent from the Lord." He, for one, "labored" always, that, whether present or absent, he might be accepted of him, knowing that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ."

"Here, then, at least, we find woven into the very thread and substance of Paul's undisputed writings the essential frame-work and tissue of the Christian creed. We had his testimony, given in a way which it is not possible to accept

his authority and reject *it*, to the life, the death, the resurrection, the ascension of, and the future judgment by, the Lord Jesus Christ."

But are we to accept his authority? In what light are we to regard his testimony? Was he a deliberate impostor? Impossible. Breaking family ties, disowning the religion of his fathers, preaching a transcendent morality, living an upright life, inculcating an unpopular doctrine, running risks of life and limb in the discharge of a mission which offered no worldly inducements—this is strange business for an impostor. We should expect that his *courage* would break down if his career had been a cheat. But what are the facts? Writing to the Corinthians, who, whether Jews or Pagans, would hardly look with favor on the doctrine of salvation through a crucified Galilean, he flung down the challenge, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation into every one that believeth." Paul's life was a commentary on this courageous utterance. It is monstrous, then, for to suppose that he lent himself to the work of imposture. But perhaps he perverted the teaching of his Master? Has he not grafted upon the simple doctrine of Christ a set of dogmas which are to be put to the credit of his own genius? In reply, it is enough to say with Mr. Leathes, that Paul's appeal to a "contemporary verdict" must be considered decisive. He said, "If we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other doctrine, let him be accursed." Paul would not have thrown down the gauntlet at the feet of those who had been with Jesus, if he had gone before the world with a perverted gospel. It would have been a dangerous thing to preach as Christianity what was only a perversion of Christianity. And the amazing thing is, that if Paul's doctrine was not in accordance with the teaching of Christ, it gained such root in the minds of the early Christians as completely to supplant the teachings of Jesus, supposing them to have been different, and to have become recognized as representative of the gospel. How was it that the peculiar doctrines of Paul—doctrines which modern critics are so anxious to dispose of; doctrines, therefore, which we may suppose were always unpalatable to the unregenerate heart; doctrines which, from their mysterious nature as well as from

the humbling views of human power which they suggest, we may suppose no man seeking popularity would venture to propound—how is it that these doctrines gained such currency that Paul could throw down the challenge before the Christian world and say: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed?"

But if Paul did not deliberately invent or pervert Christianity, was he the victim of deception himself? Was he under the control of some hallucination when he said, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel!" Was he the subject of religious insanity that he exhibited such perseverance in publishing what he called the glad tidings? Was he led astray by some ignis-fatuus that he was "in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of his own countrymen, in perils of the heathen, in perils of the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness, in painfulness, in watchings often, in cold and nakedness?"

Now there was no room for deception with regard to the facts to which Paul appealed, provided he could trust his own eyes and ears. A sane man could not be mistaken. The simple question then is, whether Paul was crazy, or in his right mind. Are Rationalists prepared to say that his career, from beginning to end, is one of insanity? And if they are, can they explain how it was that it escaped detection? Was a delusion so easily propagated that all the churches between Jerusalem and Rome were carried away by it? Were Sergius Paulus, and the chamberlain at Corinth, and the saints in Cesar's palace the dupes of a religious enthusiast? Rationalists must have a prompt affirmative ready in reply to these questions if they wish to set aside Paul's testimony.

After discussing in successive lectures the early life of Paul, his conversion, faith, and courage, Mr. Leathes, under the head of "The Influence of Paul," treats of the miraculous gifts which the early Christians exercised.

That they possessed these gifts we can hardly doubt if we attach any importance to Paul's testimony. And even if we should be slow to call them miraculous, it is at least clear

that certain events were of frequent occurrence among the Christians which were so strange that the heathen looked upon them as indications of supernatural interference. It enhances the value of the testimony to know that these gifts were not possessed by all; they were of so exceptional a character that they cannot be imputed to any collusion among the early Christians. The Apostle himself alludes to them incidentally, and in no labored, apologetic manner. He wrote to correct the abuses which had attended the exercise of gifts, and, so far from magnifying the importance of miraculous powers, is careful to subordinate them to the grace of charity. "It is no less certain that many Christians at Corinth spoke with tongues, and prophesied, possessed gifts of healing, and wrought miracles, and that some abused these gifts, than that in the same church the Eucharistic feast was profaned by drunkenness, unseemly conduct, and excess. No one would deny the latter, but the former is equally undeniable." "No one writing a letter to a number of persons deeply attached to him, and to whom likewise he was deeply attached, could possibly think of rebuking them for errors of which they were guiltless; of charging them with offences they had not committed. The idea is preposterous. The Corinthian church was guilty, on the one hand, of incest, and, on the other, of gross profanation of spiritual gifts."

Now we must remember that the position of the early Christians was very different from that of mediæval ecclesiastics. There was no church authority to back a pious fraud. Every thing was against them; Christianity was fighting its way, inch by inch, against the combined prejudice of Jew and Pagan; chicanery would have killed it. Shrewd Turks and Jews were in no danger of mistaking an ordinary recovery for a miraculous cure.

We cannot take ground against New Testament miracles without asserting either that the early Christians, the Apostle Paul included, were a set of cheats, or that they were the victims of deception.

Now, the moral character of the system which they professed is against the first supposition. Both in theory and in practice, in precept and in life, Christianity was in advance

of any thing in the world. To suppose that such a system was born in sin, that a religion of such transcendent excellence was rocked in its cradle by a set of liars, that a faith which made men love what is honest, and lovely, and of good report, was propagated by jugglery; to suppose that a man of Paul's moral stature would go before the world with a lie in his right hand, is a moral impossibility.

And if we take the latter supposition, we do but little credit to the intelligence of one people among whom the most subtle philosophy was born; we under-estimate the shrewdness of another people who, in all matters of worldly gain, are known in history as a keen-eyed race, if we believe that among those who witnessed the so-called miracles there were none who could see through the delusion and expose it.

These miracles, however (since we are shut up to the admission of them), no less than Paul's conversion, witness to the resurrection of Christ and the cardinal facts of the gospel. For "their bestowal was the exclusive dowry of a particular confession of faith—of faith, that is, in a person, marked by a particular history, and exercising at the time particular functions." The Christians claimed to perform the miracles in Christ's name and in confirmation of Christian doctrine. If God allowed them to control the powers of nature for the purpose of corroborating the doctrines which they preached, it is equivalent to an indorsement, on God's part, of the doctrines themselves.

"The Mission of Paul" is the title of the seventh lecture. In the opening verse of the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul declares that he is "an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father who raised him from the dead." The Galatians, we may gather from this epistle, were disposed to admit his claims; nay, we are told they "received him as an angel of God, even as Jesus Christ." The question which Mr. Leathes discusses in this lecture are, "why did *they* so receive him?—and, how did *he* know that he had a divine message?"

Why did the Galatians receive him as a messenger of God? In the first place, his conversion must have been a powerful

argument. Here was a man preaching "the faith which he once destroyed."

Then, as the Apostle could show, he was "in good repute among the brethren who were in Christ before him." Then the effect of the gospel upon themselves sustained the Apostle's claim. Whereas they had been blind, now they could see. And if faith were yet lacking, the miracles which they had witnessed would more than convince them. But, more than all, they had the witness in themselves. "Paul had done something more than impose upon the senses. He had led captive the heart, and had convinced the reason. He had wrought miracles, not only before their eyes, but in themselves. If he had made them conscious of the living power of the living Jesus, there was a third witness independent of themselves and independent of him." God had sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying, Abba, Father. "In one word, the Apostle proved his divine mission by its divine results."

To say *divine* results, however, is to overleap the objections of Rationalism. Yet, if not divine, what were they?

What are the facts? The Apostle marvels that the Galatians are "so soon removed from him that called them into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel." He calls them "foolish Galatians," and wonders who had "bewitched" them that they "should not obey the truth." He reminds them of a time when they "knew not God," and did "service to them who are no gods." He urges them to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

These expressions all imply that the preaching of the gospel had been attended with certain good results, which, however, were only of too short duration. Were these results only imaginary, or were they only what we might naturally look for under the circumstances? They were not imaginary; for then the defection would be only imaginary, and the Apostle would be charging them with an offence which they had never committed; and the epistle, as the result of whim, would carry on its face its own condemnation.

Nor can these results be credited to nature. "If the results were natural, then it has still to be shown how it was they

were so much opposed to nature; how, in the midst of heathenism and a profligate and depraved idolatry, there sprung up suddenly a pure and elevated morality, a conception of the divine nature, unequalled by the loftiest flights of philosophy; a consciousness of divine mysteries and divine realities till then unthought of; a recognized standard or ideal of human action till then unheard of and unattained; a sensitiveness of the moral nature which can never be surpassed, and which till then had never been imagined." . . . . "*The production of that epistle* (to the Galatians) *as a mere literary effort was a phenomenon not to be accounted for on merely natural principles.* The tone of it was out of harmony with the voices of the world. The stream and current of it ran counter to that of the course of this world."

If it be asked how Paul knew that he had received a divine message, it will not be difficult to point to certain facts in his experience which must have set the matter beyond a doubt. He could not help seeing that his own life contrasted with the lives of both Jews and Pagans; nay, that the contrast was so strong that, turn whither he would, he encountered enmity. And he well knew that the reason of the contrast was his doctrine of Christ Jesus, and him crucified. He found himself "the depositary of a gospel in direct contradiction to the whole world." How was he to explain his singular position?

Then the strangest contrast separated the life of Saul of Tarsus from that of Paul the Apostle. He became a "new creature" the moment he became a Christian. His own mind must have sought an explanation of this; and surely we are not at liberty to reject rashly his own account of the matter: "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

He was not indebted to anybody for what he knew of the gospel. He "conferred not with flesh and blood!" "It grew up in his mind spontaneously, and yet wholly in opposition to his own will, and in defiance of his natural bias, and the prejudices of his education."

Can we find any other explanation of this than that it 'pleased God to reveal his Son in him?" His theology was

not a matter which he had thought out for himself. It shows no signs of growth. It was the same at the close that it was at the beginning of his ministry. Where did he get it? He says it was revealed. Do not all the circumstances favor this view? His consciousness testified that he had been a recipient of divine revelation. We surely should not be required to go back of that. No stronger guaranty could have been given him than that. Taking every thing into account—Paul's early hatred of the Christians—his wonderful conversion—his implicit faith in Christ—his courageous loyalty to him—his sterling character—his heroic endurance of persecution, and withal, the miracles which corroborated his claims—it is only the most perverse scepticism which will put the question, whether it is possible that, after all, Paul was mistaken? "Assuredly here, if anywhere, there can be no mistake; for here," as Mr. Leathes finely remarks, "we are on the very confines of the supernatural, within ear-shot of the voice of God."

It can be seen from the hasty survey we have given of Mr. Leathes' argument how decided the witness is which Paul bears to Christ. In fact, if the Acts of the Apostles and the four undisputed epistles of Paul were all that were left of the New Testament, we should be able from them to construct the system of evangelical theology.

Not only do these writings represent Paul as the voluntary preacher of a faith which he had embraced on the very best of evidence, but they substantiate his claims to be an accredited ambassador of Christ.

This feature in his character gives the stamp of *finality* to Christian doctrine, and effectually removes it from the category of things liable to change or open to improvement. We might, indeed, have inferred as much, had Paul not been charged with official authority. For if he had reason to give up a religion of confessedly divine origin, and put his trust in Jesus, we may reasonably infer that we ought to do likewise. If Paul became a missionary of the Christian faith, and if his preaching was confirmed by miracles, then those miracles are no less confirmatory of our faith, though we never witnessed them.

But when, in addition to all this, we are assured that the Apostle spoke as God's ambassador; delivered a message which had been revealed to him; pronounced anathemas on all who preached another gospel; it amounts to demonstration, that the gospel as Paul preached it, was meant to be final, and that no one can neglect it or pervert it without running the most fearful risk.

Leaving the question of inspiration altogether out of sight, setting aside all the other parts of the Bible, these epistles make known that an "unalterable deposit had been given to the world." What this deposit is, what Paul considers it to be, we cannot doubt. A crucified Christ—a risen Christ—a coming Christ—these are the cardinal doctrines of the gospel. To deny them is to part with the gospel. To pervert their meaning is to preach another gospel. If it was ever true that Christ died for our sins, then the doctrine can never be superannuated. The epistles of Paul veto the doctrine of development. To the Romanist, who says the Bible teaches too little, and to the infidel, who says it teaches too much, to him who supplements it with human corruptions, and to him who weeds out of it all that displeases him, to Dr. Newman, and to Matthew Arnold—the words of the Apostle have equal reference, "though he, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

In the foregoing remarks it has been our object to make our readers acquainted with the drift of the author under review, rather than to express any opinion respecting the merits of the book.

We will say, however, that we have derived profit from the study of the volume. The author is a scholar in the strict sense of the word, and his book is written in an attractive style.

To be sure, in several points regarding the evidential value of Paul's conversion and subsequent career he crosses the track of previous writers on the subject. A superficial reader might, on that account, think that the book contained nothing new. The thing which we particularly admire in these lectures is the skill with which the author anticipates every conceivable

rationalistic hypothesis, thus narrowing the discussion to the alternative of receiving Christianity or doing violence to history.

The appendix to the lectures is exceedingly valuable, consisting of an exhaustive defence of the credibility of the book of Acts against the onslaughts of Dr. Davidson.

Art. VI.—*Tithes and Offerings: A Treatise on the Principles, Practice, and Benefits of devoting Portions of our Substance to the Service of God.* By C. W. Boase. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1865.

The church is ever being called upon, by the providence of God in the progress of his kingdom in the world, to meet new practical issues and to take new and higher positions in view of them. From time to time the old order of things practical is outgrown, and old platforms must be left behind, just as the successive stages of the scaffold used in the erection of some cathedral are one by one left behind by the workmen as the building rises toward completion. And as the wise builder is always found building upon the latest staging erected, so the church, in its work on the great spiritual temple, should always be found building from the highest and latest platform to which God has called her. We carry the figure further, and affirm it equally true of the earthly and the heavenly temple, that the work wrought from a lower level than that already attained by the summit of the walls does nothing in lifting them toward the capstone, and can have at best but a secondary value, if any at all. There are abundant indications on every hand that the providential demand for pecuniary means to be used in the evangelizing of the world is slowly waking the church of the present day to the necessity of taking a great step forward in the matter of Christian giving. From these indications we single out the formation of national organizations for the promotion of enlarged beneficence, as

illustrating the general tendency of the times. The British Systematic Beneficence Society was established April 29, 1860. It has for its object, as we learn from its official organ, the *Benefactor*, "to promote, by the Press, the Platform, and the Pulpit, a sound and scriptural public opinion in favor of, 1st, Conscientious giving to God, Prov. iii. 9, 10, etc.; 2dly, Proportionate giving to God, Gen. xxviii. 20, 22, etc.; 3dly, Systematic giving to God, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, etc." It numbers among its members some of the leading men of the British islands. The Systematic Beneficence Society formed at New Haven, January 19, 1869, was also designed to be a national organization. Its idea originated at the meeting of the American Board at Norwich, Conn., in the autumn of 1868. The Constitution declares that, "its object shall be to promote the practice, among Christians and others, of giving a certain per cent. of their yearly income to charitable objects, having regard to the Divine rule, 'as God hath prospered them.'" Its president is Hon. H. P. Haven, of Norwich; its treasurer, Moses H. Sargent, Esq., of Boston, and among its supporters are to be found Rev. Prof. George E. Day, of Yale Theological Seminary, President Cummings, of the Wesleyan University, Rev. Dr. Tyng, of New York, and Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia. But the stately octavo volume of Mr. Boase, issued by the great Scottish religious publishing house of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, is perhaps one of the best indications of the importance which this subject is assuming in the mind of the Christian public. It contains, under a peculiarly Jewish title, an elaborate discussion of the subject of Beneficence in most of its bearings, ancient and modern. The author we take to be a Church of England Scotchman. His book exhibits the churchliness of the one and the metaphysical proclivities of the other. The *Scotchman* in him we credit with the thorough scriptural grounding of some portions of the book, and the hosts of inferences often so incomprehensible to any one but a metaphysician after the well-known definition of the old Scotch woman. In truth, in undertaking to read his book, it may as well be understood at the outset, that with much reverence for the Scriptures, Mr. B. combines the ability to see as much of the invisible and to gain positive knowledge

of as much of the unknowable as almost any man who can be imagined. The *Churchman* in him we credit with the peculiar backward drift of the teachings of the book, setting toward the tithe system and Judaism. It is freely admitted, however, that, notwithstanding these damaging peculiarities which render it impossible to accept its teachings as a whole, or to follow the line of discussion in any of its parts, we still regard it as a valuable contribution to this branch of our religious literature, grounding some fundamental propositions most thoroughly, leaving scarcely an important practical question untouched, presenting a condensed view of the literature and bibliography of the subject of tithes, everywhere eminently suggestive,—and accordingly fitted to benefit the thoughtful and discriminating reader.

Three elements must necessarily be taken into account in any adequate discussion of the subject of the Christian giving for the times,—God, the church, and the world: the world, with its hundreds of millions under the influence of deadly error hastening to eternal perdition; God in his infinite grace having purposed to save it, having provided salvation through his only begotten Son, and having made ready for its application to the lost by the Holy Spirit; the church, God's authorized agent, commissioned to bear the knowledge of this salvation to the lost world. We take for granted, as universally admitted, the two facts of a perishing world needing salvation, and God's abundant provision for its salvation. The only questions which can in any sense be considered open are those which arise in connection with the agency of the church and in her present relations to the world and to God. It will be seen that our outlook is predominantly from the mission-point of view. For justification in this, our appeal must be to the pre-eminent grandeur of the mission work; to the fact that in its broadest and most scriptural sense it takes in all the other work; and to the necessity imposed by narrow limits of adhering mainly to a single line of thought.

It is evident that the work which is to be done cannot be done without the requisite pecuniary means. A first question is, has the Head of the church the right to demand that she furnish these means? If he has not, then the call so often

reiterated is unreasonable and arbitrary; if he has, then nothing can absolve her from the duty of responding to the call.

There are three possible modes of acquiring property in any thing: by production, by purchase, and by gift. God claims absolute title to the church in all its membership and in all its possessions by every one of these rights and in the highest possible sense. In creation he is the absolute producer of the church and all it holds; in redemption, the absolute purchaser of all; and in the covenant, the one to whom every saved sinner makes absolute surrender of himself and all his. His absolute ownership by the right of production, God has placed at the foundation of every covenant with man and the church. The covenants with Adam before and after the fall, with Noah, with Abraham, and with the Israelites; and the whole tenor of the New Testament legislation bear testimony to this. Take away the underlying claim of the right of the Divine Author to do what he will with his creation, and the substance is gone from them all, and there is scarcely a shadow left. The idea of man's voluntary surrender to God and the claim founded upon it, are likewise embodied in all these covenants. In the new and better covenant the Divine claim founded upon the price paid in redemption is superadded to the others. Its language is, "Ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price."

This absolute ownership of the church, with all her possessions of intellect, of power, and of wealth, originally vests in God as the Trinity. In the scheme of redemption it is given to the Second Person of the Trinity incarnate, as mediator. Upon this transfer Christ rests his claim as the head of the church. Because of this he claims power to save: "All things *are delivered unto me* of my Father," therefore, the invitation and promise to the lost, "Come *unto me* all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Because of this he claims the right to send forth the church with the great commission for the evangelizing of the world: "*All authority* is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, *therefore*, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teach-

ing them to observe *all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*"

The claim of Christ, as the head of the church, is, therefore, based upon the highest conceivable grounds, scriptural and rational. The obligation imposed upon the church by it belongs to the class of complete obligations. Whether the demand be made to furnish the means for carrying out the commission now, or in the indefinite future, whenever it is once clearly made, there is no possible absolution from the duty.

1. With this necessarily meagre exhibition of the rights of the Head of the church we pass to a more extended and detailed consideration of *the special demand made*, in virtue of these rights, *upon the present generation of Christians.*

There may exist the admission on the part of the church of her obligation to furnish, *in the course of her history*, the pecuniary means requisite to bring about the great ends of redemption purposed by God, and yet that admission be unaccompanied by any clear and adequate sense of *present duty.* This would seem to be the position of a large portion of the church of this day; they admit that they are to furnish what Christ calls for, some time in the next ten or twenty generations, more or less. We hope contrary to this, from *word of God*, in which alone is laid down the Divine law binding upon the church of every age, in connection with *the indications of Providence*, or the signs of the times, in which alone is to be ascertained the peculiar Divine demand made under that law upon the present times,—to show conclusively that Christ calls *upon the Evangelical Church of this day for all the means requisite for carrying out the great commission.*

a. The consideration of *the teachings of the Scriptures* upon this subject necessarily comes first. Only in the light of them can the signs of the times be clearly read and adequately understood. The law of the agency of the church in using her wealth in fulfilling her mission is to be found partly in the Old Testament and partly in the New. As both these are parts of one great system, progressing in regulations and motives toward perfection and universality, and in which the basis of all is in the Mosaic legislation, a knowledge of the teachings of

the earlier revelation is evidently necessary to a correct understanding of the later. We therefore begin with the requirements made through the Hebrew lawgiver, purposing to present the matter in plainest modern phrase.

According to the Mosaic code, *what proportion of his income was the Jew required to devote to the cause of his religion?*

The general notion seems to be that he gave *a tenth*. It is clearly a mistaken one, as will be seen from an examination of the Scriptures. The law, in its first enactment on the subject, required the Jew to give *one-tenth* of all the produce of the flocks and herds and fields *to the Levite*. If he paid it in kind, well; if not, one-fifth was added. The Levite was to give one-tenth of this tenth to the Lord for the support of the high-priest. This enactment is found in Leviticus xxvii. 30–33, and is repeated and enlarged upon in Numbers xviii. This was one-tenth for the support of the priesthood, or of that part of the religious system. Secondly, the law required that he should devote *a second tenth to the yearly religious festivals*. He was to take this tenth to the place appointed by the Lord for his worship, and there devote it to the uses specified. This enactment is found in Deuteronomy xiv., beginning with verse 22. Thus far there are *two essentially different tithes* each year. Thirdly, the law required that *every third year* the Jew should bring *a tenth* of all and share it with the Levite, with the poor, and with the stranger, in festival rejoicing with them. This enactment is found in Deuteronomy xiv., and is renewed in Deuteronomy xxvi. Independently of all testimony on the subject other than that of the Scriptures themselves, it might perhaps be said that there is a *possibility*, although as far as may be from a probability, that the tithe of the third year might have been the same as that previously mentioned. If we have read its provisions correctly, the Mosaic law demanded of the Jew *two-tenths every year, and each third year three-tenths*, or an average of two and one-third tenths yearly.

But may we not have read the record incorrectly? Certainly no argument against the result arrived at, based upon *the greatness of the requirement*, can for a moment stand; for, by accurate calculation, *almost one-half the time* of the Jew was required in God's service. It was evidently the Divine

purpose to require great things of the chosen people. Indeed, it is necessary to go further, and to take into account the fact that these tithes were *only a part* of the gifts of the Jew,—the ordered and measured part.—before we can appreciate the full extent of the means which he devoted to God's service. The other part consisted of *free-will offerings*, the largeness and frequency of which were left to the promptings of the individual heart, but which might, in some instances, exceed even the tithes. Moreover, it was the *gross income* or product of his industry that was tithed, before any thing had been used for his own purposes. But we are rescued from all need of dependence upon probabilities, by finding, just at hand, reliable witnesses to the correctness of the above reading of the Mosaic law. Josephus,* who lived at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, says distinctly that *one-tenth* was to be given yearly to the Levites, *one-tenth* was to be applied to the festivals at Jerusalem, and *one-tenth* was to be given every third year to the poor. Tobit,† who probably wrote some 400 B. C., and Jerome,‡ who wrote about 400 A. D., tell us the same thing. Now these are all credible and competent witnesses to the Jewish understanding of the law in their day, and they all confirm our reading of the rule which was to govern the benevolence of the Jews.

But does this enactment of the Jewish lawgiver belong to that part of his code which, as is the case with the Decalogue, is of perpetual obligation, and, therefore, necessarily binding upon the Christian church? Or, if not, what is the present rule which is to govern the church in its Christian giving? This involves the inquiry, How did *Christ and his Apostles* treat the tithe system? What rule did they acknowledge or lay down?

How did *Christ*, the greater lawgiver than Moses, treat the tithe system? We learn from the Gospels that he ratified it, at least *for the Jew*. He did this when he reproved the Pharisees for their neglect of the weightier matters of the law. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the

* *Antiquities*, iv. 8, §§ 8 and 22. † Tobit i. 7, 8.

‡ See citations in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, Article, *Tithes*.

weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: *these* ought ye to have done, and *not to leave the other undone.*" This ratification is recorded in Matthew xxiii. 23, and in Luke xi. 42. But was this ratification for any one besides the Jew? The considerations in favor of a negative answer appear to be conclusive. *For the Jew*, clearly, since the Jew was still under the law of Moses, and this was but an affirmation of that fact; *for none besides the Jew*, since Jesus was himself a minister of the circumcision, or of the old dispensation (see Romans xv. 8), and, as such, enforcing the law of Moses. The new dispensation could not have its full beginning until its foundation had been laid in his death. Taking into account the teachings of the Apostles along with those of our Lord himself, there is nowhere any clear and sufficient evidence that he made the old Jewish law of tithes the law of that dispensation; there is nowhere even the shadow of evidence that he did.

If he *did* reaffirm the law, then the requirement would be that the church should yearly devote at least *seven-thirtieths* of its income to the objects of Christian benevolence; and this, too, in addition to all the *free-will offerings* for which the special favors of God give ten thousand occasions. If he *did not* reaffirm it, then *more*, rather than less, in some form, must be required of Christians as a body. If a reason be asked, it may be answered, that since the times of the Mosaic law, the grand truth of God's ownership of all things has given place to that of *Christ's* ownership of all things; that the motive has risen all the way up from law to love, and that the mission of the people in covenant with God has enlarged from the reception and conservation of the Divine revelation in the little Jewish state, to the propagation of the Gospel throughout the whole world. To the Christian the Head of the church can say, Give as *bought by my blood*, as *recreated by my Spirit*, as *you love me*, as a *perishing world needs*.

But assuming that *Christ did not* make the Mosaic system binding under the new dispensation, *did the Apostles*, on whom devolved the work of organizing the primitive church, do any such thing? The answer must be an emphatic negative. The substantive expression for "tithe," and the twofold ver-

bal expression for "giving" and "receiving tithes," occur in the apostolic writings from the Acts to Revelation only seven times, never out of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and there always in such a connection that nothing short of Mr. Boase's churchly Scotch metaphysics could possibly find in them any thing on which to base an argument in favor of the re-enactment of the tithe law for the New Testament Church. We do not see how any one can avoid coming to the same conclusion with regard to the whole tithe system which Blackstone reached with regard to the tithes of the clergy, and that in spite of his noted and almost slavish adherence to past usages, and which he expressed when he wrote in his Commentaries, "I will not put the title of the clergy to tithes upon any Divine right; though such a right certainly commenced, and *I believe as certainly ceased, with the Jewish Theocracy.*"*

What then is the *scriptural and apostolical rule* laid down to govern Christian giving? It would be easy to bring forward many passages bearing upon the objects of benevolence and the dispensers of it, the frequency of giving and the times for it, the extent of the demand made upon the income of the primitive Christians and their response to it,—but a single apostolic expression of the rule of beneficence, and a single instance of Christian conduct illustrative of it must suffice for present purposes. The *rule* is the comprehensive one laid down by Paul for the Christians at Corinth, in 1 Corinthians xvi. 2: "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." It is a simple rule, suited to the needs of that single poor church, and yet expansive enough to leave room for a growth of liberality that should take in all the world; and Christians in this day seem to be generally turning toward it as a Divine direction quite abreast with the progress of the most advanced school of modern benevolence. It decides *who shall give:* "Every one of you," rich and poor. It tells *when and how the consecration shall be made:* "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you store up by him." Upon the Christian Sabbath the laying aside was to be done, that out of it the Sabbath offering, which, as will be seen further on, was an

* *Commentaries*, Book ii., c. 3.

essential part of the Christian worship, might be made. It directs *how much to give.* "As God hath prospered him," or as God has made him able to give. The rule is altogether a plain one to the man in whose heart the love of Christ reigns supreme. There is need of no more specific legislation even touching the amount to be given. Shall the Christian give *a tenth?* Is that all that the Head of the church in giving him his measure of prosperity has made him *able* to give? Shall he give *a fifth?* Is he willing in his liberality to fall behind *the Jew* who lived in the comparative darkness of thirty-five hundred years ago? Shall he in these days of large demands give *one-half? Nine-tenths?* Is that *all* God has made him able to give? The apostolic rule evidently knows no measure short of the steward's utmost ability when wholly under control of love to Christ and a lost world. *The single illustration from Christian conduct* to which we refer is that furnished by the mother church of all, at Jerusalem, and recorded in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. Living in that first great crisis in the spread of the Gospel, than which no greater has been known till that of the present day, they read with all clearness the demand of their ascended Lord in his words and the signs of the times, and catching the spirit of their mission, devoted *themselves and all their possessions* to his cause.

b. With this review of the teachings of the Scriptures we come to the consideration of *the special Divine demand made upon the church of this day in present providences.*

The Divine law laid down in the Word is evidently one which binds the Christian from generation to generation, and from age to age. At the same time, it may be taken for granted that the Word of God supposes that a work of so vast moment as that of bearing the Gospel to a lost world is to be done as soon as possible. If, in any particular age or generation, the church is able to give a valid reason for not furnishing the entire pecuniary means requisite, and finishing the appointed work, well. The past has been able to give at least a partial reason for failure in its mission, and beyond that has suffered even to judgment where the failure has been without adequate reason.

By certain marked, nay, wholly unprecedented, features in the condition and relations of the world and the church, by which the great Head and Lord makes known his will concerning a perishing world, and Christian duty toward it, he has made it abundantly clear that *he calls upon the church of the present day to furnish the entire pecuniary means requisite for the complete and immediate fulfilment of the great commission.* And by the church, be it understood, we mean the church of Protestant Christendom, which alone can give mankind a pure gospel. In that wonderful twelfth lecture in Guyot's "Earth and Man," * in which the author delineates the progress of human civilization until it becomes the Christian civilization of the Great Britain and America of this age, the church is brought face to face with this duty to the rest of the world. The voices of all the ages are made to enforce the duty. We wish it could be read just here, to prepare the better for the considerations about to be urged. It is twenty-one years since that lecture was delivered in Lowell Institute. The unprecedented features in the present condition and relations of the Protestant Church and the world, to which attention is to be called, are mainly the results of the revolutions, intellectual, moral, and social, which have occurred in those twenty-one years.

In specifying these peculiarities of the times, it may be affirmed, first in order, that we find one evidence that Christ has made this great demand upon the church of this generation, in his *opening the whole world in this quarter-century to the Gospel as in the hands of Protestant Christendom.*

It is now twenty-eight years since Dr. John Harris wrote the prize essay entitled, "The Great Commission," † the most eloquent and stirring appeal that has been made to the modern church in behalf of missions, in which, with almost prophetic foresight, he proclaimed the dawning of a new era, and, with almost apostolic fervor, summoned God's people to the rescue of the world. At that time the more earnest

* *The Earth and Man: Lectures on Comparative Physical Geography in its Relations to the History of Mankind.* By Arnold Guyot. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

† *The Great Commission; or, the Christian Church constituted and charged to convey the Gospel to the World.* By the Rev. John Harris, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln.

Christians were gathering from month to month to pray in concert for the breaking down of the barriers interposed by the governments of the nations, Roman Catholic and heathen, to the spread of a pure gospel. These nations were then everywhere substantially closed against our Christianity, the whole force of the governments being arrayed against it, and on the side of error. The governmental obstacles interposed by the *heathen nations* have successively been removed, partly by internal revolution, and partly by external pressure; partly by the peaceful advances of commerce, and the quiet working of thought, and partly by mighty throes that have shaken the world, until the masses of Asia and Africa and the Isles of the Sea are almost as open to Protestant missionaries as the non-church-going multitudes in these so-called Christian lands. In the *Papal world*, on the Western Continent, from Mexico to Patagonia, and on the Eastern Continent, in Italy, Spain, Austria, and the other leading Roman Catholic nations, the religious changes which have taken place in the same period, and which have been even more marvellous than those on heathen grounds, have made them all open and inviting mission fields to Protestant Christians. No thinking man can help inquiring, what does this almost miraculous revolution in the relation of the entire world to Protestant Christendom mean? What, when viewed in connection with the united prayers of Protestant Christians all over the world directed to this very end? What, when looked upon as all compressed within the life-time of the present generation? The only answer that can be returned is, that it means that to the Protestant Church of this generation belongs the work of giving the entire world the Gospel. The work is Christ's. He has a right to call upon his own at any time for the requisite pecuniary means. *By opening the world now*, he calls upon his followers *to furnish the means now.* They are bound to respond, and fill the treasury of their Lord *now*, unless they can give a *valid reason* for delay.

But Christ has just as evidently made this great demand upon his church of this generation, *by creating and giving into her peculiar control the facilities for the speedy proclamation of the Gospel to all this open world.*

Dr. John Todd, in his sermon at the opening of the Annual Meeting of the American Board for 1869, called this the *propagating age* of the church. First came the age for settling the Christian faith; then followed the age of union of church and state, ending with the Reformation. "To undo the past, to cut free from the state, to reform the church, to educate the human mind to think, to discover the power of the press, to create the free school and the free church—to discover and invent all the instrumentalities needed, and to find the way to every part of the globe, has been a great part of the work which has since been done." Accepting this characterization of the age as so far correct, we would fix the attention upon the fact that every one of these forward movements has reached its culmination *within the present quarter-century.* This is, accordingly, the day in which *God has first freed a mighty host from the daily toil for bread and raiment*, that they may be his messengers to the world. The almost universal application of machinery driven by natural forces to all the varied industry of Christendom, has multiplied many fold the quantity of labor, so that if need be a considerable proportion of this population can be spared without detriment to the industrial interests of society. This is the age of *the universal diffusion of education in the leading Protestant nations*—Prussia, Great Britain, and the United States. The common people have now come to furnish a great portion of the vigorous thinkers and workers in all departments of human effort and enterprise—the Hugh Millers and Faradays and Henrys, the Clays and Websters and Lincolns, the Milnes and Judsons and Spurgeons. Now for the first in modern history, most homes are no longer unfitted by want of intelligence to furnish a messenger of the cross from among their inmates. This is the age in which the church is *able to make the Gospel understood in all the world.* The philosophy of human speech had its origin but yesterday. The men who began the work of collection, comparison, and classification of languages have just passed away; the men to whom is intrusted the perfecting of it are now at work. The mysteries of the difficult tongues are now, for the first, easily made plain to even the ordinary intellect. This is the age of *abounding energy and enterprise*

—qualities requisite for the speedy evangelizing of the world. To-day Protestantism is at the lead in all the world's work of improvement and progress, and no task is, humanly speaking, too great for it to undertake and complete. For this age to rise up, and designate, and train, and send forth the messengers to all the world, would be but a little thing in comparison with the immense material and secular work it is accomplishing. This is the age of *a remarkable spirit of unity in the church at large.* Large numbers who, thirty years ago, belonged, in a peculiar sense, to the *church militant*, are now ready to work together in peace, on the broad platform of the essential doctrines of God's word, for the world's redemption. Above all, this is the age in which, for the first time in the providence of God, *the representative Protestant nations stand at all the open doors of all of the world of heathenism and Roman Catholicism.* In a striking manner the way is thus made ready for them to fill the nations with missionaries. On the Western Continent, all the states from Mexico to Chili, in swinging away from Papal Europe by which they were once enslaved, gravitated toward Protestant United States, by whose example they have been led to secure civil and religious freedom. Upon Great Britain, with her position established on the west, south, and east of Africa, and her explorers traversing its vast centre, and with her lines of influence and political ascendency reaching along by India and Oceanica far out beyond Australia,—must depend the future religious destiny of these vast regions. To Protestant Christendom of this day confessedly belongs the dominion of the sea. By the recent completion of the Pacific Railway and the Suez Canal, in connection with the Indian and Pacific steamship lines and the ocean telegraph now being laid by the Great Eastern by the way of the Red Sea and Bombay to China, a new thoroughfare of traffic and thought, *predominantly Protestant*, girds the globe in such a way as to bring our Christianity into immediate and daily contact with all the representative *Papal nations*, Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, Austria; with all the representative *Mohammedan nations*, the Barbary States, the two Turkeys, Egypt, Nubia, Arabia, Persia; and with all the representative *Pagan nations*, Afghanistan, Beloochistan, Hindostan, Farther

India, China, Japan, and the inhabitants of the almost innumerable islands of the Pacific Ocean. Every one will be ready to admit that this new route has vast significance for the commerce of the future, but the Christian cannot help seeing that it cannot have less for the church in its work; for the very steamships which must soon bear the traffic of the world along the Mediterranean, up the Nile, the Euphrates, the Indus, the Ganges, the Brahmapootra, the Irrawaddy, the Cambodia, the Yang-tse-Kiang, and the Hoang-Ho, into the very heart, nay, to the remotest bounds of all these great nations, will be ready to bear the missionaries of the church to the same regions. The man of most exalted imagination can have but an inadequate view of the vast import to the cause of Christ of this new step in the onward march of Providence. And viewed in its relation to the population of the globe, its bearings appear no less striking and important than when viewed in its relations to the nationalities. A Berlin professor estimates the total population of the globe at 1,283,000,000. Of these more than 900,000,000 are found along this great thoroughfare of the world! Of the remaining 350,000,000, more than 200,000,000, along Northern Europe and Asia, are under the control of the Protestant and Greek churches. The less than 150,000,000 remaining inhabit the portions of America and Africa peculiarly under the moral influence of the United States and Great Britain. Let the fact be emphasized that the Protestant Church, with all its new facilities for giving the world the Gospel, now for the first stands foremost at every one of the open doors of the world. A single month will soon suffice to place a band of missionaries within the bounds of the most remote of these nations. The inquiry forces itself upon every one who gives this subject a moment's thought: What does it all mean? This almost incomprehensible increase in the facilities for propagating the Gospel among the unevangelized races and the giving of them all into the hands of the leading Protestant states—do not these providences point Protestant Christians to their duty? The creation of these facilities within the memory of men still living—does it not point to *present duty?* Can any one who owes allegiance to the Head of the church escape the conclusion that this lavish furnishing of facilities

for reaching the world falls in very strangely with the Divine purpose in opening it to Protestant Christian effort; and that this twofold movement of Providence binds the church to respond to the Divine call by filling the treasury of the Lord to overflowing *now;* unless she can give a *valid reason* for delaying?

But Christ has made his providential demand for the means requisite for the spread of the Gospel as clear and as binding as possible upon the church of the present day, *by suddenly furnishing her with all the wealth needed.*

These remarkable revolutions of the past thirty years have been so numerous and so silent that even the best ecclesiastical statisticians and financiers scarcely understand the full meaning of the *rich church* with its vast income which so often enters into their calculations. De Quincey, in some curious investigations in his "Biographical Essays" has shown that the dowry which Mary Arden, the mother of Shakespeare, brought to his father, John Shakespeare, the estate amounting at the lowest calculation to £100 and at the highest to £224, and the rent amounting at the lowest to £8 and at the highest to £14,—was really a very respectable fortune. In these days, and that even after taking into account the difference in values so greatly in favor of three centuries ago, such an income would be considered but a beggarly one for the most unskilful boot-black. Only fifty years ago, when Coleridge refused a half-share in *The Morning Post & Courier*, with the emphatic declaration, that he would not give up his country life with the lazy reading of old folios for two thousand times the income it offered; he added, "In short, beyond £350 a year I regard money as a real evil." Yet this would barely meet the wants of some first-class mechanics of the present day. Manifold causes have been at work in producing an almost fabulous increase in the wealth of the Protestant nations in the present quarter-century. One of these is found in the fact that fire furnishes the nervous power, and iron and steel the muscles, of our modern civilization. The industrial arts have thus been revolutionized. In Great Britain alone the working power of the machinery already employed five years ago was estimated to be equiv-

alent to 400,000,000 men,* or to twice that of the adult working population of the globe. In the United States the working power created in the same manner cannot be much, if any, less. This increase of productive power is the source of an immense revenue. Another cause may be found in the commerce which has increased so immensely in consequence of this enlarged productive power, and which has made the world largely tributary to the leading Protestant nationalities. A third cause is to be found in those striking providences which seem to indicate the purpose of God to give the world to Protestant Christendom; among which may be enumerated those which in a century have increased the subjects of the British empire from 13,000,000 to 200,000,000, raised Prussia from the position of an insignificant state to a first place on the map of Europe, and established on these western shores our great republic with its 40,000,000 of free people, mostly Christian and Protestant; and those which have given into the hands of the leading Protestant nations the great gold fields of the world, California and Australia, which had been kept concealed from all men until God's chosen instruments for his work had been prepared and his time for its accomplishment had fully come. The increase of wealth resulting from these and other causes has almost outrun accurate statistics, and even imagination. So far as we have been able to ascertain by somewhat careful inquiry, an income of half a million dollars is more common on this side of the ocean now than was an income of fifty thousand thirty years ago. Three centuries ago, the ransom of the Inca, Atahuallpa, paid to that Spanish robber and butcher, Pizarro, turned the brain of all Europe by its magnitude; yet it was less than the annual income which has been returned to the revenue officers by some of our merchant princes of New York as the reward of legitimate business. The increase of national wealth in the aggregate has kept pace with that of individual wealth. The sum of values in the nation in 1850 was $7,000,000,000; in 1860, $16,000,000,000; at the present time, according to the estimate of Special Commissioner

* See *Tithes and Offerings*, page 345. The figures are taken by Mr. B. from *The Benefactor*, the organ of the British Systematic Beneficence Society.

Wells,* $23,000,000,000, and, according to that of Judge Kelly, member of Congress from Pennsylvania, $43,000,000,000. The increase in twenty years, during five of which there was expended in civil war at least $10,000,000,000, has therefore been somewhere from three to six fold. The gross product of the industry of the country for 1869, which may represent its gross annual income, apart from the annual increase of aggregate values just referred to, Mr. Wells estimates at $6,825,000,000. He proceeds, however, at once to show that this "is an under rather than an over estimate;" and in doing this gives data drawn from the wages of the lowest of the working classes, which indicate that $8,000,000,000 would be a very moderate estimate. These statistics show that the product of the industry of the nation last year equalled or surpassed the entire value of all its property nineteen years before. A like marvellous increase has taken place in the wealth of Great Britain, as might readily be shown by statistics.

Now, after making all proper deductions from these figures on account of the greater plenty and diminished value of gold, the great depreciation of our currency below the gold standard (the whole reducing a dollar to about half its former value), and not overlooking the doubling of our population meanwhile, nor the increasing tendency of surplus wealth to become concentrated in immense masses and in few hands, the question arises with overwhelming force, Why has God so flooded the Protestant nations with wealth, and done it in these same twenty-five years in which he has been making openings for the Gospel into all nations and bringing Protestant Christendom to stand foremost at all these openings? It cannot be claimed with a shadow of justice or even a show of plausibility that this vastly enlarged income is required for increased expenses of living. Nor can it be claimed with any greater show of justice that either the Scriptures or human experience warrants the hoarding up of these vast sums in private coffers. Mr. Lewis Tappan, well known once as a Christian merchant, and later as secretary of one of the benevolent societies of the

* For the estimates of Mr. Wells, see *Reports of the Special Commissioner of the Revenue*, for 1868 and 1869.

country, in his little tract, "Is it Right to be Rich?"* gives a forcible exhibition of the teachings of the Scriptures on this subject, in connection with many striking corroborative facts, drawn from his extended observation and experience. We commend the tract to every reader, not, of course, indorsing all its statements. Yet how dangerous this unscriptural hoarding of millions is to the possessors of great wealth and to their families any one may learn by observation. In short, nothing can be clearer than that the Head of the church has not placed this vast wealth, just at this juncture, in the hands of Christians as his stewards, for the purpose of allowing them to indulge in enervating luxuries without stint, or for the purpose of giving them opportunity to pamper their families through their millions of stored and rusting treasure. If there is any meaning in this wondrous chain of providences, taken together and in connection with the truths of God's absolute ownership of every thing and the Christian's stewardship, that meaning must be *this*, that *Christ does not purpose that the thousands of millions of the race for whom his blood has been shed shall perish without the Gospel*, and that, moreover, he has rolled upon the church of this very time the responsibility of furnishing *the entire pecuniary means* requisite for the work in its completeness at home and abroad, the world over. He who has the authority given him by the Father to call for the gold at any time, calls *now*. Can the church, and especially its opulent members, give a *valid reason* for not furnishing the Lord's treasury with all that is needed *now?*

The Word of God and the signs of the times manifestly discountenance the so-prevalent mission creed of the church, that the world's conversion is a work belonging to the indefinite future. The Word shows us that even the law laid down for the Jew, if enforced upon Christians, would call forth from the burglar-proof and benevolence-proof safes all the needed treasures for carrying out the Great Commission now; making it thereby doubly clear that with the application of the higher law and motives of the new dispensation there could be no lack of means for the immediate completion of the work for the

* *Is it Right to be Rich?* By Lewis Tappan. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1869.

world. The Signs of the Times leave no open question as to present duty; since they make the present call of Christ as clear as the facts of the existence of a lost world and of the church as his agent to bear to it the Gospel. Now what have Christians to offer as against this Divine claim? Absolutely nothing but the insane rage for *laying up treasure upon earth*, upon which Christ set the mark of reprobation in laying down the very constitution of his kingdom! For, what is this remorseless devotion of body and soul and life to money-getting and money-hoarding, whether in the church or out of it, but that *worship of Mammon* which Christ taught his disciples could not coexist with the service of God? No such plea will stand the test of the judgment. Taking the whole Protestant Church; or simply that portion limited by the English-speaking peoples; or even coming down to the church of the United States, we believe there is the requisite treasure in her possession to-day for carrying forward the great work to its completion. Salvation is ready, the world is ready, Christ is calling, and only the church waits; and waits without a shadow of justification for such a course before God or man!

2. Assuming as proved the authority of the Head of the church, and the fact of his present great demand upon his people, *the duty of the church in enforcing his call upon those in her communion* next requires our consideration.

Christ has the authority and makes the demand; it belongs to his church to interpret the Divine word and providence, and in her teachers and authorities to press his claims upon her communion. The problem, when all the elements, divine and human, spiritual and material, are taken into account, becomes as truly one of *supply and demand*, as any of those furnished by our earthly political economy. In other words, the supply of pecuniary means must, under God, depend upon the quantity and quality of the enforcement by the proper agent of present duty, as shown by the present Divine demand; so that any defect in the enforcement will not fail to result in a corresponding deficiency in the supply.

The church of this day is making her presentation of God's claims upon those in her communion. If the results thus far reached in this discussion are in accordance with truth and

fact, it must be affirmed of her presentation that it is utterly inadequate. We must go still farther and affirm it fundamentally wrong *in not starting out with God's full claim.* The action of the General Assembly for 1869, found on pages 931–3 of the Minutes, illustrates this point. It confesses to the too patent fact of the failure of past plans, and the imperative necessity laid upon it "to arouse the whole church to a higher standard of Christian liberality, and to put in force some method by which liberal gifts shall be made to flow in from every part of the field;" but, nevertheless, it has no whisper of any indication of a Divine call for more than a *moderate advance* in the supply of pecuniary means for the cause of Christ; in fine, it scarcely ventures to hope for the increase demanded to maintain the present position of the work of the Boards. The *method* devised by the Assembly's committee (in accordance with the expressed need in the Minutes), for making the liberality at once more free and more general, involved the apportionment of the sum estimated to be required for all the work of the Boards of the church for the current year among the various Synods, and, through these and the Presbyteries, among the churches. The whole sum apportioned, as expected to be raised, to the rich Synod of New York, with its 168 churches, its 23,000 communicants, and its untold millions of wealth, is $196,082. Is any thing more needed to show how far short the church comes of making God's full demand upon those in her communion, than the fact that this is the presentation of the Divine claim for the world's needs made by that branch of the church which in its liberality *falls behind no other branch*—which, in fact, may be shown by statistics of unquestioned fairness to be *the leader* in the generosity of its contributions for the foreign work?

What, then, is the response of the current year to this utterly inadequate presentation of God's demand for a lost world? What as compared with that of the past year? Once more by a single branch of the church may be illustrated the condition of the whole. From two appeals sent out to the membership through the religious journals, and coming from the two principal Boards, may be learned something of the present financial condition of what was the Old School branch

of the Presbyterian Church. The first appeal is from *the Board of Foreign Missions*, and comes from the pen of the worthy treasurer, Mr. Rankin. It runs thus:—

"February 1, 1870—Total receipts from May 1.....$142,556
" 1869— " " " " 153,401

Less receipts this year..... $10,845

February 1, 1870—*Cash* payments to date (9 months).....$231,210
" 1869— " " " " 229,096

Increased payments this year..... $2,114

Which would have been $9,000 larger if the average premium for gold had remained as during the preceding year.

The total receipts from churches, Sabbath-schools, legacies, and 'miscellaneous' for the year ending April 30, 1869, were.....$300,492
Deducting nine months' receipts as above, to February 1, 1870..... 142,556

Leaves.....$157,936

required to make the receipts of this year equal to those of the last.

"It is not likely that this amount will be realized between this and the 1st of May. But the nearer it is approached, the less will be the legacy of debt transmitted by the existing Board of Foreign Missions to its successor.

"MISSION HOUSE, NEW YORK, *Feb.* 7, 1870."

The other bears date January 6, 1870, and is signed by Dr. Musgrave, Secretary of the *Board of Domestic Missions*. We extract the following paragraphs:—

"The receipts during the first ten months of the present fiscal year, viz.,—from March 1, 1869, to January 1, 1870,—as compared with the corresponding period of the preceding year, were *less by twenty-eight thousand four hundred and thirty-five dollars and thirty-four cents!*

"This is not all. Encouraged by the action of the General Assembly, Synods, and Presbyteries, and the assurance of many pastors that the churches would contribute more liberally than heretofore, the Board enlarged its operations and increased its liabilities. During the present year the appropriations to the first of January *exceeded* those of the corresponding period of the year preceding *twenty-three thousand and eighty-four dollars.* This increase in the liabilities of the Board, and diminution in its receipts, make an *adverse* difference in the present financial condition of the Board of *fifty-one thousand five hundred and nineteen dollars and thirty-four cents!*"

Let each judge of the prospects for himself. Altogether the worst feature in the case is *the universality of this state of things.* It is a fact that the supply of means is as deficient in measure as the enforcement of the demands of Christ is in-

adequate. Each year calls for a louder cry over impending bankruptcy, in order to the annual extrication from financial difficulties.

Before taking leave of a theme of such profound practical importance, we pause to enumerate a few of *the requisites to any right and adequate enforcement* of the present pecuniary demand of God's cause, without due regard to which the supply can never, with reason, be expected to approximate to that demand.

The first and fundamental requisite to the full enforcement of the Divine claim is a more complete, general, constant, and forcible exhibition of the scriptural doctrine of *the stewardship of the church under Christ, the absolute owner of all things.* In the full and correct conception and reception of this truth is laid that solid foundation of principle in its application to the use of property, without which there may indeed be impulsive, spasmodic distribution, but never the intelligent, systematic, liberal, dutiful *Christian giving* which the word of God evidently contemplates. Having to do in this day with such grand and awful issues, the lesson of Christian beneficence deserves a place next to those first words in the home which bear to the tender conscience and the retentive memory of the little ones of the household the dawning knowledge of salvation by the crucified Jesus; claims a place only second to that of the way of life in the more elaborate unfoldings of the Scriptures, doctrinal and practical, in the Sabbath-school and Bible class; and in the exhibitions of truth and duty from the pulpit demands for itself a place no less important than that which God has given to love to our neighbor in the Decalogue. The obligation to respond in full to every call of the Head of the church must somehow be made plain beyond possible misunderstanding, and that speedily. It must be acknowledged that there are times when the professed people of God have need of the sweet and encouraging words of warning to the angel of the church at Philadelphia, but the present is rather a time when many of them need to have thundered in their ears the awful message to the angel of the church at Laodicea. Giving to God's cause has long enough been regarded as something Christians

might neglect or not according to inclination; God's right and his claim ought now to be enforced, and enforced with increasing point and power till the truth shall become a fire in every covetous man's bones. Said Christ when upon earth, "*How hardly* shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of heaven." There is to-day a large and increasing class who need something more than honeyed or even plain words if they are ever to be reached by the truth and saved from their idolatry. There died recently in New York city, according to one of our prominent religious journals, a man who had amassed a fortune of $11,000,000. He was a church member in excellent standing, but died the awful death of an Altamont, reproaching his minister who was present, not only with having failed to warn him against his sin of covetousness, but even with having encouraged him in it. We hope there is some mistake about this,—but it is high time that such men, who hold GOD'S MONEY, should, for their own good as well as for the good of the world, be made to understand that fact and the infinite peril of practically denying it, if there is any language that can make them understand it and impress upon them their peril. In short, we cannot but feel that the church is called upon to bring to bear without delay her united wisdom, under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, upon the solution of the pressing problems as to method and means furnished by the necessity for the widest, most complete, and most forcible presentation possible of the true relation of the Christian and his property to Christ the Lord of all.

The second requisite to the full enforcement of God's claim, is *that the church be aroused to an adequate sense of her duty to the world.* After the inward principle of beneficence must come the outward call for its exercise in deeds of practical Christian giving. The divine agency for such awakening of the people of God is to be found, according to our Presbyterian theory, *in the ministry*, to whom the great commission was pre-eminently addressed, and *in the entire ministry.* The infinite importance of the work of giving the Gospel to all the lost world, the imperative divine demand to fill the treasury for this purpose without delay, the awful responsibility of having the conduct of all the Christian stewardship and the sal-

vation of a thousand million souls resting, under God, upon their interpretation and enforcement of the Divine word and ways, must first be impressed upon that ministry, and so impressed that, with the weeping prophet, they shall be ready to exclaim, in view of the message intrusted to them, "His word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." Our reading is a mistaken one, if the signs of the times do not demand that *all the ministry*, under most solemn sense of this absolutely overwhelming weight of responsibility, should give *a very large proportion of their time* to the work of making clear to the people who hold Christ's treasures, this *present pressing call from God* for the immediate evangelization of the world at home and abroad. By aid of maps of the world the abodes of these dying myriads must be made as familiar to every churchgoer as is the dining-room or the dormitory in his home; by help of missionaries, and all accessary agencies for communicating mission intelligence, the Sabbath pulpit must make every adherent of a pure Christianity as familiar with the progress of the work at home and abroad, and the present needs of the Lord's treasury, as he is with the prospects and requirements of his own daily business; and by every consideration of humanity and religion to be brought from God's word and his world, and that can rouse the intellect, the conscience, the heart, the imagination of man, the whole soul of every Christian must be so roused that there shall be no possibility, either in the perplexing and absorbing anxieties of business or in the luxurious ease of the fashionable home, of getting for an instant beyond the reach of the awful wail of that thousand millions of souls perpetually hanging over the bottomless pit!

A third requisite to the enforcement of the full Divine claim, and the last we mention, is that *appropriate channels be furnished for regular and frequent response to the call of God's word and providence.* The order is, first the principle fixed in the heart, next the call for its exercise made imperative, and then the opportunity furnished at the right moment and in the right way for its proper exercise. Here is found the place for all the machinery of systematic Christian giving.

We are of those who believe that the only true basis for any

scriptural and permanently effective scheme, is to be laid in the recognition of the truth that Christian giving is the worship rendered to God of our substance, and therefore must be an essential part of a complete Sabbath worship. In accordance with this view, the Directory for Worship, ch. vi., provides for a "collection for the poor, and other purposes of the church," with every Sabbath service; the General Assembly, in the report of its first "Committee on Systematic Benevolence," in 1855, declares that "giving, in the Scriptures, is put upon substantially the same basis as prayer—the one is the sacrifice of the lips, and the other of the substance;" the Scriptures associate κοινωνία as the "communication of benefits, beneficence, liberality," with teaching, prayers, and the eucharist, as making up with them the complete Christian worship of apostolic times; and the *collection* was uniformly a part of the religious worship in the primitive church. The wisdom of such an alliance between our Christian giving and our regular Sabbath service with its prayer and praise, may be seen from the fact that, while the prayer and praise are needed to cultivate one set of graces—reverence for God, joy in God and his salvation, dependence upon God, in short, all forms of regard for his infinite worthiness,—the offering of our substance as God has prospered us is just as much needed to cultivate another set of graces—the sense of stewardship and accountability, love for the needy and perishing, readiness to *communicate*. System implies regularity; and here we have the *divinely ordained regularity* which is essential to that true *system of beneficence* after which the Christian heart of this age is reaching out.

It is in connection with this as the basis, that the need arises for plans; in order that none of the interests of the vast field of effort may be overlooked, while to each is consigned its due relative place. From among the almost innumerable working plans offered in this season of planning, we single out that embodied in the "Report of the Committee on Systematic Beneficence" of the Presbytery of North River, as on the whole the most comprehensive of any we have examined, and the best adapted to the necessities of the Presbyterian Church at large. The arrangement for contributions is as follows:—

"First Sabbath in each month—Foreign Missions.

"Second Sabbath—Domestic Missions, with its affiliated Boards, Church Extension, and the Committee on Freedmen: the distribution to be made by the donor, or, if not so done, by the church session according to some rule announced beforehand.

"Third Sabbath—The other Boards of our church, viz.: Education, Board of Publication, and Disabled Ministers' Fund. Distribution as before.

"Fourth Sabbath—Presbyterial Mission work, *i. e.*, the supplementing of salaries of feeble churches within our bounds, or direct mission work under the care of Presbytery.

"Fifth Sabbaths—Whenever they occur, to the Bible or other societies, or to any special fund required by the church.

"For Sabbath School collections the same general order might be preserved, with such modifications as would adapt it to the interest and capacities of children."

It commends itself as being scriptural, simple, and flexible; while calling upon all who frequent the house of God to worship him in their property, furnishing constant occasion to the ministry for pressing upon Christian stewards their obligation, urging upon them the call of Providence for the world, and giving abundant opportunity for training both young and old into the habit of giving from principle. But while putting forward this plan as meeting our views more nearly than any other we have examined, it is freely admitted that changes in circumstances call for various and, in some cases, perhaps, constantly varying plans, embracing even a wider range than that indicated by the excellent Digest sent out to the churches by the last General Assembly's Committee.

It was said, at the opening page of this essay, that the church of God is slowly being aroused to see the necessity of taking a great step forward in this all-important matter of Christian giving. If her complete awakening is to be hastened, as God in his providence indicates that it should be, the three requirements just indicated must be met, and fully met, by the divinely-appointed leaders in Zion. We must have a clearer, stronger presentation of God's truth,—a more vivid and forcible exhibition of the lost world's needs, and better, more wisely-adapted, and more scriptural plans for replenishing the treasuries of the Lord from the enlarging liberality of Christian hearts,—and we must have these in all

the congregations. Without these it is vain to expect the actual standard of liberality among Christians to approximate to that true and divine standard to which Christ is at this day summoning Protestant Christendom to advance.

Art. VII.—*Brief Suggestions on Presbyterian Reconstruction and Unification.*

Most of the matters connected with the practical completion of the re-union of the two great branches of the Presbyterian Church were so arranged in the "concurrent resolutions," that they will probably work themselves through to a satisfactory solution, in accordance therewith, without serious friction. So far as now appears, the "imperfectly organized churches" will become perfectly organized in five years at the longest. The Missionary Boards of both bodies will become consolidated. Corporate rights, records, etc., are to be adjusted and combined. We presume this will be done in a manner acceptable to all parties. Three subjects only just now appear to require the light of further discussion, in order to reach safe practical conclusions:—

1. *The Basis and Ratio of Representation in the General Assembly.*

The committee having this subject in charge have rightly judged that the present ratio of representation should be greatly reduced. This is a matter of overbearing necessity. The present Assemblies are each too large for the convenient dispatch of business and the hospitality of any but the largest cities. United, they would tend to become a huge crowd, rather than a grave, well-organized, deliberative assembly. About this there can be no doubt. The only question is as to the best method of reducing the ratio of representation, in order sufficiently to reduce the number of the body. The Reconstruction Committee have recommended the substitution of synodical for presbyterial representation. This has much to recommend

it. It will surely accomplish the object. It is making constituencies of existing ecclesiastical bodies or church-courts known to our system, instead of erecting new districts for the purpose. On the other hand, it is open to very grave objections.

The Synods generally meet but once a year. They cover large districts of country. Their members, to a great extent, are little known to each other. The candidates to be voted for will mostly be strangers to those who vote for them. On account of the distance and expense of travel, they are often attended by minorities only of their members. These circumstances furnish capital opportunities for men of a little activity and forwardness to electioneer, and plan, and get their favorite candidates ahead of others who would more fairly represent the mind of the Synod; and would be its choice if there were a fair opportunity to exercise such choice. We regard this as a very formidable objection. It becomes serious just in proportion to the numbers and geographical extent of the Synod, both which conditions are unfavorable to a full attendance, and to any effectual counteraction of the movements of cliques and ecclesiastical aspirants and politicians.

Again, all the habits of our people, the whole historical life and development of our church, are in the line of presbyterial representation. They feel that in this way they know who they are voting for, and cannot often be outgeneraled by petty cliques or aspirants. Ordinarily, the active and effective ecclesiastical supervision of our churches; the knowledge of their ministers, officers, members; and of the interests and wants of our congregations, is through our Presbyteries. These bodies will be reluctant to part with a prerogative to which they have always been accustomed, which invests them with much of their importance, and which they think more safely lodged with themselves than with Synods. The question then arises, is there no way of effecting the reduction of representation which all admit to be necessary, and still retaining it in the hands of the Presbyteries?

We throw out the following plans for consideration; recognizing it as quite likely that thorough discussion may show unforeseen difficulties to be involved in them:—

Let every Presbytery numbering twenty-four ministers or less, be entitled to send one, and but one, commissioner, either elder or minister, as it may see cause. Let every Presbytery numbering over twenty-four and not more than forty-eight, be entitled to two commissioners, of whom one must be a minister and the other an elder; when over forty-eight and not over seventy-two, let it have three delegates, of whom one at least must be an elder and one a minister; when over ninety-six, four delegates, one-half ministers and one-half elders. This allows one delegate for every twenty-four ministers and every fraction of that number. By thus doubling the unit of constituency, the number of commissioners will be reduced considerably more than one-half. This will be effected by the union of many of the smaller Presbyteries of the two branches on the same territory. We think exact figuring would show that the Assembly thus constituted, would not, after the re-union, much outnumber three-fourths of our last Assembly. However this may be, it will be easy to bring it to the exact size desired by adjusting the unit of constituency to it, making it—instead of twenty-four—twenty, thirty, thirty-five, or forty, and their respective fractions, as may be deemed best.

Special provisos might be made, if deemed desirable, to guard against any undue preponderance of clerical or lay representation in the Presbyteries entitled to delegates in odd numbers. It might be ordered that the odd commissioner should be alternately minister and elder, or that, whether minister or elder, he should have the major vote of the elders separately, and the ministry separately. Doubtless other devices and arrangements might be made to meet all reasonable objections.

The great objection to this is that it would aggravate our present inequality of representation—giving to twenty-three ministers who together constitute five Presbyteries five times as many representatives as twenty-four ministers composing one Presbytery.

To obviate this and other difficulties we look with favor upon the following plan which has been laid before us: Assuming that the ministers in the united body number not far from 4,000, let the church be divided into districts comprising

single or conterminous Presbyteries, which districts shall be so adjusted, as to contain as nearly as possible, fifty ministers each, or multiples of fifty. For every such fifty ministers (or as near fifty as practicable) let two commissioners to the Assembly, one a minister, the other an elder, be allowed. Let each Presbytery be required to nominate at least one minister and one elder for commissioners to the next Assembly, and more in proportion to its numbers, at its first stated meeting after the adjournment of the previous Assembly, said nominees to be from any Presbytery or Presbyteries within the district, as may be preferred. Let the election from these nominees take place at the first stated meetings of the Presbyteries concerned, after the nomination, and before the meeting of the Assembly. This would give an Assembly of not far from 160 members. In size it could not be better. It would give equal and just representation to all parts of the church. It would give direct representation to the Presbyteries. It would prevent all sudden springing and rushing of elections by surprise or artifice. It would fairly represent the deliberate mind of the church. It seems to us to obviate most of the difficulties and to combine most of the advantages of the various other plans proposed.

2. *The Board of Publication.*

The concurrent resolutions declare that "The publications of the Board of Publication and of the Publication Committee should continue to be issued as at present, leaving it to the Board of Publication of the united church to revise these issues and perfect a catalogue for the united church, so as to exclude invidious references to past controversies."

How shall this purgation be effected? Who shall judge and determine what books, and what passages, contain these "invidious references"? The few books that are mainly polemical, and replete with reproaches, accusations, and innuendoes from one side against the other, might be dropped without serious trouble. Occasional books and pamphlets on either side, mainly designed to put the other in the wrong with respect to the division in 1837 may be of this character. But the difficulty respects books of another kind. They are

valuable contributions to theology, doctrinal, practical, experimental, casuistical, to the cause of our common Presbyterianism and Christianity. Yet they may contain passages here and there tinged by the controversies of the time when they were written, and which are decidedly offensive and seem "invidious" to the parties against whom they are aimed, or on whom they reflect. What shall be done with such passages? Shall they receive the *imprimatur* of the new Board of Publication, especially, if any earnestly object? But if not, who shall decide which passages ought to be weeded out, and who will undertake the work of revision and elimination? We do not envy the makers of that *Index Expurgatorius*, whoever they may be. Besides, the authors of most of these books are in their graves. Have we a right to make such alterations without the author's consent, whether he be dead or living? If not, shall their works be suppressed—and shall the church melt the stereotype plates containing so precious a portion of her literature?

It seems to us there is one and but one way out of these difficulties. That is plain and simple. Let all issues of the Board of Publication and Publication Committee respectively prior to the time of consolidation, be published afterward, as heretofore, with the imprint of the Board or Committee which originally published them. Let all subsequent issues be published with the imprint of the new Board. Then the new Board will be responsible only for what it expressly sanctions. The previous issues will simply bear the sanction of the bodies which published them. If they contain any thing objectionable to either side, they will pass for what they are worth, and will show who have been their real indorsers. The few books and tracts which, as a whole, are objurgatory and acrimonious, can be dropped entirely as respects future publication. Catalogues can be constructed accordingly, crediting to the several Boards and Committees, past and future, the works respectively issued by each.

Thus every good end will be answered, which the offensive and "invidious" work of clearing books of "invidious references to past controversies" will be avoided.

3. *Theological Seminaries.*

There is no doubt that one of the chief sources of the repugnance to re-union which remained to the last, if it does not still linger, in some parts of the church, is to be found in the attitude in which it places the theological seminaries of the respective branches of the church. The fact that it invests the branch lately New School with a full share in the legal control of the seminaries of the other branch, because these are all by their charters placed under Assembly supervision, while it leaves those of the other body entirely independent of the Assembly, and of all supervision by any portion of the late O. S. church, except such as they may please to elect into their Boards of direction, involves an inequality which has been more deeply felt than expressed, especially by some of the principal donors to the funds of Princeton and other Old School seminaries. This is so serious a matter, that the importance of some provision to meet it has been felt by right-minded men on all sides. It has found utterance in the following among the "concurrent declarations" adopted, with nearly complete unanimity, by both branches of the church.

"ART. 9. In order to a uniform system of ecclesiastical supervision, those theological seminaries that are now under Assembly control may, if their Boards of direction so elect, be transferred to the watch and care of one or more of the adjacent Synods; and the other seminaries are advised to introduce, as far as may be, into their constitutions, the principle of synodical or assembly supervision; in which case they shall be entitled to an official recognition or approbation on the part of the General Assembly."

This contemplates a "uniform system of ecclesiastical supervision" of our theological seminaries as desirable, and what we ought to seek, and it indicates the way to its attainment. In this we cordially agree. We think this unification can and ought to be accomplished. The process seems to us very simple—substantially as follows:—

Let the Assembly confide the supervision and control of the seminaries now under its control to their respective Boards of direction, as now, with simply these alterations: 1. That these Boards shall nominate persons to fill their own vacancies to the Assembly for confirmation; 2. That they shall arrange the professorships, and appoint the professors, subject to rati-

fication by the Assembly. Thus this body by its veto power, will retain control sufficiently to keep out all unsound and unsuitable persons from these important posts, while the active duty of finding suitable nominees will devolve on the body most conversant with their wants—a body far better qualified for the task, we hazard nothing in saying, than a large assembly, gathered for a few days from the "whole boundless continent," can be. We prefer this to mere synodical supervision, 1. Because a considerable portion of the funds of Princeton Seminary are vested legally in the Assembly, and might be imperilled if this should give up all supervision and control. 2. For the purpose of uniformity, the Assembly is more adequate than Synods. The Synods may happen to be larger or smaller, of greater or less weight and fitness for such a trust; more or less narrow and provincial, or broad and catholic, in their sympathies with the whole church. One Synod may be poor. Another may mass in itself much of the surplus wealth of the church, which ought to help nourish and endow all her seminaries, instead of being the *peculium* of any one. 3. It being only in case of manifest unfitness that the veto power of the church should interfere, and candidates being liable to be found in all parts of the church, the Assembly is the best body for that sort of supervision. This would suffice for unification so far as the seminaries heretofore of the Old School branch are concerned.

It seems to us that it cannot be difficult for the seminaries of the other branch to reach substantially the same platform. They, of course, can report annually to the Assemblies. Without knowing all the details of their present charters, we presume there is no insuperable obstacle to their making the simple by-law that all their elections to fill vacancies in the Board or Boards of oversight and direction, also of professors, shall be submitted to the Assembly for approval before they are finally ratified. If the charters now forbid such an arrangement, doubtless alterations could easily be obtained which would admit of it, or something equivalent.

This, of course, must rest with the managers of these seminaries themselves. They have full legal power to prevent it, if they please. We have no doubt they can substantially

accompl ish it, if they please. And they will, of course, act their own pleasure. But from their known fairness of character, the prominent part they have taken in promoting reunion upon the avowed basis of perfect equality on both sides, the vast importance of the complete unification of the church in this great department of ministerial training, second in moment to no other; its bearing on the promotion of complete mutual confidence, the suppression of jealousies and fears of undue advantage given to or taken by one side as against another, we cannot but think those who have the power and responsibility will be ready to do their utmost "in order to a uniform system of ecclesiastical supervision" of these institutions. If we have not indicated the best way, they will be quick to find and adopt a "more excellent way." Sure we are, that they will not set up any mere legal technicality as a barrier to so momentous a result. We cannot doubt their will to put all the seminaries on a substantial equality in the premises. And doubtless the result will prove, that "where there is a will there is a way," and that thus all our seminaries "shall be entitled to an official recognition or approbation on the part of the General Assembly."

Auburn Seminary is now under the supervision of several adjacent Synods, and of course falls within this class, so "entitled to official recognition or approbation." We presume that if all the other seminaries shall come upon one and the same footing, her guardians will cheerfully consider the question whether any further steps are necessary on their part "in order to a uniform system of ecclesiastical supervision."

ART. VIII.—*Recent Publications on the School Question.*

1. *History of the Public School Society of the City of New York, with Portraits of the Presidents of the Society.* By WM. OLAND BOURNE, A. M. New York: Wm. Wood & Co., 61 Walker Street.

2. *The Relation of the State to Religious Education; John D. Minor et al. versus the Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati et al.; Argument for the Defence.* By Stanley Matthews. Cincinnati: Robert Clark & Co. 1870.
3. *The School Question*, from the *Christian World* for February, 1870.
4. *Bible Gems; or, Manual of Scripture Lessons, specially designed for Public Schools, but equally adapted to Sunday Schools and Families.* By R. E. Kremer. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.

These are a portion of the contributions to the Public School controversy with which the press now teems, and which show how profoundly it agitates the public mind. The first is a heavy octavo of nearly 800 pages, compactly printed. It recites the history of the Public School Society of New York City during the whole of its beneficent career, from its first attempt to do well and thoroughly what the religious charity schools had before done partially, until its functions were assumed by the State Board of supervision. It is a volume of great value. It is, in fact, a thesaurus of the literature, the arguments, the controversies in reference to the organization, basis, and conduct of common schools in the metropolis of the country. Here, where the Romanists came first, at least in the Northern States, into a position to display their attitude and claims in respect to common schools and the public school moneys, they have shown what their precise demands, arguments, and pretensions are. This volume contains the grand arguments of the Romanists, as exhibited in their public documents, the great speeches of Bishop Hughes, the debates before the Common Council, between him and the distinguished representatives of the Public School Society. Any careful examination of it will show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, what they insist on, and what alone will satisfy them.

The second of these publications is the great argument of Judge Matthews, a leading Ohio lawyer, and Presbyterian elder, in defence of the recent action of the School Board of Education of Cincinnati, prohibiting the reading of the Bible in public schools. It, in substance, maintains that the Protestant version of the Bible is a "sectarian book," and thus far agrees

with Bishop Hughes and the Romanists, as well as indifferentists, sceptics, and non-religionists generally, including some Protestant Christians, who, like the judge himself, are coming to the same ground. We are very far from agreeing with him in some of his main positions. But his argument is exceedingly able, adroit, and learned. What he has left unsaid on that side is hardly worth saying.

The third is a pamphlet reprint of an article in the February number of the *Christian World*, showing, by a copious collection and comparison of the declarations (mostly recent) of Romanists, different classes of Protestants, and various secular journals and persons, the grounds now taken by the chief parties involved, with regard to the preservation of our common schools, and the moral and religious teaching to be maintained in them. It is quite timely and helpful to those seeking light on the question.

The fourth is a little manual prepared by an experienced and successful teacher, for the purpose of aiding the giving of really biblical and really unsectarian instruction in the public as well as other schools, and in families. It is in the form of question and answer. It gives only unquestioned statements and facts of Scripture. It collides with no denomination or denominational scruples, but presents only what is gladly accepted by all denominations. It has already received warm encomiums from leading clergymen of several principal Christian bodies. It has also received the cordial approval of the heads of the public school department of Pennsylvania. If the school controversy could be settled by the introduction of such a manual as this for study in our common schools, we should rejoice in the consummation.

We have been looking into this contest over common schools, and the Bible in schools, which has been looming up so largely of late, and find ourselves surcharged with interest enough to write, off-hand, scores of pages, instead of the few left at our command. We are persuaded that the parties are forming and marshalling for a contest on this subject, which for depth and earnestness has seldom been paralleled in the history of the nation.

The Romanists insist on the appropriation of the public

moneys to support the Romish schools in which their religion is taught, and in proportion to the number of children so taught. They utterly scout the public schools, and withdraw their children from them wherever they are strong enough to set up their own, no matter what these schools may do to satisfy them. If the schools teach the elements of morality and religion, even by reading the Douay Bible, without note or comment, they stigmatize it as unsafe and hurtful to their children. If no Bible is read, no religion taught, no prayers offered, they denounce these schools as giving a Christless and godless education. They ask nothing, and will accept nothing less than the appropriation of the public money to support their own church schools. This appears from all their outgivings on the subject, by their priests, prelates, and periodical organs. This we are satisfied the American people will not grant for two principal reasons:—

1. They are unwilling, on conscientious grounds, to be taxed to pay for teaching children the Romish religion, with its known contempt and hatred of all other systems of faith and bodies of Christians. While willing to tolerate them in such teaching at their own expense, the mass of Protestants are not willing to pay for it.

2. To concede this demand, in the present circumstances of the nation, is to break up the whole system of common schools. For if it is allowed to the Romanists, it cannot be withheld from Christians of other denominations, from Jews and people of other religions and irreligious persuasions. This at once substitutes sectarian schools, supported by the State, for common schools. But, unless in large cities and towns, such schools are impracticable in this country, because too few of any one denomination live near together to sustain a school, much less a good one. The result would be smaller and inferior schools, or no schools, with no provision for the children of that large outlying population not connected with any church. For the education of this class our people will insist on keeping up common schools; not only so, but the magnitude, the unity, the system, the classification attainable in our public schools, give them an incomparable advantage over any possible system of denominational schools in this country. Were our

people compactly settled, and homogeneous in their religion, as in Scotland, or formerly in some New England States, the case would be altered. But as the concrete case is, and whatever be the abstract merits of the question, our people, except the comparatively late importation of Romanists, are unalterably opposed to the abandonment of their common schools. Here and there some may set up their own church schools, and for the best of reasons. But they will not appropriate the public money to them, or often ask it, or for a moment abandon their common-school system.

Assuming, then, that common schools must and will be maintained, having the support of all classes of our population but Romanists, the only remaining question is, how far morals and religion shall be taught and have place in them? Particularly, shall the Bible, or any portion of it, in any version, be read there? May the Lord's Prayer, or any prayer, be publicly offered? Shall those Christian truths that are accepted alike by Protestant and Romish churches as undisputed, be allowed to be taught? Or shall the word of God, and all religious exercises of every kind, be banished from these great training schools for our American youth? To this question, which is beginning to stir the American mind as nothing else has since the bombardment of Sumter, various answers are given. Infidels, sceptics, and indifferentists, for the most part, of course say, Out with every vestige of religion and Christianity. It infringes the rights of conscience. The state discriminates against certain views of religion, or patronizes some religious opinions at the expense of others. It is, in short, church and state, contrary to the fundamental principles of our republican institutions, which forbid all patronage of any religious opinions or dogmas by the state. The Romanists join hands with them here, because they maintain that every form of religious teaching not Romish, including the reading of their own version of the Scriptures without comment, is sectarian, heretical, and pernicious.

A considerable class of Protestants, including some ministers and laymen of eminence, favor or consent to the removal of the Bible, and all religious exercises and teaching, from the common schools on some or all of the following grounds:—

First.—That the state has nothing to do with religious education; that its only and proper sphere is to give a secular education to qualify its citizens for the ordinary duties of life. If we let the state teach religion, we must take such as it sees fit to give us.

Secondly.—That the Bible, or at least the Protestant version of it, is a sectarian book, and that the reading of it in the public schools infringes upon the rights of the Roman Catholics who contribute, through the taxes they pay, to the support of these schools.

Thirdly.—That our government is based upon the principle of universal freedom, and that by insisting upon having the Bible read in our schools we violate the consciences of the Roman Catholic population, who are, with all others, entitled to the benefits of this freedom.

Fourthly.—That the reading of the Bible, as now practised in the schools, is a mere perfunctory service, of too little effect and value to justify its maintenance in the face of the existing peril to the school system.

These are the great points in Judge Matthews' argument. Others still fear that unless the sceptical and irreligious part of community be conciliated, by withdrawing the Bible and all religion from common schools, they will conspire with the Romanists for their overthrow. Thus their very existence will be endangered. The Romanists will carry their point. We shall be thrown back upon merely denominational schools, weak and inadequate as they will be without aid from the public treasury. Vast masses of our children will be wholly uneducated and unfitted for their duties as citizens. Most of the residue will be poorly educated. They will grow up in isolation from each other, with blind and intense sectarian antipathies, such as would melt away if they were educated together in the public schools, where they would grow up with that sense of unity and brotherhood which would fit them for a common citizenship of our great republic. For these reasons, although they would deplore the withdrawal of the Bible and religion from common schools, they would think it a less evil than to lose them, or to drive the Roman Catholic or Jewish children from them. We confess that this reasoning is plausi-

ble, and impressed us sufficiently to lead us to re-examine the whole subject. As the result of this investigation, we have been led ourselves, and we believe, that the Christian, or, at all events, the Protestant mind of the country, is working its way, with more or less clearness and decision, to the following positions:—

1. That our government is bound to protect all in the free and full enjoyment of their religious principles, until this conflicts with the just and equal rights of others, or with the peace and order of society. But while it is, to this extent, equally bound to protect all sects and persuasions, it is no less bound not to espouse or support any of them with positive pecuniary or other special privileges.

2. This principle, however, ought not to be carried so far that the state will ignore or disown the moral and religious nature of its subjects, or its supreme importance, or its own subjection to moral law, and its obligation to and dependence upon the Supreme Ruler and Sovereign Lord of all. This were to sink its subjects into mere animals, and itself into a mere unprincipled, immoral, atheistic, or materialistic organization. Nor can a government, the great majority of whose people are Christians, ignore their sacred convictions, or that the morality which governs them is a Christian morality. There are issues and occasions in states in which not to be moral is to be immoral; not to be religious is to be irreligious; not to be Christian is to be anti-Christian; not to be for Christ is to be against him. Not to be governed by the fundamental principles of Christian morality, or to honor the Sabbath because some have scruples to the contrary, is to violate the conscientious convictions of nineteen out of every twenty of the people in order to please the twentieth part of them.

3. The whole history of our nation, in all its governmental procedures, State and National, confirms this view. It is proved to be the true meaning of their fundamental constitutions, as understood by their framers, by the whole course of concurrent legislative and judicial action, and by all public practice under them from the first. We are quite in sympathy with our friends who desire, and have organized to promote, the express recognition in our national constitution, of

some belief in God and Christianity. But we do not admit for one moment that, because not expressly mentioned, it is not in effect and substance the supreme element of the national life, lying deeper than constitutions, and conditioning their practical interpretation and working, through Congress, legislatures, courts, and public institutions. All our governments, State and National, recognize the Christian's God in the oath, in stopping and outlawing business on the Lord's day, opening their sessions with prayer, in their annual calls upon the people for thanksgiving, and their frequent proclamations inviting the people to public prayer and fasting. Not only so, but by furnishing chaplains for the army and navy, for military and naval schools, our government has shown its conviction that men cannot be fitly educated for high responsibilities and commands, without duly educating their moral and religious nature; also that it will not subject the Christian people of the land to the cruel necessity of shutting out their sons from these spheres of occupation and preferment. The same is true of State governments. Almost without exception, they enact Sunday laws, require oaths, supply Christian chaplains to their prisons, their reform schools, and institutions for deaf, dumb, and blind. They dare not bring these children of their care down to the standards of atheism, or refuse to provide for the due training of their immortal nature. It is past all doubt, therefore, that the unsectarian character of our civil constitutions does not mean atheism or infidelity, or the disowning of our common Christianity.

4. The State provides common-school education for all her children whose parents will permit them to accept it, in order to make them good citizens. This end cannot be accomplished unless they become upright and virtuous. Such only can preserve a democratic government from corruption and ruin. But all sound morality must have its roots in religion, and the only religion which the mass of our American States know, or can know, is the religion of the Bible. The very object which the State aims at, therefore, in its common schools is defeated by the extrusion of religion and Christianity. Is it said that religion can be taught in the family, in the church, and the Sabbath-school? But how does this reach the case of

the vast number whose parents are indisposed or incompetent to give them moral and religious teaching, and who are not reached by other agencies? And however well-taught at home, how is it to keep the tender and sensitive minds of children closed against all religious or moral ideas in their reading, their study of history and geography, without leaving them profoundly ignorant of what is most essential in these studies,—what exhibits man in all that most exalts him above the brute, the phenomena of his moral and religious nature. Further still, the intellectual is so implicated with the emotive, the moral, and religious nature, that the development of the former is dependent on the latter; to starve the one is to dwarf the other. It is religious and moral truths, ideas of the infinite and perfect, God and eternity, that most quicken, expand, and sublime the human, and especially the youthful, intellect. Education, therefore, divorced from morality and religion, becomes shrunken, distorted, and monstrous.

5. Still, this teaching must be unsectarian. Is it not so, in every fair sense, if the Bible, or selections from the Bible, are read without note or comment, and in such translation thereof, as the parent may signify, that he prefers? May it not speak its own meaning and leave its own impression without injustice to the claims of any sect? This is precisely what is done in the schools of Cincinnati, the prohibition of which by the School Board of that city has been set aside by the courts, as contrary to public policy and the clause of the State constitution which, after forbidding religious tests, etc., declares, "Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction." Is not the pretence that the recognition and teaching of principles recognized by all bodies of Christians, and disputed by none, are sectarian, unreasonable and unworthy of regard? Do the Romanists who make it aim thereby to render our common schools acceptable and worthy of public favor, or do they not aim thereby to render them so utterly godless as to deprive them

of the confidence of the whole Christian community, and thus effect their ruin? We shall see.

6. But it is said, we shall thus offend and wrong the atheistic, infidel, and sceptical part of the people who are unwilling that any religious, if not even moral dogmas, shall be taught in our public schools, and that they will thus be led to join the crusade of Papists against the common schools. The answer is: 1. We must take a stand somewhere, unless we turn these schools into herds of human animals, without heart or soul, conscience or morality. Are we to have, to recognize, to presume upon no moral standards in our dealings with, in the mutual relations of, the hundreds of children often gathered in our public schools, that are contrary to the creed of Confucius, of Brigham Young, of polygamists, adulterers, idolaters, libertines, and blasphemers? The thing is simply as impossible as monstrous. We cannot live together, or permit our children to live and be educated together, on such a basis. We cannot de-humanize; therefore we cannot demoralize; therefore we cannot de-religionize; therefore we cannot de-christianize them. Not to give us any religion, or morality radicated in religious sanctions, is to give us immorality and irreligion. Here neutrality is impossible. So, these schools must observe the Christian, and not the Jewish Sabbath. We must have some standards. The attempt to please Mormons, Chinese, Jews, idolaters, atheists, and infidels, is out of the question. It would, and ought to destroy the schools. Christians could have nothing to do with them.

And this in effect settles the question of the expediency of abstracting all religious exercises, or reading of the Scriptures, from the public schools for the purpose of conciliating the sceptical part of people, and detaching them from the Romanists to re-enforce us in this contest. Our impression is, that the irreligious element is small who will join the Romanists in destroying our common schools, when once the object of the latter is understood to be their destruction. However this may be, it is unquestionable, that the project to de-religionize and de-christianize our common schools would alienate ten of our Christian people from their support, where it would gain to it one of the contrary sort. Not only so, but it would arm

the Papists with weapons of tenfold power, to compass their destruction, and deprive them of the support of multitudes of Christian people. The following, quoted in the *Christian World* from the *Western Watchman* of St. Louis, a Romish paper, shows sufficiently to what purpose the Romanists will turn any exclusion of the Bible from public schools in accommodation to their consciences :—

"The much vexed question of Bible-reading in the public schools of Cincinnati is at length settled. * * * The resolution of the Board is sweeping; and not only is the Bible excluded, but all hymns, prayers, and whatever else savors of religion. Books, too, in which Christianity is taught, must be replaced, or expurgated, and no vestige of religious truth can be allowed to disgrace the hallowed precincts of the school-room. Protestants are found for the first time in the history of our State school system, who teach that no religion, not even that weak dilution of it, which we call Puritanism, is compatible with the well being of their much extolled institution. Our school instruction must be purely materialistic. If the name of the Author of Christianity is mentioned at all, he must be spoken of as one of the men who figured prominently in history, as we would speak of Mohammed, Julius Cæsar, or Napoleon. Under no circumstances may we hint to the child that the great preacher and teacher was God. We may not even tell him that he has a soul, or that there is any code of morality outside the statutes of the city, and the records of the police courts. There must be nothing in the character or surroundings of our schools which might offend a Jew, a Mohammedan, a disciple of Confucius, or a common infidel. Our State has no religion, and our schools can have none."

The writer in the *Christian World* justly adds :—

"This logical and practical issue of the proposed withdrawal of the Bible we commend to consenting Protestants, as coming from the very men on account of whose consciences it is proposed. Coming from such a source, and in such a connection, surely the mere ideal conception of so fearful a result in the establishment of a godless State, must have a weighty argumentative force to every honest, thoughtful Christian mind."

7. The plea that the reading of the Bible in public schools is a perfunctory exercise, and that all moral and religious teaching in them must be feeble, does not answer its purpose. Prayers in colleges, high schools, the army and the navy, in Congress and in legislatures,—nay, we might even add, sometimes in our Sabbath assemblies, are not always attended with becoming reverence. They are quite too much attended in a perfunctory manner. This is to be deplored. But then, do they not constantly and publicly recognize the right, the true, the good, the divine, the infinite and eternal, and in most

cases, the Incarnation, Redemption, Salvation, Eternal Judgment? However heedlessly attended, do they not exercise a constant educating, moral, and religious power, which would be lost in their absence? So, in regard to the reading of the Bible and offering the Lord's Prayer in public schools. These exercises may be attended in a more perfunctory manner than is for edification. And yet the child that knows the first verse of the Bible, knows more than all heathen philosophers. And what is impressed upon the most careless mind by the story of the birth, life, miracles, parables, humiliation, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, is a "truth-power" in the soul infinitely greater than the highest classic or scientific culture without it. Moreover, the continuance or exclusion of the Bible and all religion in the public schools, not merely involves the more or less actual religious teaching; it has a symbolic significance. It is a proclamation to the world of the place which the Bible and Christianity have in the public mind. To withdraw them is to lower the flag of Christianity in the face of our children, and of all mankind. It declares, so far forth, the decline of its ascendency over the public mind. This is just what its foes, infidel and Papal, want, and strive for. It is what the Protestant religious mind of our country will resist.

We do not insist on any particular method of recognizing and asserting morality and Christianity in our public schools. It may vary according to circumstances. It may, where communities are sufficiently united, be more minute; in others where greater divisions exist, less so. In no case is the state to compel the attendance of any child upon religious exercises against the conscientious preference of the parent properly expressed. If parents express the wish, their children may read the Bible in the Douay version, or they may be allowed to keep their children away from the opening religious exercises; or some hour in the week may be specially set apart for the purpose, when parents may or may not send their children, or may commit them to their own chosen religious teachers if convenient, as they may judge right. But what we insist on first and last is, that the Bible, the Lord's Prayer, the recognition and assertion of fundamental moral and religious truth

shall not be *prohibited* in our public schools on any pretext whatsoever. It is unnecessary to become sponsors for the following extract from a recent defence of Christian education and the Bible in common schools, by the Rev. Dr. Bellows. But when Unitarian preachers write in this way, we think that all concerned may see evidence of the deep earnestness of the Protestant mind of the country, which is sure to be roused, but cannot be trifled with, in this great agitation. We quote it as a sign of the times, not because we adopt all its expressions:—

"We cannot concede the equal rights of Catholics with Protestants to regulate our educational system any more than we could allow monarchists to become senators and representatives. They must swear allegiance to the unmonarchal principle of the Constitution to be eligible to office. But the Catholics are denying and seeking to overthrow the political supremacy of the Protestant ideas originally imbedded in our public law. They are contending against the original recognition of the Bible—on which every President and every high officer swears his official oath of allegiance to the Constitution—to be a national book, and at the bottom of our system. And it is a weak and illogical hesitation to refuse to hold the true historic ground and to maintain the original supremacy of the Protestant idea, which is now weakening and imperilling the national fidelity to its public school system, and the national claim that the Bible is the fundamental stone in the temple of American liberty.

"If the Roman Catholics are not content with perfect toleration; if they look for the countenance and support of the American people as having an equal claim with the Protestant founders of our institutions to regulate its fundamental methods of public education, they are reckoning without their host, and will surely come to grief. They are arousing an opposition, such as American slavery in another form, aroused only after thirty years of smouldering indignation and wrath, but which finally broke out into overwhelming ruin for its insidious and fatal system. We warn our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens of what is in store for them if they continue to press their claim to break up our national system of public schools. They will sooner or later bring on a civil war, in which they and their churches will be swept, as by a whirlwind, from the land. All the liberty they can rightfully ask, they enjoy. But they ask, in another form, the liberty which Utah claims—she wishes to enjoy polygamy, and to have the right to teach it under the American flag. We deny the right; and shall extinguish it in her ruins, if she raises a finger to maintain it."

Art. IX.—NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament. By Karl Friedrich Keil. Translated from the Second Edition, with supplementary notes from Bleek and others, by George C. M. Douglass, B. A., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College, Glasgow. 1869. Vol. I., 8vo, pp. 529. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Co.

An Introduction to the Old Testament of the proper character has been greatly needed both for private use and as a manual for theological instruction. And it is surprising that the lack has been so long left unsupplied. Horne, which for a generation maintained its place as the standard, and in fact the only book in English of any value upon this subject, does not represent the present advanced state of biblical learning. The reader will turn in vain to its pages for a solution of critical inquiries with which the theological world has been ringing, or for a statement and refutation of those arguments by which the veracity and authenticity of certain parts of Scripture have been so ingeniously and pertinaciously assailed, or for an exhibition of those impregnable defences which learning and piety have constructed from the materials furnished by the most recent researches. The writings of Davidson, with his importations of foreign neology, enlarged in each successive publication, are still less satisfactory. In this dearth of native works of the right sort, Messrs. T. & T. Clark have laid the theological public under great obligations by the translation and publication of Keil's Introduction to the Old Testament, which of all those that have appeared in Germany is best suited to the wants of English readers.

With no affectation of novelty and little pretension to originality, it presents, for the most part clearly and in brief compass, the principal facts and opinions which bear upon the criticism and literary history of the Old Testament as a whole, or any of its parts. Keil is a sturdy defender of old and well-established views, though candid in stating and honest in refuting opposing arguments. This treatise moreover has the advantage of being done into English by an orthodox Scotch professor, who takes occasion to correct any unguarded expressions which might be to the prejudice of sound opinions (as on p. 435), or to enter his caveat in any case of departure from received views, as where Keil, following the lead of Hengstenberg, gives up the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes, and assigns it to the period following the exile. The second volume, which completes the work, is promised shortly, and is perhaps already through the press.

An Introduction to the New Testament. By Friedrich Bleek. Edited by Johannes Friedrich Bleek, Pastor. Translated from the German of the Second Edition by the Rev. William Urwick, M. A. 1869. Vol. I., 8vo, pp. 448. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Co.

The eminent learning and distinguished abilities of Prof. Bleek make this a work of rare value. And the more so as this was his favorite branch, to which he devoted "many years of faithful toil." According to the statement of his son, by whom this posthumous publication was edited from his father's notes, "he first lectured upon this subject from four to six hours weekly during the winter of 1822; and he revised and repeated his course of lectures four and twenty times down to the winter of 1858," in which he died. Unfortunately his views of inspiration are not of the strictest sort, so that he can speak of it as "unhistorical and irrational" to "identify God's word and Holy Scripture," though regarding it as his "main task to discern the word of God in Holy Scripture," and approaching this task with devout reverence. Accordingly he does not hesitate to admit that one Evangelist may contradict another in minor and unessential points. But he has no sympathy with the destructive criticism of Strauss or Baur, whom he earnestly opposes. He would not even go as far in his damaging concessions as Neander. He is too serious a seeker after truth to be guilty of flippant trifling with the sacred record, or to pervert it for the sake of aggravating difficulties or multiplying seeming discrepancies. But he has the German vice of preferring the subjective to the objective, and overlooking the distinction between a plausible theory and well-attested facts.

He regards the gospel of John as undoubtedly the production of the beloved Apostle, and accordingly as presenting "a true and historical account of the Lord's life, an account exactly corresponding with the course of events. When therefore, we would draw up a consecutive and chronological exposition of our Lord's history during his public ministry, we cannot hesitate to make St. John's gospel the basis of our plan, even in those points wherein there is a seeming discrepancy between it and the Synoptics, and though the Synoptics all three coincide in their narration." Mark and Luke are also admitted to have been the authors of the second and third gospels; but he decides against Matthew as the author of the first, though the testimony in his favor is equally ancient and unvarying. He says, p. 308, "It takes its stand, so to speak, a stage lower than St. John, but it still ranks side by side with St. Luke; and it still remains a trustworthy and most valuable spring from which Christian faith may draw, and by which it may be strengthened and confirmed. And though we have not the immediate testimony of an Apostle for those facts and aspects of gospel history which are taught us in the Synoptics only, we have for the most of them the concurrent yet individual testimony of three evangelists who all belonged to the apostolic age: and we must thankfully regard this as a special providence of God, while for that portion and aspect of gospel history which are presented to us in St. John, we do not need any further witness than the direct testimony of this Apostle."

But though some of Bleek's conclusions cannot be accepted, and some of the speculations in which he indulges are more than doubtful, the whole discussion is exceedingly instructive, and throws a most welcome light upon the structure, relations, and characteristics of the several gospels. The laborious research of the author, his vast stores of learning and complete mastery of his subject, coupled with good sense, penetration, and discriminating judgment, make it both profitable and delightful to prosecute these studies with such assistance. But the reader must be careful to preserve his own independence of thought, and to scrutinize results before accepting them, mindful of the apostolic maxim: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Practical Expositions of the whole books of Ruth and Esther: with three sermons on the duties of parents to their children. By George Lawson, D.D., Minister of the Associate Congregation, Selkirk, and Professor of Theology of the Associate Synod of Scotland. With a Memoir of his Life and Writings. 1870. 8vo, pp. 400. Philadelphia: William S. Rentoul.

Dr. Lawson was one of the Scotch divines of the last century, who was especially mighty in the Scriptures. It is related of him, as of John Brown, of Haddington, whom he succeeded in the chair of theology, that he could repeat the entire Bible from memory, with the exception of certain passages containing merely proper names. It is said to have been his daily habit to commit a portion of the Scriptures in the original. He also lectured through the Bible from beginning to end, in the course of his ministry. The lectures contained in this volume are plain, practical, and judicious, with no parade of learning or attempt at profundity. They are good specimens of that expository style of preaching once so familiar to the Scottish pulpit, which more than any other trains the people to an accurate acquaintance with the word of God.

A German Course, adapted to use in Colleges, High Schools, and Academies. By George F. Comfort, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages and Æsthetics in Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1870. 12mo, pp. 498. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This course consists of four parts. The first contains practical lessons for learning to read, write, and speak the German language. The second contains familiar conversations in German and English, models of letters, and forms of business, and selections from German literature. The third consists of a compend of German Grammar, preceded by a brief discussion of the history, characteristics, and dialects of the language. The fourth contains vocabularies and several valuable tables. The whole has been prepared with great care and evident skill by an accomplished scholar who has enjoyed abundant opportunities both for gaining a thorough knowledge of the language and for becoming acquainted with the best methods of teaching. We learn that it has already been adopted in several institutions, and have no doubt that it will commend itself to general favor.

Classical Study: its Value illustrated by extracts from the writings of eminent scholars. Edited, with an Introduction, by Samuel H. Taylor, LL. D. Pp. xxxv., 381, 12mo. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1870.

If there is any people on the face of the earth likely to be prejudiced against Classical Study, it is the busy, impatient American people. Nowhere else is there such a field for the busy, "practical" activities of men; nowhere else the temptation so great to strive for the quick, even if precarious, attainment of the prizes for which men struggle; nowhere else is the popular sympathy so quickly enlisted in behalf of native vigor, boldness, with a dash of unscrupulousness, and without a dash of delicacy or refinement; nowhere else have "self-made" men grasped the highest honors of social and public life. And it is our prerogative to be an original people, forsaking beaten paths, repudiating ancient or common methods, creating new types of culture, and reading and illustrating them in our own way.

If even in England and on the Continent of Europe the friends of the old "humanities" have been put on the defensive, much more must friends of the Classics here expect to encounter all manner, both of legitimate and illegitimate attack. Few men in the land are better prepared by experience and wide observation as educators, to estimate the relative value of different studies than the honored Principal at Andover. In this volume he sets before us a very valuable array of testimonies in behalf of classical culture. His own personal contribution to the volume, while occupying but little space, will be estimated by no means through a mere mechanical counting of pages. The judicious selection and effective grouping of the selections which make up the mass of the volume, is an important part of the obligation under which he lays us. These extracts from Principal Jones, Thiersch, Whewell, Mill, Joseph Payne; Professors Conington, Pillans, Sellar, Masson, Thompson, Goldwin Smith, Campbell, Edwards, Porter, and Sanborn; Presidents McCosh, Felton, and Brown; Hons. H. S. Legaré, G. B. Loring, and P. H. Sears, and W. N. Gardiner, present, with great fulness and variety and richness of illustration, the argument which justify to the friends of the old paths the "practical" wisdom of their choice. And we are glad to see signs about us that we shall still have a goodly following among the most thoughtful and discriminating of our young men. We heartily thank the editor for bringing within our reach and that of the public, so timely and valuable a discussion.

Families of Speech. By Rev. F. W. Farrar, M. A., F. R. S. London: Longman, Green & Co. 1870.

This little volume, consisting of four lectures delivered before the Royal Institution of Great Britain, gives a very compact and useful exhibition, first, of the Growth of Comparative Philology, and then of the speech of the Aryan, Semitic, and Allophyllian races. It is an attractive and useful little volume.

History of American Socialisms. By John Humphrey Noyes. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.

We have looked over this History of American Social*isms* with unusual but melancholy interest, partly arising from the nature of the subject, partly personal, because we knew the author when the first germs of the principles, whose ultimate development we find here, were forming in his mind. As fellow-students in the same theological seminary, we were in frequent contact, and had much animated discussion over the first beginning and original genesis of the ultraisms which at last flowered out into that system of sanctimonious licentiousness unblushingly avowed and defended in this volume, in the following terms:

"We affirm that there is no intrinsic difference between property in persons and property in things; and that the same spirit which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money, would abolish, if circumstances allowed full scope to it, exclusiveness with regard to women and children. Paul expressly places property in women and property in goods in the same category, and speaks of them together as ready to be abolished by the advent of the kingdom of Heaven."—P. 625.

"The abolishment of social restrictions is involved in the anti-legality of the gospel. It is incompatible with the state of perfected freedom toward which Paul's gospel of 'grace without law' leads, that man should be allowed and required to love in all directions, and yet to express that love in but one direc-

tion. In fact Paul says, with direct reference to sexual intercourse—'All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.'" This is using gospel liberty as a cloak of licentiousness, and turning the grace of God into lasciviousness.

We recollect when what the author calls "the Revival afflatus soon landed him in a new experience and new views of the way of salvation, which took the name of Perfectionism. This was in February, 1834." He was equally addicted to most of the *isms* of that period so fermenting, and so prolific of this sort of progeny. He had more than average intellectual activity and acuteness, but wanted breadth and solidity. He had a great proclivity for working and heating his mind on single points, until it was inflamed into those fanatic ultraisms which find their legitimate issue in unsettling all moral standards, and inaugurating the sway of Antinomian licentiousness. He sets up to be a teacher and guide of men. He can be such only as he is a beacon to warn them.

Nevertheless, his book has value. It is a complete account of all the social abnormities of this country which have tried to substitute some form of communism for family life, and for the constitution established by God in nature and revelation. All the "socialisms" set on foot in the land by the disciples of Owen, Fourier, the Spiritualists, Shakers, and others, are faithfully portrayed. To the student of sociology who would learn the morbid anatomy and pathology of the subject, we commend this large and beautifully printed volume.

The Pope and the Council. By Janus. Authorized translation from the German. Second edition. London: Rivingtons. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. 1869.

A very cursory survey of this volume confirms the high estimate which has been put upon it throughout Protestant, and the more liberal part of the Romish church. It is a protest from within the bosom of this church against the animus which has convoked, and the purposes of the Pope, cardinals, and prelates who essay to control, the great ecumenical council, which seems rapidly to fade into insignificance before the march of the civilization it has assembled to arrest, and with about as much effect as a dam of pasteboard to keep back a tide, or a bull infuriated to attack a locomotive.

This book is learned, logical, and powerful in its exposure of the ultramontanism which is reasserting its pretensions with such pomp and audacity. It exposes the programme of the Jesuits and the syllabus of dogmas for which they invoke the authoritative support of the present council. It especially exposes to shame the dogma of Papal infallibility, blazoning the undeniable errors, inconsistencies, and contradictions in Papal decrees, bulls, and anathemas. The dogma of Papal infallibility is sharply contrasted with the very different doctrine of such infallibility in the church, as a whole, as ever does and ever must preserve it from fatal error. It exposes the advancing mariolatry of the ultramontanes, and is altogether one of the high books of our day.

Principles of a System of Philosophy, in accordance with which it is sought to reconcile the most difficult questions of Metaphysics and Religion with themselves, and with the Sciences, and Common Sense. By Austin Bierbower, A. M. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The way in which the promise of this imposing title-page is fulfilled may be judged from the following and other like passages. "It is not certain at all that God foreknows every thing, at least with any thing more than a probable knowledge. There is no reason for believing that he should foreknow any thing except the necessary laws." We think, if the difficulties in philosophy can only be solved by denying the foreknowledge and omniscience of God, they must go unsolved. Poor as it is, however, this solution is nothing new, but threadbare and hackneyed. The author's analysis of the correlate doctrines of Providence and Predestination, moral agency and accountability, are about what this would lead us to expect.

Studies in Church History. The Rise of the Temporal Power—Benefit of Clergy—Excommunication. By Henry C. Lea. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. New York: Charles Scribner. London: Sampson Low, Son & Marston.

When the Church of Rome is so strenuously laboring to recover lost ground, it is well-timed to thoroughly sift the nature of her claim to it. Agitation of the Pope's infallibility naturally leads to scrutiny of the whole system at the head of which he stands. The object of this volume is to unfold the rise, growth, and abuse of three elements of mediæval church government and discipline. In recounting that series of events, whereby the Papal system climbed to its pretensions to supreme temporal authority over all the powers of earth, to immunity of its clergy from civil jurisdiction, and to the construction and wielding of a penalty, which laid nations and sovereigns prostrate at its feet, the author expounds the vital principles of that mystery of iniquity. This material, drawn from original sources, he sets in striking contrast with the fabrications by which Rome, for centuries, bolstered up her claims.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers, down to A. D. 325. Edited by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, D. D., and James Donaldson, LL. D. Vol. XIII., The writings of Cyprian, vol. II.; Vol. XIV., The writings of Methodius, &c. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co.

In church history much importance attaches to the Christian writers of the period preceding the Council of Nice. It was a happy thought which led to the enterprise of transferring them bodily to the English language, that every man of our independently thinking people may have access to them, and be able to estimate for himself what their testimony amounts to.

The series has now reached the fourteenth volume, and contains much valuable matter which has never been published in English before, except in as far as embodied in history or twisted to one side or another in controversy. The thirteenth volume contains the remainder of the works of Cyprian, together with those of Novatian, the Octavius of Minutius Felix, the anonymous account of the martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas, and other remains of about the same date. In the fourteenth we have all that time has spared of the writings of Methodius, the celebrated opponent of Origen. But among them are not his controversial treatises. They have gone where most controversies ought to go. His dialogue on the subject of celibacy, in the manner of Plato,

called the "Banquet of the Ten Virgins," and other smaller pieces, filling only two hundred and thirty pages, make up the sum of his remains. The rest of the volume is occupied with the fragments of various other writers who flourished in the middle and latter part of the third century.

These volumes maintain the high reputation earned by their predecessors for careful rendering, clear expression, and the pleasing style in which they are got up. Without cumbering the work with critical discussions the editors contrive to give in brief historical notices, all the information really needed for intelligent perusal of the several treatises.

The Student's Manual of Oriental History: a Manual of the Ancient History of the East to the Commencement of the Median Wars. By François Lenormant, sub-librarian of the Imperial Institute of France, and E. Chevallier, member of the Royal Asiatic Society. Vol. I. Comprising the History of the Israelites, Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. London: Asher & Co. New York: Scribner & Co.

Recent antiquarian research, in the hands of a greatly expanded scholarship, has completely revolutionized ancient Oriental history. The last fifty years have been prolific of discoveries going to enlarge our knowledge of the pre-Hellenic world. First came the original memoirs of the discoverers and decipherers; then great works combining their fruits into connected history and rehandling the old narratives in their light; and now we are having all that condensed and separated from critical apparatus, and presented in forms for popular reading and instruction. Among works of the latter class this of Lenormant is positively the best we have yet seen. Its clear and brief narrative contains the latest results of the most advanced Orientalists, in their respective fields, and the whole is woven together by a scholar whose own life has been devoted successfully to the same round of subjects.

The work was produced in French and published in Paris. Its great success gave occasion to its being translated into English, and at the same time greatly enlarged and improved by the author. Accordingly, this English version is more valuable than the first edition of the original.

Standing as he does, in the van of discovery, the author frankly professes his Christian faith. "I am," says he, "a Christian; but my faith fears none of the discoveries of criticism when they are true. A son of the church, submissive in all things necessary, I, for that very reason, claim from her, with even greater ardor, the rights of scientific liberty. And it is just because I am a Christian that I regard myself as being more in accord with the true meaning and spirit of science than are those who have the misfortune to be without faith."—"For me, as for every Christian, all ancient history is the preparation for,—modern history the consequence of,—the Divine sacrifice of Calvary."

Fables of Infidelity and Facts of Faith; a Series of Tracts on the Absurdity of Atheism, Pantheism, and Rationalism. By Robert Patterson. Cincinnati: Western Tract and Book Society. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

Without vouching for all of Dr. Patterson's criticisms of the positions of modern scientists, and all his modes of terminating the portentous antagonisms

which they claim to raise against the Bible, we nevertheless think he has done great service in exposing the contradictions, incongruities, and absurdities which disfigure the writings of those boastful sciolists who array their crude and erratic hypotheses as of infallible truth and paramount authority against God's infallible word. If he at times goes too far, and brings down his sledge-hammer upon what is, or is not unlikely to be proved to be, some solid scientific or philosophical truth, he has demolished many of the pretentious and blatant "oppositions" of science falsely so called, and pierced many glittering bubbles blown up by philosophy and vain deceit against Divine revelation and redemption.

This volume is copious and vigorous in its exposure of the fallacies of different forms of scepticism, and of those specious reasonings of Atheism, Pantheism, and Rationalism which would deceive, if possible, the very elect. His style is bold and blunt, and if he does not always stand for all the refinements of diction, he doubtless thus opens his way more fully to the popular mind and heart.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures. By the Rev. Francis L. Patton. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

This little volume gives an able and discriminating discussion of the subject of inspiration, by one of the most promising young writers of our church. The different views of Lee and Bannerman exhibited and discussed by Mr. Patton, as to the breadth of the word "revelation," do not affect the grand conclusion, that however the sacred writers used each his own style and idioms, yet they all spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and indubitably uttered the mind of God.

Immortality. Four Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for 1868. By J. J. Stewart Perowne, B. D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in St. David's College, etc., etc. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1870.

These sermons contain an able and learned discussion of Immortality as related to the later forms of Materialism, Pantheism, and Spiritualism. In the preface the author pays his respects to Herbert Spencer, Huxley, and other materializing philosophers—particularly that paper of Huxley in the *Fortnightly Review*, on Protoplasm, which has been twice republished in New Haven, and in thousands of copies spread broadcast through our country. He also notices the assaults of Renan and others. The great superiority of the Christian's hope is portrayed with beauty and power. The volume is a valuable though fragmentary contribution to apologetic literature.

Pater Mundi; or, Modern Science testifying to the Heavenly Father, being in substance Lectures delivered to Senior Classes in Amherst College. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Cœlum." In two volumes. Vol. I. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. 1870.

Dr. Burr, known to us in his youth as a modest but studious lad, and since as the faithful and unpretending pastor of a rural Connecticut congregation, has suddenly burst upon our vision as an author of the first mark in the highest realms of thought, and as a leading defender of precious truth against assaults of scientific pretenders and pretentious sciolists. He calls to mind the days when the great New England divines, the Edwardsces, Bellamy, Backus, West

Burton, Smalley, Emmons, were pastors of agricultural country congregations. The universal approbation of this and his previous volume, by the press and by Christian thinkers of the highest reputation, we find borne out by the actual inspection of it. Real science is proved to be the handmaid of true religion, in a series of discussions which evince a masterly comprehension of the issues involved—a thorough acquaintance with modern science, and its relations to religion—the whole in a style clear and simple, vivid and graphic. We think the quiet of a rural charge more propitious to thorough study and deep thinking than the din and whirl of metropolitan excitements.

The Wonders of Pompeii. By Max Meunier. Translated from the original French. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Another volume of that "Library of Wonders," which Scribner & Co. are publishing, so replete with matter to charm and instruct the young, and persons of every age. The "Wonders of Pompeii" are here exhumed and distinctly set before the inquisitive and admiring reader.

The History of Rome. By Theodor Mommsen. Translated with the author's sanction, and additions, by the Rev. William P. Dickson, D. D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow, late Classical Examiner in the University of St. Andrews, with a Preface by Dr. Leonard Schmitz. New edition, in four volumes. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

We are glad to see another volume of this great work, which fully vindicates the estimate we formed of it from looking at the first volume, and which we expressed in a short notice of it in our January number. It is impossible to look at any page that may turn up, *ad aperturam libri*, without detecting the hand of a master alike in the facts and the philosophy of history. We regret Mommsen's rationalism. It seldom, however, crops out in a way to impair the impartiality or the value of his history.

A Dictionary and Concordance of the Names of Persons and Places, and of some of the more remarkable terms which occur in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Compiled by William Henderson, D. D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. 1870.

We can only repeat and refer to the high estimate of this work (again sent to us), which we expressed in our last number.

The same house have also brought out a new edition of *Essays on the Supernatural in Christianity, with Special Reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tubingen School*, by Dr. George P. Fisher, Professor of Church History in Yale College. We pointed out the high value of this work, when it first appeared, in our April number, 1866, p. 314.

Ecce Femina. An Attempt to solve the Woman Question. By Carlos White. Published by the author: Hanover, N. H.

This book is by a young man who was two years since an undergraduate in Dartmouth College. Its point of attack is John Stuart Mills' "Subjection of Woman," and the miscellaneous arguments of the "Innovators," as the writer styles the advocates of Woman's Rights. He attacks them all, from highest to lowest

with much boldness and shrewdness. He has given the question earnest and thorough study, and in a clear and forcible style unfolds the principles and the practical difficulties involved in it. The successive chapters are entitled "The Sexes Compared," "The Family," "Popular Suffrage," "The Teachings of the Bible." "Woman's Sphere." The book will instruct and influence wisely the popular mind.

The Presbyterian Historical Almanac and Annual Remembrancer of the Church for 1868. By Joseph M. Wilson. Vol. X. Philadelphia: Joseph M. Wilson, 123 South Fourth Street. 1868.

The character of this work as a repository of the chief facts and doings in the Presbyterian bodies of our land is too well known and appreciated to require special delineation here. We take pleasure in bringing it to the attention of our readers, and hope that the indefatigable author will be rewarded for his labor.

The Northmen in Maine. A Critical Examination of Views expressed in connection with the Subject, by Dr. J. H. Khol, in Vol. I. of the New Series of the Maine Historical Society. To which are added Criticisms on other Portions of the Work, and a Chapter on the Discovery of the Massachusetts Bay. By the Rev. B. F. De Costa, author of the Pre-Columbian Discovery of America by the Northmen, etc., etc. Albany: Joel Munsell. 1870.

This is a very learned and finished monogram, on a subject of deep interest, which has been generally supposed to be so much a region of myths and fables, as to afford little material for veritable history. It was originally designed for insertion in a Quarterly, as a simple review of Dr. Khol's work on the subject. The author, however, has chosen to present it to the public in a separate volume, which is a model of exquisite paper and typography.

The Cross. A Poem. By Robert Wharton Landis, Professor in Danville Theological Seminary. New York and Cincinnati: C. F. Vent. Chicago: J. S. Goodman & Co. 1870.

We detect considerable Calvinism but no poetry in this volume. We confess that we have never suspected Satan as capable of poetizing in the manner attributed to him in Book IX., of which the following is a random sample :—

"A little more respectable, indeed;
With ears, however, rather long for devils.
Some I perceive of you, (and of the tribes
Not yet encharged,) are learning dandyish airt
From human dandies. Well; I will assign
To you a proper charge; for you will meet
Congenial souls on earth, whom you'll induce
To ridicule all sacred things, whate'er
Their shallow pates may fail to comprehend
Within the Word of God. Make them denounce
The doctrines which therein his mercy show—
Predestination, Perseverance, Grace,
Especial Grace, Election, the Spirit's power
Converting and renewing ruined souls;
And make them say, that if Election's true,
Nine-tenths have been created to be damned.
Assail awakened souls with doubts and fears,

And lead them to despair of pardoning grace,
Till they—*cheraw; tississe, tiss; hiss! hiss!*
Ev'n as he speaks his utterance thus is staid
By that recurring doom earned long before—
Upon thy belly as a reptile thou
Shalt henceforth go, and dust shall be thy food;
A doom which he biennially endures
With the copartners of his cruel frand
For weeks thrice four continuous; nor can
Anticipate the hour."

Froude's History of England—Popular Edition. Vols. V.–VIII. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co.

The popular edition of this admirable work is all that could be desired, and we welcome these additional volumes with the same pleasure with which we received the earlier ones. They differ in no respect from the Library Edition except in paper and in price. Since Macaulay published his fragment and left us to mourn our great loss, nothing so able and so thorough as this work has appeared upon any portion of English history. Macaulay gave us a series of portraits, admirable for their force and color, but the personality of the artist was sometimes too strongly manifest in his handiwork. Froude writes with the same earnestness; and his graphic power and studious conscientiousness have produced a work which must ever remain an authority in English history and an enduring monument of the great ability of it author.

The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth. By the Rev. William Hanna, D.D., LL.D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Dr. Hanna is well known as the son-in-law and biographer of Dr. Chalmers, and author of some religious works. He is a highly cultured, graceful, and graphic writer. These qualities appear in these volumes (I. and II.), which sketch the life of our Lord from the Annunciation to the Transfiguration, in a continuous narration, fascinating in their style, their express teachings, and their suggestive implications.

The Life of David. By John M. Lowrie, D. D. Author of "A Week with Jesus," etc. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

We are not alone in placing a high estimate upon the volumes from Dr. Lowrie's pen heretofore published by the Board. We regard them as among the most standard issues of the religious press for ordinary devotional reading. This volume is posthumous, and although designed by the author for publication, he was prevented from fully preparing it by his untimely death. Filial affection has supplied the defect, and put the church in possession of a treasure of which she would not willingly remain bereft.

Words in Season. A Manual of Instruction, Comfort, and Devotion, for Family Reading and Private Use. By Henry B. Browning, M. A., Rector of St. George with St. Paul, Stamford, England. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.

An excellent manual of devout, evangelical, experimental instruction, clear, sound, and well adapted to its purpose.

The Spirit of Life; or, Scripture Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost. By E. H. Bickersteth, author of "Yesterday, To-day, and Forever." New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

This is a compact, lucid, convincing, yet popular (if this term can be applied to an exposition and demonstration of high and holy doctrine) setting forth of the witness of the Scriptures to the Being, Distinct Personality, and Eternal Godhead of the Holy Ghost, his anointing of Christ and his people; inspiring the Scriptures; striving with the world; regenerating the soul; sanctifying the believer, and perfecting him in eternal glory. We think a thorough study of one such book as this worth more to any soul than the reading of fifty of the religious novels with which the press now teems.

Words of Comfort for Parents bereaved of Little Children. Edited by William Logan. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

This is a collection of extracts and monograms from a large number of the best authors, in regard to infant salvation, made by one who had himself lost a beloved little daughter. It has had a wide sale in Great Britain, and can hardly fail to be precious to vast numbers similarly afflicted in this and other lands.

Light and Truth; or, Bible Thoughts and Themes. The Acts and Larger Epistles. By Horatius Bonar, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

These "Bible Thoughts and Themes" are in the usual style of Dr. Bonar, fresh, felicitous, vivid, all aglow with scriptural light and evangelical unction. Like the Bible they explain and apply, they are "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness." We would place it alongside of the work of Mr. Bickersteth noticed above, in comparison with the tales and stories now forming so much of the pabulum of the Christian mind.

Manual of the German Language. By W. Grauert. 12mo. First Part, pp. 96; Second Part, pp. 113. New York: E. Steiger. 1869.

Ahn's German Handwriting, being a Companion to every German Grammar and Reader, with notes. By W. Grauert. 12mo, pp. 62. New York: E. Steiger. 1869.

The former of these publications contains a series of exercises in reading and writing German, in which the author has, as he states, "endeavored to avoid the defects of both the synthetic and the purely analytic methods by an organic development of the forms of words and sentences." The latter consists of thirty-six different pieces printed in the native script, and will prove an admirable introduction to the reading of German writing.

Mrs. Jerningham's Journal. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

poem which pleases by its naturalness and its simple graceful style.

The following books for children and youth have been received from the Presbyterian Board of Publication:—

The Prisoners. By the Rev. W. P. Breed, D. D., author of "Lessons in Flying," "Grapes from the Great Vine," "The Little Priest," etc.

The Bitter Dose, and other Stories.

The Little Street-Sweeper.

The Silversmith of Jerusalem. By the author of "Asa and his Family," and "Ellen and her Cousins."

Edith's Two Account Books. By the author of "Annie Lincoln's Lesson," "The Little Watchman," etc., etc.

Margaret Lawrence, and other Stories.

Footsteps in the Light.

Tell the Truth, and other Stories.

Echo to Happy Voices. Published by the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau St., New York.

At the moment of going to press, and too late for further notice, the Carters send us the following excellent books:—

The Life of James Hamilton, D. D., F. L. S. By William Arnot. Edinburgh. Second Edition.

Memoir of the Rev. Wm. C. Burns, M. A., Missionary to China from the English Presbyterian Church. By the Rev. Islay Burns, D. D., Professor of Theology, Free Church College, Glasgow.

Expository Thoughts on the Gospels, for Family and Private Use, with the Text Complete. By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, B. A., St. John. Vol. II.

Removing Mountains. Life Lessons from the Gospels. By John S. Hart.

PAMPHLETS AND PERIODICALS.

Index Volume of the Princeton Review. Peter Walker, 821 Chestnut St., Philadelphia. Sold by Charles Scribner & Co., New York.

Mr. Walker, former publisher of the *Princeton Review* has undertaken the highly important enterprise of publishing an index volume for the first forty volumes, and up to the time when he ceased to be its publisher. It consists of three parts—1. Historical analysis of the origin, aims, and course of the Review by the senior editor. This is the only part for which either of the editors are responsible. 2. The authors of the articles, with biographical sketches of them. 3. The index proper. The great value of this index must be obvious to all. Those who have sets of the work complete, or partially so, will of course procure it, while it will be eagerly sought by many others as a standard addition to our religious and theological literature. We notice that the words on the cover "January, 1870," and "Published Quarterly, Price $3 per annum," might possibly mislead the incautious to confound it with the regular issue of the *Review* for the current year by its present publishers, Messrs. Scribner & Co. Of course nothing of this sort was intended. On account of our personal relations to the *Review* we prefer copying the only notice of the religious press which has met our eyes, to any characterization of it by ourselves. The following is from the *New York Observer* of March 10:—

"One of the most fascinating books for a religious scholar, that we have seen, is the first part, just issued, of the 'Index Volume of the Princeton Review.' It gives a history of that great Quarterly, unquestionably the ablest Calvinistic

Review ever published, and then commences a biographical sketch of each author who has at any time contributed to its pages. It reaches only to the letter E, yet in these few letters are included the Alexanders, two Dods, Carnahan, Cox, and an array of 'lights in the world' whose names we cannot enumerate. The sketches are written with spirit, and the volume will prove a literary treasure to every well-read man."

The Interior: Thursday, March 17, 1870.

This is the first number of the new Presbyterian weekly, established at Chicago, which, as requested, we shall gladly add to the list of our exchanges. We are gratified with its tone, temper, ability, and promise. If it shall develop in accordance with this promise, it may do a great work for our ecclesiastical interior and for our common Christianity. We are happy to notice a general improvement in the Presbyterian weeklies since the Re-union.

American Sunday-School Worker.

The second number of this magazine, published by J. W. McIntyre, St. Louis, at $1,50 a year (four months on trial for 50 cents), is received. We are glad to see so able a journal as this issued in the very centre of our continent, and with contributors of known ability from the different evangelical churches.

It contains articles on the "Supply of Teachers," by E. D. Jones. "The Bible in our Common Schools." "The proper manner of conducting a Sunday School," by Bishop E. M. Marvin. "Infant School Lesson," by Prof. E E. Edwards. "Expository Preaching." "How are Children Saved," by Rev. Jas. H. Brookes, D.D. Besides Blackboard Lessons, Notes and Queries, Book Notices, Music, and Prepared Lessons for each Sabbath, with expositions, questions, etc.

The European Mail. 44 Cannon Street, London.

Contains much valuable literary and scientific intelligence, and judicious criticism, besides a full and complete summary of home and foreign news for the United States, Canadian Dominion, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Bermuda, Cuba, Honduras, British Columbia, Vancouver Island, and the Sandwich Islands.

The Technologist. Vol. I., No. 1, February, 1870.

This is a new periodical, so far as we are able to judge, of very high character. If the editors keep their pledge that "no descriptive puffs of worthless inventions shall be inserted in its columns under any circumstances whatever," they will do a grand thing for the industrial journalism of the country. We find that the number before us consists of forty-four large pages, and it is printed on very superior paper, and in the best style of the typographic art. Altogether, it is the finest-looking journal of practical science now before the public. The articles, too, are of unusual excellence, and contain matter calculated to instruct and interest all classes. The titles of a few of the subjects discussed are,—Technological Education, Tempering Steel, Trial of Steam-Engines, Improvement in Distillation, Sunless and Airless Dwellings, the Measurement of Electrical Resistance, Vision and the Stereoscope, the Walks of New York Central Park, East River Bridge Caissons, the Microscope, Lessons on Drawing, Relation of Technology to Insurance, etc., etc.

City Mission Year Book. 30 Bible House, New York.

A most valuable summary of facts pertaining to the religious condition of New York city, being the 43d annual report of the New York City Mission and Tract Society, with brief notices of the operations of other societies, Church Directory, list of Benevolent Societies, and statistics of population, etc.

Our Monthly. A Religious and Literary Magazine for the Family. Cincinnati: Sutton & Scott.

This new periodical is designed to meet the demand for a Monthly suited to the wants of religious, and especially Presbyterian, families. The numbers thus far issued justify the great success it has achieved.

Art. X.—LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

The winter months have naturally brought out a large proportion of the year's publications, and although the list may not include many works that will win for themselves a permanent place in literature, there are not a few that are for the present both interesting and valuable.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have brought out two new volumes in their Foreign Theological Library,—Vol. I. of Keil's "Introduction to the Old Testament," and Vol. I. of Bleek's "Introduction to the New Testament;" and two in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, "Cyprian, etc." Vol. II., and "Methodius, etc." The Rivingtons have projected a "Summary of Theology and Ecclesiastical History," to be comprised in eight volumes, of which Part 1 has just appeared, in Part 1 (first half) of "A Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology," edited by Rev. J. H. Blunt. The Clarendon Press has brought out Dindorf's "Clemens Alexandrinus" (4 vols).

The literature of ecclesiastical controversy grows as on the Continent. Some of the latest additions are the Earl of Crawford's (late Lord Lindsay) "Œcumenicity in relation to the Church of England;" Hon. Colin Lindsay's "Evidence for the Papacy;" Part 3 of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon—Is healthful reunion impossible?" Dr. Selwyn's "Letter to Pio IX. on the Council at Rome;" Dr. Rule's "Councils Ancient and Modern;" Sweet's "Memoir of Henry Hoare" (including narratives of important recent church developments); Renouf's "Case of Pope Honorius reconsidered;" Shipley's "Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola;" "John Wesley in company with High Churchmen;" Burgess' "Reformed Church of England in its Principles and their Legitimate Development;" Ffoulkes' "Romau Index and its late Proceedings;" Jeanjacquot's "Explanations concerning the

co-operation of the Most Holy Virgin in the work of Redemption, and concerning her quality of Mother of Christians;" Archbishop Manning's "Pastoral Letters on the Council and Infallibility;" Garibaldi's "Rule of the Monk;" and Hobart Seymour's "Confessional."

In theology we have a new and carefully revised and admirably illustrated edition of Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise, "On the Theistic Argument supplied by Geology and Mineralogy;" R. T. Smith's "Church Membership on Church Principles;" Walters' "Harmony of Prophecies;" R. Martineau's "Roots of Christianity in Mosaism," and "The True Pronunciation of the Divine Name, Jahveh, Jehovah;" Biddle's "Spirit Controversy;" Gen. Goodwyn's "Whole Armor of God;" Hannah's "Hollowness, Narrowness, and Fear,—Warnings from the Jewish Church;" Kennion's "Sermons on the Lord's Supper;" Adamson's "Analogy of Faith;" an anonymous work entitled, "Belief, what is it?" Blenkinsopp's "Doctrine of Development in the Bible and in the Church;" Cochrane's "Resurrection of the Dead,—its Design, Manner, and Results;" Cox's "Essays on the Resurrection" (the last two works being expository of 1 Cor. xv.); Dale's "Christ, and the Spirit of Christ;" Bickersteth's "Spirit of Life;" Voysey's "Defence on the Charge of Heresy;" a translation from the French entitled, "The Bible in India: Hindoo Origin of Hebrew and Christian Revelation;" Vol. III. of Bunsen's "God in History" (Miss Winkworth's translation); Gasparini's "Attributes of Christ;" and Molloy's "Geology and Revelation."

In the department of exegesis, formal or popular and practical, we find a "Commentary on Mark," by Prof. Godwin of New College; one on "Joel," by J. Hughes; Canon Norris's "Key to the Narrative of the Four Gospels;" Forrest's "Faithful Witness, an Exposition of the Epistles to the Seven Churches;" Parker's "Homiletic Analysis of the New Testament, Vol. I., on Matthew;" Ryle's "Expository Thoughts, etc., Gospel of John, Part 2;" Saphir's "Lectures on the Lord's Prayer;" Thomas's "Homiletic Commentary on Acts;" new editions of Wardlaw on Proverbs, Zechariah, Romans, and James; Binnie's "Psalms, their History, Teachings, and Use;" Kelly's "Lectures Introductory to the Study of the Acts;" a new edition of Leighton's "Commentary on 1st Peter," edited by W. West (being Vols. 3 and 4 of the Whole Works); and a new instalment of "The Book and its Story," viz., "Fresh Leaves in the Old Testament Part."

In ecclesiastical history and literature we have Penningtou's "God in the History of the Reformation in Germany and England;" Margoliouth's "Vestiges of the Historic Anglo-Hebrews in East Anglia;" Demaus's "Biography of Latimer;" Rev. Josiah Bull's "Letters of Newton;" Melia's "Origin, Persecutions, and Doctrines of the Waldenses;" Rev. W. Ellis's "Martyr Church, Christianity in Madagascar;" Gill's "Gems from the Coral Islands;" "Memoir of the Missionary Rev. W. C. Burns;" Marsh's "Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon and his Times;" and Dr. Van Lennep's "Asia Minor."

To the essay literature of theology two volumes have been added which will draw attention. One is from Nonconformist sources, and bears the title of "Ecclesia, or Church Problems Considered, etc.," the contributors being Rev. Drs. Stoughton, Reynolds, Mullens, Rev. Messrs. Baldwin Brown, Dale, Allon, and others. The other comes from a churchly section of the Church of England and has the title "The Church and the Age," and contains essays from Bishop Ellicott, Dean Hook, Dr. Irons, the Bampton Lecturer for 1870, Prof. Montagu Burrows, Revs. A. W. Haddan, M. F. Sadler, and others. Bishop Moberly's

"Brightstone Sermons," the Oxford Lenten Sermons for 1868 on "The Personal Responsibility of Man," those for 1869 on "The Prophets of the Lord," and Newman Hall's "Homeward Bound," are the most noteworthy of their class among the quarter's publications.

To philosophical literature little has been added. Our list includes Galton's "Hereditary Genius;" Barratt's "Physical Ethics;" S. H. Hodgson's "Time and Space;" Alfred Day's "Summary and Analysis of the Dialogues of Plato;" Williams's "Translation of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics;" and Killick's "Student's Hand-book, Synoptical and Explanatory of Mill's Logic."

The history of India is illustrated by Vol. II. of Sir H. M. Elliot's "History of India, from the Native Historians;" Sewell's "Analytical History of India, to 1858;" Pritchard's "Administration of India from 1859 to 1868;" Beames's new edition of "Elliott's Memoirs on the History, Folklore, etc., of India;" and Mrs. Manning's "Ancient and Mediæval India." From other departments of history we have Vol. III. of Long's "Roman Republic;" Pearson's "Historical Maps of England;" E. A. Freeman's "Old English History for Children;" Gaskin's "Varieties of Irish History;" Baker's "History of St. John's College at Cambridge;" Bonwick's "Last of the Tasmanians;" A. B. Cochrane's "Francis I., and other Studies;" Mrs. Oliphant's "Historical Sketches of the Reign of George II.;" and Rawlinson's "Manual of Ancient History."

Biographies are numerous, and some of them quite attractive. Among them are Mrs. Gordon's "Home Life of Sir David Brewster" (her father); Hosack's "Mary, Queen of Scots;" "The Life of Mary Russell Mitford;" "Memoirs of Jane Austen;" Brisbane's "Early Years of Alexander Smith;" Woolrych's "Lives of Eminent Sergeants-at-Law;" Hesekiel's "Life of Bismarck" (translated by Mackenzie); Liddon's "Sketch of Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury;" Adlard's "Amye Robsart and the Earl of Leycester;" Cowden Clarke's edition of "George Herbert," with Nichol's Memoir; and Rossetti's edition of Shelley, with memoir.

Of the recent works in geography, travel, etc., we mention Eckardt's "Modern Russia;" Kennedy's "Four Years in Queensland;" Colonel Wilkins' "Reconnoitring in Abyssinia;" Taylor's "Ancient Topography of the Eastern Counties of Britain;" Tristram's "Scenes in the East;" Newman Hall's "From Liverpool to St. Louis;" Hunt's "Peeps at Brittany," and Pallisser's "Brittany and its Byways;" and Mrs. Grey's "Visit to Egypt, Constantinople, etc. (with the Prince and Princess of Wales)."

Philological literature has been enriched by a new and greatly improved edition of Liddell and Scott's "Greek Lexicon;" Dr. Wm. Smith and T. D. Hall's "English-Latin Dictionary;" Vol. II. of Norris' "Assyrian Dictionary;" the completion of Dr. R. G. Latham's "English Dictionary;" Sharpe's "Decree of Canopus;" Part II. of A. J. Ellis on "Early English Pronunciation;" Peile's "Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology;" Edmunds' "Traces of History in the Names of Places;" Lechler's edition of the "Trialogus of Wiclif;" and Farrar's "Families of Speech."

Playfair's "Primary and Technical Education" (two lectures); "Earl Russell's Speeches and Dispatches;" Sir Alexander Grant's "Recess Studies;" Godkin's "Land War in Ireland;" and Dodd's "Epigrammatists (Ancient, Mediæval, and Modern)," must close our list.

FRANCE.

The interest taken in France in the Ecumenical Council at Rome did not at all abate as the time for its assembling drew near. In our last number we noted a few of the publications of the early months of autumn. The last quarter of the year brought out from both sections of the Catholic Church some of the clearest and strongest of their utterances. To those weeks just preceding the 8th of December belong such books as Dupanloup's "Lettre au Clergé de son Diocèse relativement à la définition de l'Infallibilité;" Maret's "Le Pape et les Evêques;" Maupied's "Le futur Concile selon la divine Constitution de l'Eglise;" Charaux' "La Philosophie et le Concile;" Abbé Chauvierre's "Histoire des Conciles œcuméniques;" Franco's "Catéchisme raisonné sur les Conciles;" Jacques' "Du Pape et du Concile;" Canon Loyseaux' "Traité pratique et canonique du Jubilé;" Burnier's "Rome, la France et le Concile;" Deroux' "Histoire des Conciles œcuméniques;" Montrond's "Les Conciles œcuméniques: tableau historique;" Guyot's "La Somme des Conciles, généraux et particuliers," and Bungener's "Pape et Concile au XIXme Siècle."

The general works in theological and ecclesiastical literature are of no unusual significance. Here again we put the name of the able Archbishop of Orleans at the head. We find accredited to his pen a "Histoire de notre Seigneur Jésus Christ," and a smaller treatise "De la vie commune et des associations sacerdotales." To these we add Chéry's "Théologie du Saint Rosaire;" Abbé Craisson's "Les Communautés religieuses;" Vol. I. of Abbé Dardenne's "L'Enseignement théologique en France;" Marchési's "La Liturgie gallicane dans les huit premiers Siècles de l'Eglise," translated by Bishop Gallot; Gentili's "L'Athéisme réfuté par la Science;" Rougemont's "Il faut choisir. Conférences contre le Déisme et contre le Matérialisme;" Vol. I. of Laurent's "Le Catholicisme et la Religion de l'Avenir;" Autran's "Paroles de Salomon;" Havet's "Le Christianisme et ses Origines;" Vol. I. of Guettée's "Histoire de l'Eglise;" and De Pressensé's "Histoire du Dogme." The contributions to philosophy, general and special, are few, such as Gratacap's "Essai sur l'Induction;" Janet's "Eléments de Morale;" Montée's "La Philosophie de Socrate;" Rezan's "La Bonté;" Leroy's "Philosophie Chrétienne de l'Histoire;" Jules Simon's "La Peine de Mort;" and Thonissen's "Etudes sur l'histoire du droit criminel des peuples anciens."

In history and the kindred departments we find a larger array, from which we select Daumas' "La vie arabe et la société musulmane;" Drapeyron's "L'Empereur Héraclius et l'Empire Byzantin au VIIme siècle;" Dufour's "Troplong, son œuvre et sa méthode;" Dussieux' "Généalogie de la Maison de Bourbon de 1256 à 1869;" Abbé Duclos' "Madame de la Vallière et Marie Thérèse d'Autriche;" Champagny's "Les Césars du IIIme Siècle;" Deltuf's "Théodoric, roi des Ostrogoths et d'Italie;" Gobineau's "Histoire des Perses;" Victor Guérin's "Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine" (3 vols, large 8vo.); Humbert's "Le Japon illustré" (a work exhibiting the result of the author's careful observations and unusual opportunities while Minister of Switzerland at Jeddo); Vol. VI. of Lacroix' "Histoire de la vie et du règne de Nicolas I., empereur de Russie;" Le Hardy's "Histoire du Protestantisme en Normandie;" Melun's "La Marquise de Barol;" Ratsch's (a trans-

lation from the Russian) "La Russie lithuanienne jusqu'à la chute de la Pologne," and the same author's "L'Autriche et le Polonisme;" Saint Albin's "Histoire de Pie IX et son Pontificat;" Saint Genis' "Histoire de Savoie;" Vol. II. of Schmidt's "Tableaux de la Révolution française," and Vol. IX. of Garnier Pagès' "Histoire de la Révolution du 1848."

Of a more miscellaneous character are Laboulaye's "Discours populaires; suivis d'une Rhétorique populaire;" Roux's "Histoire de la Littérature italienne contemporaine;" De Paravey's "Illustrations de l'Astronomie hiéroglyphique, et des plauisphères et zodiaques, etc.;" Perny's "Proverbes chinois;" Chodzko's "Grammaire paléoslave;" a second considerably enlarged edition of Oppert's "Eléments de la Grammaire assyrienne," and from the same source a "Mémoire sur les rapports de l'Egypte et de l'Assyrie dans l'Antiquité;" and Daremberg's "Etat de la Médecine entre Homère et Hippocrate."

GERMANY.

The controversy which is rife in the Catholic Church has called forth in Germany much spirited discussion, while adding but little to the permanent literature of theology. Protestants watch the debate, now and then throwing in a word or two—but for the most part wait to see where the Catholic Church, now in the view of all the world, chooses to plant itself. The powers and prerogatives which the Pontiff successfully claims, and the Church of Rome concedes, will shape this part of polemic theology for all coming generations. The list of the last quarter hardly claims a recapitulation.

In theology the list is meagre and of little permanent worth. Perthes, of Gotha, publishes Part I. of Berger's "Evangelical Faith, Romish Error, and Worldly Unbelief," and Part I. of Kahle's "Bible Eschatology," containing the Eschatology of the Old Testament. We note, besides, Oischinger's "Christian and Scholastic Theology, or the Fundamental Christian Doctrines according to the Symbols, Councils, and Fathers of the Church;" the "Compendium veteris ritualis Constantiensis;" Pfannenschmid's "Holy Water in Heathen and Christian worship;" and Vol. II. of the 3d edition of Heltinger's "Apology for Christianity."

In exegetical literature we find a richer list. Two volumes, the first and fifth, have appeared of Vercellone and Cozza's edition of the "Codex Vaticanus;" also a fourth edition of Tischendorf's "Septuagint;" a new eighth edition, by Prof. Schrader, of De Wette's "Introduction to the Old Testament," increased by the addition of about 200 pages to the seventh edition; Vol. III. of Riehm's revision of "Hupfeld on the Psalms;" Frankel's "Introduction to the Jerusalem Talmud;" Keil's "Commentary on Daniel," from Keil and Delitzsch's "Commentary on the Old Testament;" Zöckler's "Commentary on Daniel," from Lange's "Bibelwerk;" Volkmar's "Gospels; or Mark and the Synopsis of the Canonical and Non-canonical Gospels, according to the Earliest Text;" Klöpper's "Exegetical and Critical Examination of I. Corinthians;" Schmidt's "Pauline Christology;" Küper's "Prophecy in the Old Testament;" and Krenkel's "Paul, the Apostle of the Heathen." An eighth edition of Ewald's "Ausführlichs Lehrbuch" is just out.

In biblical and ecclesiastical history and the cognate literature, we have Hengstenberg's "History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament; first

period—from Abraham to Moses;" Vol. II. of Hitzig's "History of Israel from the beginning to A. D. 72;" Laurent's edition of "Clemens Romanus—the Epistle to the Corinthians, and the alleged second Epistle, and the fragments;" Haneberg's "Canons of Hippolytus, in Arabic, from Roman MSS., with a Latin version;" Lipsius' "Chronology of the Bishops of Rome to the middle of the 4th century;" Vol. III. of Heinrichsen's edition of "Eusebius Pamphilus;" Vol. III. of Hergenröther's "Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople;" Tobler's "Palestine in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, from the itineraries;" Möller's "Life and Writings of Osiander," being Part V. of the series, comprising the "Fathers and Founders of the Lutheran Church;" Mörikofer's "Life of Zuingle;" Sickel's "Contributions to the History of the Council of Trent;" Holtzmann's "Monuments of Religious History, within the sphere of Italian art;" Zirngiebl's "Studies concerning the Institution of the Society of Jesus;" and a third edition of Simrock's "Manual of German Mythology."

In secular history and biography we have, among the issues of the quarter, Breysig's "Times of Charles Martel;" Vol. II. of Ihne's "Roman History" (a work already noticed in the *Repertory* on the appearance of Vol. I., and a translation of which is in press in England); Vol. I. of Holm's "Ancient History of Sicily;" Siever's "Studies in the History of the Roman Emperors;" Oberdick's "Movements in the East hostile to the Romans in the last half of the third century of the Christian era;" Vol. III. of Von Cosel's "History of Prussia under the Hohenzollerns;" Braun's "Pictures of the Mohammedan World;" L. von Ranke's "Correspondence of Frederic the Great with William IV., Prince of Orange, and his wife, Anne of England;" Vol. I. of Von Noorden's "European History in the Eighteenth Century—the War of the Spanish Succession;" Ficker's "Researches into the History of Italian Monarchy and Jurisprudence;" and Parts 2 and 3 of Vol. IV. of Droysen's "History of Prussian Politics."

Turning to philosophy, general and special, and its history, we find Vol. I. of a third edition of Zeller's "Philosophy of the Greeks—the pre-Socratic period;" Kalischer's "Comparison and Criticism of Aristotle's Rhetoric and Nicomathean ethics;" Durdik's "Liebnitz and Newton;" Caspari's "Philosophy of Leibnitz;" L. Grote's "Leibnitz and his Times;" Bender's "History of Philosophical and Theological Studies in Ermland;" Von Hartsen's "Inquiries in Logic;" a second and enlarged edition of Schwegler's "History of Philosophy," edited by Köstlin; W. Gass' "Doctrine of Conscience;" Rosenkranz' "Hegel as the National Philosopher of Germany;" Hartenstein's "Historico-philosophical Essays;" Vol. II. of Volkmann's "Life, Writings, and Philosophy of Plutarch of Chæronea;" Ernst von Bunsen's "Unity of Religions," Vol. I.; Dreydorff's "Pascal, his Life and Conflicts;" Delff's "Dante Alighieri and the Divina Comœdia;" and Scartazzini's "Dante, his Times, his Life, and his Works."

In philology and general literature we record the appearance of Vol. II. of the fourth edition of Bähr's "History of Roman Literature;" Part 1 of the fifth edition of Bernhardy's "Roman Literature;" Part 3 of Teuffel's more concise and very excellent manual in the same department; Friedrichsen's translation of "Ussing's System of Training and Instruction among the Greeks and Romans;" two prize essays from the Jablonowski Society at Leipsic—Büchsenschütz on the "Chief Seats of Industrial Art in Antiquity," and Blümner on the "Industrial Activity of the Nations of Classical Antiquity;" La Roche's "Homeric Researches;" Vol. II. of Hübner's "Corpus Inscriptionum latina-

rum;" a third edition of Curtius' "Greek Etymology;" Vol. I. of Pindar's "Epinicia," edited by M. Schmidt of Jena; a second edition of Schleicher's "German Language;" Andresen's "Language of Jacob Grimm;" Part 2 of Merx' "Syriac Grammar" (based on Hoffmann); Bruppacher's "Phonetic System of the Oscan Language;" Lepsius on the "Chronological Value of the Assyrian Eponymes, and some points of contact with Egyptian Chronology;" Hassan's "Concise Grammar of the common Arabic Dialects, especially the Egyptian;" Part 1 of a third revised edition of Diez' "Grammar of the Romance Languages;" a volume of Von Raumer's "Literary Remains;" and Vol. VII. of Klein's "History of the Drama."

HOLLAND.

From Holland we find a few volumes announced of more than usual interest: Prof. Schaarschmidts' edition, in a Dutch version, of Spinoza's "De deo et homine," valuable especially on account of its critical and philosophical preface; Roorda's "Commentary on Micah;" Part 2 of Pierson's "History of Roman Catholicism to the Council of Trent;" Part 2 of Wolber's "History of Java;" the first issue in a new series of the Teyler Society's publications—Scheffer's "Criticism on F. C. Baur as a Theologian;" Blom's "Epistle of James;" Parts 1 and 2 of Vol. I. of Müller's "Boniface;" Riemen's "First Epistle of John in its relation to the Gospel of John;" Von Toorenenbergen's "Symbolical Literature of the Reformed Church of Netherlands;" Tiele's "Comparative History of Ancient Religions,"—Part 1, "The Egyptian and Mesopotamian Religions;" another instalment (No. 4 of Part 2) of Moll's "Church History of Netherlands before the Reformation;" Part 2 of Doedes' "Doctrine of Blessedness, exhibited according to the Gospel in the Scriptures of the New Testament;" Veen's "Anabaptists in Scotland;" and Johanna's "Life of Thorwaldsen," with portrait and illustrations.