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Article I.

Universalist Conventions and Creeds.

The Convention of 1790.

Very unexpectedly, since the preparation of the former Article, an opportunity has been given to examine all the Original Papers of this Convention that have been preserved. They have all been faithfully copied, making over one hundred and fifty pages of foolscap MSS., and will now be freely used.

In 1833, the Record book of this Convention, came into the possession of Rev. A. C. Thomas, who published a brief abstract of its contents in the Universalist Union of Sept. 15th, 1888. Since then, the book has disappeared, and thus far, all efforts to find it have been in vain. The papers referred to above, are the original minutes of the preliminary meetings in 1789 and the winter of 1790, the credentials of delegates, letters from the Churches, copies of letters sent out by the Convention and its committees, and in several cases the Minutes of the Convention as kept by the sessional clerks, — in all ninety papers. The years covered by these papers are 1789 to 1805, with the exceptions of 1797, '99, and 1800, '4. For 1799 Mr. Thomas found no record, and for 1800, the memorandum, "No Convention held this year." There was no record for 1804, but a leaf of the book, at that place, was missing. The Proceedings of 1806, '7, were recorded, and after that several leaves were torn out. In a sketch of Universalism in Philadelphia, published by Mr. Kneeland in the Christian Messenger, Jan. 18, 1821, it is said that, "This Convention continued to be held at intervals, till, 1806." The papers to which I have had access, are now the property of James W. Dale, D.D., a Presbyterian clergyman, whose grandfather, Thomas Fitzgerald, was for many years an active member of the First Universalist Church, Philadelphia, and frequently a representative in the Convention. By Dr. Dale's kindness I have been favored with the examination of these papers, and am permitted to use them in setting forth the history of the Convention.
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in this attempt to rescue from oblivion the history of an organization which aimed to put forth a Statement of Belief, and a Plan of Government, that should be acceptable to all the Universalists of America; and which so far succeeded, that Conventions, shortly after organized by its permission, in the then extreme East, and West, adopted its Platform as their own, and reaffirmed its Plan of Government.

As late as 1805, it was in Correspondence with the New England Convention, but in another generation it seems to have been wholly forgotten. Rev. Thomas Whittemore knew nothing of its doings, save in one item, gleaned from the Life of Murray, nor, with the exception of Murray, of any of the preachers who participated in it, when he published his "Modern History of Universalism," in 1830; nor when he wrote his Article on the "State of the Doctrine and Denomination of Universalists," in the "Universalist Expositor," in 1833. Later that year, Rev. A. C. Thomas brought it to public notice, in an Article in the "Christian Messenger," but it soon passed out of mind; even so careful and accurate a writer as the late Dr. Ballou, making no mention of it in his Article on our "Dogmatic and Religious History," in the QUARTERLY for January, 1848. And so generally had ignorance or forgetfulness of this Convention prevailed, that nothing relating to our history, has been, or is now, more commonly said, than that our only Profession of Faith, dates from 1803, and that the pressure of sympathy with a brother compelled to pay taxes to the support of Congregationalism, because Universalists were not recognized as a Sect in the State of New Hampshire, was the only thing that induced our Church to submit to the imposition of a Written Creed.

The idea of the Philadelphia Convention originated with the Society in that City, who held their first meeting with reference to it, "Sunday evening, Sept. 6th, 1789, agreeably to notice given at the close of the afternoon sermon, in an upper room of the Universal Baptist Meeting House." After

For the history and location of this building, see Century of Universalism, pp. 30, 62. There were present at this preliminary meeting, "William Perkins, Samuel
choosing James Moore, Moderator, "It was made known to those present that the design of the meeting was to lay before them the propriety of writing and sending forth a Circular Letter to our friends in different parts of the Continent holding like faith with us in the Salvation and Restoration of All Things by Christ Jesus, inviting them to a Conference or Association, in order to agree on some General Sentiment, and Form of Church Discipline, which may have a tendency to unite us more in the bands of love and uniformity, and prove more to our edification and the Declarative Glory of God."

A committee was appointed to draft such a Letter, and at an adjourned meeting two weeks later, they made a report, which, being considered then, and at a subsequent meeting in October, it was agreed that it should be sent out "to such persons or Societies as the Committee may deem proper."

The following is the Letter. It was sent to New Britain, Penins, Cohasey, Pilesgrove, and Pennsneck, N. J., Frederick Co., Va., Boston, Mass., and perhaps to some other localities; and immediate replies were solicited.

Fletcher, John Brayfield, Thomas Fitzgerald, Israel Israel, James Moore, Thomas Dobson, Elisha Gordon, Thomas Biven, the Rev. Mr. Seagrave, Mary Hountsell Elizabeth Perkins, Elizabeth Fletcher, Mrs. Kennard, Mrs. Robertson, Miss Wane, Amy Scott and several others."

*The Letter received in Boston, was copied and sent, with the following, to Providence:*

**BOSTON, DECEMBER 10, 1789.**

**COLL. ZEPHANIAH ANDREWS.**

Respected Sir: — I am requested to inclose under Cover to you, the Copy of a Letter from the Society of Universalists, (as they are generally termed) at Philadelphia, to the Society in Boston, professing the same belief.

This letter you will please lay before the Brethren at Providence, Taunton, and Rhode Island, and their respective Determinations upon the Subject Matter, whether they will send one, or more Delegates to the proposed Convention, be so kind as to transmit to the underwritten by a safe Hand, they being appointed a Committee for said purpose.

I am, Sir, with due Respect, Your Well-wisher in the fulness of Salvation,

GEO. RICHARDS.

Please direct your answer to George Richards, School Master, Boston, near Dr. Lathrop's Meeting; or, Mr. Shippie Townsend, Block Maker, Head of Cross Street, Boston; or, Mr. John Murray, at Mr. James Prentiss', Brattle Street, Boston, as may suit you best.

Col. Andrews at once forwarded copies to Nathan Beebe, Newport, R. I., and to Jonathan Cobb, Taunton, Mass. The former made speedy reply, that "our numbers
Friends and Brethren: — In the glorious belief of the final Restitution of All Things through our Lord Jesus, we address you at this time by the advice and with the consent of the Brethren in the same belief in this place, though not generally acquainted with you, but considering you as desirous to promote the Truth, and further the progress of Genuine Religion, on a subject which we doubt not has exercised your minds, in a measure as it has ours. You no doubt, have long since seen and deplored, the unsettled situation we are in, without Order, Rule, or System, floating about on the waters of unsteady helps, to promote our knowledge, and unite us in One General Church in the bonds of Love and Uniformity. Imprest with a sense of our state as a people, and induced to believe that the time is come, that by the blessing of our God, and the support and endeavors of one another, that we may rise to and become comforted, in the prospect of numbers being brought into the Truth as it is in Jesus.

To accomplish this glorious purpose we have had a Meeting of our Friends on the 6th of September last, and taking the matter into our most serious consideration, it was there agreed unanimously, to appoint Four Members to draw up, and lay before the professors of our belief, a Letter for approbation; copies of which were to be taken, and forwarded to the Brethren respectively in different parts of the Continent; and this being approved of, we in behalf of them, and ourselves, request you to send on to us, your opinion of calling a General Convention of suitable persons, to meet at some suitable place, on some particular time, to take our circumstances and situation into consideration; that we may be enabled thereby as much as in our power lyth, to have One Uniform Mode of Divine Worship: One Method of Ordaining suitable Persons to the Ministry: One Consistent Way of Administering the Lord's Supper, or whatever else may appear desirable to any when such Convention meets, having regard to the practice of our Saviour, by endearing to build upon the broadest Basis of Christian Benevolence.

That this may meet with your approbation, and that the God of all Grace and Wisdom may bless these our weak endeavors, we subscribe ourselves your brethren in the Universal are so trifling in this place, and our circumstances so low by the dulness of business, that we are not in a condition to appoint delegates." No response came from Taunton. The Providence Universalists signified their approval of the purpose of the Convention, but should be unable to send delegates, and doubted if they had any in their number who were wise enough to legislate for others in such matters.
Love of that Redeemer that willeth all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the Truth.

William Perkins,
James Moore,
Anthony Cuthbert,
Israel Israel,

Committee.

The Philadelphia Society held another meeting January 3d, 1790, when the Committee laid before them the following letter, received from Boston, "which, being read, was most cordially approved of, and gave much comfort, and was ordered to be read again at some future meeting."

"Boston, December 6, 1789.

Men and Brethren: — The Society at this place hath received your Affectionate Epistle of the 6th of September last, wherein you tenderly Greet them as 'Believers in the final Restitution of All Things in Christ Jesus,' and mutually address you Collectively and Individually with Salutations of Love, in that Grace, Mercy, and Truth, which came by our Lord and Saviour, the Great Federal Head, in whom every man is complete; rejoicing with all Christian Joy upon your behalf, that ye also with us, are grounded in that Truth which God hath spoken by all his Holy Prophets, since the world began.

The Brethren, having sought by earnest prayer, and a diligent attention into the lively Oracles, an answer of peace, in the unity of the Spirit, and the oneness of Faith, unto all the particulars you have mentioned, viz., The Establishment of One Church upon the Broadest Basis of Christian Benevolence: One mode of performing Divine Worship: One Method of Calling Suitable persons to the Ministry: One consistent way of Administering the Lord’s Supper; together with whatever else may appear Desirable into a Convention hereafter to Assemble; — set forth the result of their mature deliberation at present to be as follows. That they feel themselves most cordially drawn in the Bands of Love, to send forward one, or more Delegates, as they may be enabled to by permission of their Divine Master, when the place and time shall be fixed, which you will kindly consider of, and mention in reply to this.

As it appeareth that the above recited serious and important affair, will occupy the thoughts, dwell in the hearts, and proceed from the lips of said Convention, the Brethren
express their most fervent wish that in all your deliberations ye keep close unto the written word of the Lamb: to the Testimony of the Apostles and primitive disciples, his followers: walking in the footsteps of the early Churches in the New Testament, choosing the Scriptures of Truth as your Directory and Guide: Rejecting the Traditions of Men, as vain and unprofitable. And that ye, Brethren, and ourselves also, may be graciously enabled thus to think and act, we solemnly commend you to the Grace of the Lord Jesus, the Grand Master Builder; and request that in your prayers ye make mention of us, looking steadfast unto the Lord Christ, who alone can unite us in the bond of Temporal Peace, as he hath made of all nations one new man in that peace and joy of which there shall be no end.

We are, in the behalf of the Brethren, and also for ourselves, as Individual Members of the One Body, Your Affectionate Brethren in the Faith of the Gospel and the Faith of Jesus.

Signed per request of the Society.

SHIPPIE TOWNSEND,

JOHN MURRAY.

GEO. RICHARDS.

4 Shippie Townsend, as shown in the foregoing note, was a block maker, in Boston; and was one of the earliest New England writers in defence of Universalism, having published several pamphlets, among which were, "A Collection of Songs, designed for Entertainment and Edification," "A Short Catechism, with Proofs; designed for the assistance of such persons as wish to search the Scriptures for a consistent view of the Doctrines and Duties contained in them. 1787." "Remarks on a Pamphlet, entitled ALL MEN WILL NOT BE SAVED FOREVER: Wrote by Samuel Mather. 1782." These, and a number of others, were collected and published in an octavo vol. of 376 pp. in 1794, entitled, "Gospel News, Divided into Eleven Sections," etc., etc. Mr. Townsend also preached occasionally. He died at an advanced age, about the year 1800.

5 As this is probably the earliest public mention of George Richards in connection with Universalists, the following item from an unpublished letter written by Rev. John Murray, "April 9th, 1789," may not be uninteresting, as fixing the time when Mr. Richards began to preach Universalism: "I heard a gentleman preach last Sunday morning in the meeting I labour in, in consequence of my being ill, who for matter and manner, exceeded any I had ever heard. I have no acquaintance with him, that is personal. I had heard of him. He has been sometime a school master in this Metropolis, and before they get a settled minister in the North Episcopal Church, he officiates there. Some of my hearers in this place being acquainted with him, invited him in my absence to supply the pulpit. My being ill last Sunday morning gave me an opportunity of hearing him myself, and I was exceedingly pleased. I hope he will be a sensible, warm, able advocate of the truth as it is in Jesus. He labours, however, poor man, under a difficulty, in his first setting out; he is poor and has a large family; he is therefore obliged to be very much confined to his school. However, we know
The Committee appointed to send out the Circular Letter, was instructed to fix on the time and place for holding the Convention; and early in February they selected Philadelphia as the place, and May 25th, 1790, as the time. In April another meeting was hold, and the members of the Committee, with Thomas Fitzgerald added, were appointed Representatives to the Convention and "directed to invite the Representatives from other societies, to meet in the meeting house in Lodge Alley, or such other place as they may judge best."

At the time appointed, the Convention met, and continued its sessions till the 8th of June,—by far the longest session of any Universalist Convention yet held. It was composed of seventeen persons, seven of whom were preachers, viz., John Murray, Gloucester, Mass., Duncan McLean, Frederic Co. Va., Moses Winchester, Cohansy, N. J., Artis Scaggrave, Pilesgrove, N. J., Nicholas Cox, Kingwood, N. J., William Worth, Pittsgrove, N. J., David Evans, New Britain, Penna. not what may be in the womb of Providence. He is young, a man of great natural and acquired abilities, and I hope, a man of principle; so that he may be indeed a burning and shining light. I had often heard of Mr. George Richards, as a very able school master, a man of abilities, &c., but never till last Christmas day, did I hear of him as a preacher of the truth as it is in Jesus." Mr. Richards was born in or near Newport, R. I., about 1756. He studied the common and some of the higher branches of learning, under the private tuition of a clergyman in Newport, who gave him, as he afterwards felt confident, "as extensive advantages as he could have enjoyed under Dr. Manning, President of Brown University." During a portion of the Revolutionary war, he was in the Navy, as Purser and Chaplain, under Commodore Muny: and at the close of the war went to Boston as a School Master. His career as a Universalist preacher is well known; and recently, his name as a poet, especially as a patriotic writer, and also as an eminent Free Mason, has been celebrated by the Librarian of the "American Antiquarian Society," and the editor of the Old and New. His Family Bible, printed about 1776, met with a singular and sad fate. It was found in a brush heap, at Arlington Heights, April 1964, by a soldier of the 11th Regt. N. H. Vols., who took from it the Family Record, and at the close of the war, presented it to the New England Historic Genealogical Society. From this, I learn that Mr. Richards was thrice married, to Jane Day, Boston, Jan. 15th, 1761; to Mrs. Sarah Wallis, Boston, April 20th, 1786; and to Mrs. Alice Simes, Portsmouth, N. H., Oct. 23rd, 1796. By his first marriage he had three, by his second, four, and by his last five children. His fifth child Sarah Ward, born at Boston, Oct. 27, 1788, was he says, "The first child dedicated by the Rev. John Murray, of Universal Church, Boston." Of his eighth child, Alice Jane, born at Portsmouth, June 22d, 1797, he says, "The first child dedicated by the Rev. Mr. Murray, Oct. 25, 1797, at the Universal Meeting House in Portsmouth, N. H., Vaughan Street."

6 In addition to these seven, there were other preachers in New Jersey, Pennsylvania,
and farther south. Universalism was no new thing in much of that region of country when John Murray made his first visit there in 1771, Dr. De Bavenille had been in the habit since 1742, of travelling to preach, twice a year, and was from home two, three, and four weeks at a time. His visits were generally in the western part of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia. Almost all denominations of Christians would invite him to preach in their places of worship, and he would always preach the Gospel free. Letter from his son, to Rev. Thomas Whitmore, 1789. In 1763, Rev. Israel Acrelius, Provost of the Swedish Churches in America, made a visit to the Dunkers, at Ephrata, Penn. and found Universalism there. The following year, he visited the Moravians, at Bethlehem, and there found an avowal of the same by the English Moravian ferry-man. See pp. 887, 417 of new edition of Acrelius’ History of New Sweden, recently published as Vol. XI, of Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

In 1774, “N. Pomp, V. D. M., published at Philadelphia a Review of Siegroik’s Everlasting Gospel, an English edition of which had been brought out through the instrumentality of Dr. De Bavenille, (as has always been believed) at Germantown, in 1753. In the preface, Mr. Pomp, speaking of the doctrine of the book in review, says: "No where has this doctrine been more successful, and made greater progress than here in Pennsylvania."

The following may be added to the above list of preachers: Donald Holmes, Frederic Co., Va.; David Thomas, J. Moore, Louden Co., Va.; Mr. Hawkins and Mr. Pollard, Md.; William McIntyre, of Virginia, may not have commenced preaching till the following year, but it is probable that he was engaged in the work at the time this Convention was held. To the eastward, Isaac Foster, and Gamaliel Reynolds, in Conn.; Jonathan Sewall, Zebulon Streeter, Joab Young, James Ballou, and David Ballou, in N. H.; William Farwell, [or Farewell] in Vt.; George Richards, in Boston, Mass., and vicinity; Michael Coffin, in New York, or Canada. Add to these the survivors whose names are given in note 6, p 330 of Quarterly for July 1874, viz., Messrs. Rich, Barns, Sumner, Wright, Ethanan Winchester, Noah Murray, Z. Sothe and Dr. De Bavenille, and we have with the seven named above as being at the Convention, a total of thirty-one Universalist preachers in 1790. As some of these names will be new to the reader of these pages, the following are the sources of information concerning them:

"Gloucester, Dec. 16, 1787.

I was but one Sunday at home before I set out for Portsmouth, where formerly dwelt my greatly valued friend and fellow-laborer, Mr. Parker. God in His Providence has raised up a man to supply his place, whom I should have least expected; but God’s ways are not our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts,—He will send by whom He will send, He will do as seemeth good in His sight, and He does all things well. The gentleman that now preaches in Mr. Parker’s meeting is a Mr. Sewall, an eminent lawyer, and a very distinguished poet. But his soul is in love with Divine truth, and he says it is his meat and drink to do the will of God. I wish it may be the will of God to keep this faithful man from the evil that is in this world; then indeed he will be a burning and a shining light."

"Boston, Dec. 9, 1790.

I am pleased and happy on hearing the account you give me of Mr. Surjent. Yes, the wilderness is indeed blossoming as the rose; and the wilderness of human nature will in God’s time become as the garden of God. I mentioned to you in my last, if I am not mistaken, a Mr. Coffin, from the confines of Canada, who came here to see me, and learn the proceedings of the Convention,—and that there are two churches going to be formed there. It does seem as if the Lord in His grace and mercy was saying, Lengthen your cords, and strengthen your stakes—the sound is going forth from one end of the heavens unto the other.”—Unpublished Letters of Rev. John Murray.

Rev. David Thomas, in a letter written from “Loudon County, North Fork of Goose
The laymen whose names are preserved in the papers which I have examined, were the five already named from Philadelphia, Jedidiah Davis, Cohansy, N. J., William Eugene Inlay,7 Tom's River, N. J. The records, as examined in 1838, by Rev. A. C. Thomas, contained three other names. These I have not been able to ascertain.


Creek, Oct. 3, 1766," gives an account of an Association recently held in his neighborhood, says that he preached, "chiefly on Politics." [He was a zealous Federalist.] "And Jerry Moore preached on Christ's having two garments, one for himself, and another for him who had none. I calculated the number of the audience to be near two thousand."

Rev. Duncan McLean, writing from "Frederick County, Virginia, Nov. 13, 1768," says, "I have embraced this opportunity to inform you of the state of the cause of truth here, in some small measure." We are in number about eleven who have publicly owned the truth, one of whom has borne witness thereof in public, and I am in hopes will continue to do so. His name is Donald Holmes."


7In the papers of some of the subsequent years, Mr. Inlay is called an "Elder," a name which, according to the Plan of Church Government, was to be considered synonymous with "Preacher." I judge that he was a lay preacher. He was a man of ability, and his services were in demand by the Convention, as an able and ready writer. In 1792 he writes to the Convention a request, "that they will be pleased to devise some way to assist me in satisfying Mr. Dobson for printing a small pamphlet of mine last year, which was written in defence of the Common Cause, and I trust had the approbation of the Convention."
The Minutes of the Proceedings of this Convention are not among the papers preserved; but the principal business transacted was the adoption of the Articles of Faith, and a Plan of Church Government, the consideration of sundry Recommendations, to be finally acted on hereafter, and the appointment of John Murray and William Eugene Imlay, to present an Address to President Washington.  

As there will be frequent occasion hereafter to refer to these Articles of Faith, especially in considering the causes which led to the adoption of The Winchester Confession, thirteen years later, they are here inserted as officially published in the pamphlet referred to in the last note. And as the whole has long been out of print, a synopsis of the entire pamphlet is also given. It is prefaced with the following Introduction:

"Under a deep sense of the unchangeable and universal love of God to mankind in a Redeemer, and in humble thankfulness to His kind providence in permitting us to assemble and deliberate, agreeably to the dictates of our consciences,

8 With the exception of the Address to President Washington, these matters were at once published by the Convention, in pamphlet form, bearing this title page: "Articles of Faith and Plan of Church Government, composed and adopted by the churches Believing in the Salvation of All Men, met in Philadelphia, on the 25th of May, 1790. To which are added sundry Recommendations, and a Circular Letter, addressed to the Churches in the United States Believing the same Doctrine. Philadelphia: Printed by Thomas Dobson. MDCCXC." 16mo., pp. 16. The "Recommendations" were drafted on the suggestion of the church in Frederick county, Va., as set forth in their letter: "In addition to the subjects mentioned in the Circular Letter as necessary to be considered in the Convention, we beg leave to suggest the few following, they being, as we conceive, interesting to us, and on which we wish to have your judgment, that we may act in harmony with our brethren, (as much as possible) in all things. We wish to be uniform in our sentiments and manners respecting War, Giving of Evidence in Law, manner of Marriage, with any other thing of importance to the Cause of Truth, or the Order of the Churches." The Address, and the President's Reply will be found in all the early editions of the Life of Murray. Both produced no small stir in the newspapers of the day, according to the following extract from an unpublished letter of Mr. Murray's, written from Boston, Dec. 9, 1760: "There has been a vast denial said in the public prints this way, in consequence of our saying in the Address, We are the first society since the promulgation of the Gospel, professing this peculiar doctrine, who have formed themselves into an Independent Church; from whence they undertake to prove that we ourselves in full Convention acknowledge that none of the first churches held this peculiar doctrine. They also add that the President gave a back stroke to the Convention, when he spoke of our being accountable beings, inasmuch as the Universalists do not hold themselves accountable! Much has been said in the papers for and against this matter."
without fear of civil or ecclesiastical power; we, the representatives of sundry societies in the United States, believing in the Salvation of all Men, convened on the 25th of May, 1790, in the city of Philadelphia, by an invitation from the brethren in the said city, holding the same doctrine, and having implored the direction and blessing of God upon our endeavours to extend the knowledge of His Name, have adopted the following Articles and Plan of Church Government.

CHAP. I.

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

Sect. 1. Of the Holy Scriptures. We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to contain a revelation of the perfections and will of God, and the rule of faith and practice.

Sect. 2. Of the Supreme Being. We believe in One God, infinite in all His perfections, and that these perfections are all modifications of infinite, adorable, incomprehensible and unchangeable love.

Sect. 3. Of the Mediator. We believe that there is one Mediator between God and Man, the man Christ Jesus, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; who, by giving Himself a ransom for all, hath redeemed them to God by His blood; and who, by the merit of His death, and the efficacy of His Spirit, will finally restore the whole human race to happiness.

Sect. 4. Of the Holy Ghost. We believe in the Holy Ghost, whose office it is to make known to sinners the truth of their salvation, through the medium of the Holy Scriptures, and to reconcile the hearts of the children of men to God, and thereby to dispose them to genuine holiness.

Sect. 5. Of Good Works. We believe in the obligation of the moral law, as the rule of life; and we hold that the love of God manifest to man in a Redeemer, is the best means of producing obedience to that law, and promoting a holy, active and useful life.”

Chapter II. contains a “Plan of Church Government,” set forth in nine sections, embracing the following particulars, “Of a Church, the Officers of a Church, the Call and Ordination of the Officers of a Church, of Divine Worship, Ordinances, The Admission and Exclusion of Members, of Marriage, The Instruction of Children, the Communion of Churches.”
Chapter III. was called "Recommendations," and contained five sections on the following subjects, "War, going to Law, holding Slaves, Oaths, Submission to Government."

"A Church," was defined as consisting "of a number of Believers, united by covenant, for the purposes of maintaining the public worship of God, the preaching of the Gospel, ordaining officers, preserving order and peace among its members, and relieving the poor." The officers were "Bishops and Deacons." "The terms Bishop, Elder, Minister, Pastor and Teacher." were held to be the same, "intended only to express the different capacities in which the same officer is called to act." Each church was empowered to decide on the "Call," "qualifications and gifts" of those "who wish to devote themselves to God in the ministry," and to "solemnly set apart and ordain such persons; and a certificate of such appointment shall be to them a sufficient ordination to preach the Gospel, and to administer such ordinances herein after mentioned, as to them may seem proper, wherever they may be called by Divine Providence."

"Deacons shall be chosen by the members of the Church, and ordained in like manner as Bishops or Ministers. Their business (besides receiving and applying the pious and charitable contributions of the church, for the support of the laborers of the Gospel, and the relief of the poor,) shall be to attend to the secular affairs of the church, to keep an exact register of all the persons who shall be born, baptized, admitted to communion, married, or who shall remove or die, belonging to the Society; also an account of the admission and dismission of members, and of all the business of the Church."

With regard to the Ordinances none were insisted upon as obligatory, for as a diversity of opinions had prevailed in all ages of the Church, in regard to them, "and as this diversity of opinions has often been the means of dividing Christians, who were united by the same spirit in more essential articles," this Plan proposed and agreed "to admit all such persons who hold the articles of our faith, and maintain good works, into membership, whatever their opinions may be as to the nature, form or obligation of any of the ordinances." It was further
agreed that if a church believing in the ordinances, should have a minister who could not perform them "contrary to his conscience," "a neighboring minister, who shall hold like principles respecting the ordinance or ordinances required by any member, shall be invited to perform them; or if it be thought more expedient, each church may appoint or ordain one of their own members to administer the ordinances in such way as to each church may seem proper."

There was also the following section on The Instruction of Children:

"We believe it to be the duty of all parents to instruct their children in the principles of the Gospel, as the best means to inspire them with the love of virtue, and to promote in them good manners, and habits of industry and sobriety. As a necessary introduction to the knowledge of the Gospel, we recommend the institution of a school or schools, to be under the direction of every church; in which shall be taught reading, writing, arithmetic and psalmody. We recommend further, that provision be made for instructing poor children in the said schools gratis. As the fullest discovery of the perfections and will of God, and of the whole duty of man, is contained in the Bible, we wish that Divine book to be read by the youth of our churches as early and frequently as possible; and that they should be instructed therein at stated meetings appointed for that purpose."

"The Communion of the Churches" was to be accomplished by a "Convention of the Churches held annually by deputys or messengers to inquire into, and report the state of each church, respecting the admission of members, and the progress of the Gospel; . . . and to send forth ministers to propagate the Gospel in places where it has not been regularly preached, and thereby to form and establish new churches." "All the general acts of the Convention, which relate to the interest of particular churches, shall be issued only by way of advice, or recommendation."

Of the "Recommendations," the one of greatest historical interest, as showing the opposition of our Fathers to human bondage, and the ground of that opposition, was this:
"Of Holding Slaves. We believe it to be inconsistent with
the union of the human race in a common Saviour, and the
obligations to mutual and universal love, which flow from that
union, to hold any part of our fellow-creatures in bondage.
We therefore recommend a total refraining from the African
trade, and the adoption of prudent measures for the gradual
abolition of the slavery of the negroes in our country, and for
the instruction and education of their children in English lit-
ature, and in the principles of the Gospel." 9

The Circular Letter is also in this pamphlet, and is worthy
of being preserved from oblivion.

"The Elders and Brethren in the belief of the Universal
Salvation of all men, through our Lord Jesus Christ, met in
Convention in Philadelphia, on the 25th of May, and contin-
ued by adjournment, until the 8th of June, 1790.
To the Elders and Brethren in the same belief throughout
the United States of America, we wish Health, Peace and
Happiness.

Beloved in our Common Lord and Saviour,
We herewith send you a copy of the Articles of Faith and
Plan of Church Government which we have, with uncommon
love and unanimity, agreed upon in Convention. The Arti-
cles are few, but they contain the essentials of the Gospel.
We thought it improper to require an assent to opinions that
are merely speculative, or to introduce words, in expressing
the articles of our belief, which have been the cause of unchris-
tian controversies. The Plan of Church Government is nearly
that of the Congregational Church. We conceive it to be
most friendly to Christian Liberty, and most agreeable to the
Word of God. We have submitted several matters of conse-
quence to your consideration, under the title of RECOMMENDA-
tions. They form as yet no part of our system of Faith or
Practice as a Church,—but we hope the time is not very dis-
tant, when the progressive light of the Gospel shall banish all
the error and vice, which are the sources of the present disor-
ders and miseries of human society.

We rejoice in the progress of the long-imprisoned truth of
God's Universal Love to Mankind, and that He hath, in His
infinite goodness, raised up so many faithful witnesses of late
years, to declare it in many parts of our country. We hope
and pray that this glorious truth may continue to prevail

9 The Recommendations will be found in full in the Century of Universalism, pp 148
—150.
against anti-Christian darkness and error; and that all who profess to believe it, may be led by the inward manifestation of God's love, to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, and thereby to confute the objections that are urged against us, by those who deny the infinite extent of the mercy and power of God.

We request that such of you as are formed into Churches, would send deputies or messengers to meet in the Convention to be held in Philadelphia on the 25th of next May; and that such of you as are not formed into Churches, would associate for that purpose, and concur in sending Representatives to the Convention.

Signed by order, and in behalf of the Convention, by William Worth, Moderator.

Attest: Artis Seagrave, Clerk."

That the conclusions embodied in these Articles of Faith, and in the Plan of Church Government, were not hastily reached, nor without the giving up of some strong preferences, for the sake of unity of effort, may be supposed from the length of time occupied in their consideration, and is clearly shown by one of the documents sent out two years later. The Creed, although couched in language that may seem to be designedly ambiguous, making allowance for a large diversity of opinion to be entertained by those who should accept it as a common platform, was intended as a statement of the Trinitarianism of the Convention. This is evident from the subsequent action of the Philadelphia Church, which had adopted these Articles, in ruling out the application of an avowed Unitarian, for membership, on the ground that their creed would not allow them to accept him; and also from the action of some of the Churches in fellowship with the Convention, as will be more fully presented hereafter, in adopting, as supplemental to

30 "No doubt Bro. Gordon mentioned to you a Mr. Palmer, who was preaching with us when he left this city for Boston. This young man offered himself to become a member of our Church, but before the time for admitting him, his sentiments were suspected of being Socinian, if not Deistical. He was accordingly examined, and confessed that he did believe Jesus to be the natural son of Joseph and Mary, begotten by ordinary generation. This made his membership with us inadmissible at that time. He still continues the same, and hath withdrawn from us, and hath gotten other places to preach in where he can preach that sentiment freely, and that to crowded audiences." Letter of Philadelphia Church to George Richards, March 14, 1792.
these Articles, others which explicitly set forth, explain and defend Unitarian views. On the other hand, the statement was so mildly made as to be objected to in another quarter, as being a virtual denial of the Deity of Christ.\textsuperscript{11}

As we pursue our investigation of this question of Creeds, there is abundant testimony to the fact that avowed Unitarian Universalism is much older in our denomination than has been generally supposed; and there is no doubt that a record of the debates on the adoption of these Articles of Faith, in 1790, would show that arguments were brought to bear which rendered it impossible to preserve unity if a more stringent avowal of Trinitarianism had been insisted on.\textsuperscript{12}

The Minutes of the session of 1791, have not been preserved. The Circular Letter was published in the "Free Universal Magazine," and states, "We are happy in being able to inform you, that the request of the Convention last year that those

\textsuperscript{11} "We have met with some difficulty in forming our Church in this place, from a good old friend, who, thinking the language of Convention not sufficiently clear and strong in establishing the Doctrine of the Divinity of our Saviour, wished to make some Amendments in the Articles of Faith, before he could sign them. I could not give my consent to any alteration, insomuch as the language was Scriptural, and I conceived sufficiently clear and full to the purpose, and that to alter the Articles I feared would be construed as a tacit declaration that we supposed the members of that Convention not sound in the faith. Mr. Richards heartily joined with me, so that after many evening's debate only one joined with our old friend, and upwards of forty male members adopted the Articles of Convention as the Articles of their Faith—not as the Articles of Convention, but as the Oracles of God. We are now in a fair way of going on, though in order to make peace, we must let this good old friend do something by way of addition, then we shall go on I trust peaceably, and therefore prosperously."


\textsuperscript{12} The immediate results of this Convention were an increased interest in the cause in the City of Philadelphia, where Mr. Murray preached almost nightly, from the date of his arrival, June 3d, until his departure July 20th, to very large congregations. See a letter of Mrs. Murray's quoted on p. 858, of the Life of Murray, Boston edition, 1879.

The fame of the Convention also run before Mr. Murray on his homeward journey, and prepared the way for his warm reception everywhere. Writing from Gloucester, Nov. 1, 1790, he says: "Let me now give you some account of my journey since I left you. Our proceedings in Philadelphia run on before me all the way, and gave us as a people much more respectability. In every place where I had formerly preached the Word of God I was sought after, and in many places where I had not. I was surprised at the appearance of things in the Jerseys, and was sorry it was not in my power to stay there longer. In New York I had no place to preach in, and the weather was intolerably hot. I made what haste I could to Connecticut, and there, from my first entrance into the State in every town the Meeting-houses were opened to receive me, and many faithful souls I met, where I did not expect to meet any."
persons who believed with us in the Salvation of All Men, should associate and form themselves into Churches, has been complied with in a degree which has equalled our most sanguine expectations. Several churches have likewise formed, which are too remote to unite with us."

The letters brought by the Representatives or delegates of six Churches, show that the Philadelphia Church had organized since the last session, that it then had thirty-nine members, was "as yet without a settled Minister, but have given a call to our brother Duncan Mc'Lean, of Virginia." The Church in Shiloh, Cumberland County, West Jersey, had organized the proceeding February, with nineteen members. The Church in Upper Freehold, N. J., organized during the past year, was "composed of the following persons: Michael Mount, Daniel Johnes, For'rn Mount, Wm. Barton, Meribah Barton, Margaret Mount, Ann Pidgeon and Wm. Eugene Inlay."

[To be continued.]

13 Mr. Murray was called in 1790, but declined, on account of the strong opposition of his Eastern friends; Mr. Mc'Lean accepted the call in 1791, but subsequently "re-considered the matter, on account of his family affairs, the great work, and his usefulness in that part of God's vineyard, and some other reasons." George Richards was called in 1792, the Church agreeing to "raise the sum of one hundred and fifty pounds per year, certain, and fifty pounds more if possible to get it subscribed." But no pastor was settled till 1796, when Thomas Jones came over from Wales, and remained with them till 1804. The quotations above are from the letter of invitation to Mr. Richards.

14 The Representatives to this session were Anthony Cuthbert, Israel Israel, James Moore, William Perkins, Thomas Fitzgerald, Thomas Francis, Thomas Moore, Philadelphia; Rev. Nicholas Cox, Kingwood; Rev. David Evans, New Britain; Rev. Moses Winchester, Shiloh; Amos Cress, Cape May; Wm. Engene Inlay, Upper Freehold; Rev. Wm. Hawkins, Maryland; Rev. Wm. Worth, Pittsgrove; Rev. Aris Seagave, Pilsgrove.

NEW SERIES. VOL. XII 2
ARTICLE II.

"The Safest Creed."¹

We have read the volume with this title, by Rev. O. B. Frothingham, with much interest. We like its freshness, liveliness, and rhetorical richness. Because of these traits it will be read with eagerness by a certain class who may not be so ready to look after the reasonableness of all the author's opinions, as to be delighted with his style. While we regard him as a prince among rhetoricians, we cannot help regarding him as an expert worker-up of rhetorical coruscations rather than a plain worker out of theological problems.

The author has confidence in a creed—the true creed as he understands it. He thinks no creed safe "that puts itself in antagonism to the natural human heart." In this we think him to be right.

And what is the creed of this radical author? He undertakes to tell us in the second chapter of his book. It is 1. The acceptance of the fact of the religious sentiment in man; 2. The recognition of God by this sentiment; 3. God revealing himself; 4. Christianity as the most worthy form of the religion needed for man yet manifest; 5. Jesus as the highest manifestation of God which the world has yet known; 6. Immortality; 7. As much of the Bible as answers to the radical's cultured reason.

In definition of some parts of this creed, the author states that he does not bow to Jesus or sit submissively at his feet, nor call him Master nor Lord. And as to immortality, he receives it as a truth, not because Jesus taught it nor demonstrated it by his rising, but because it has been somehow held by the most advanced among men. Summing up his creed he states that the radical believes the world is to be humanized; that the men and women in it are to be made nobler and better; that society is to be regenerated by the action of

the natural laws of reason and goodness. He believes in the higher education of all men and women, in the largest possession of rights, the freest sharing of opportunities, the most cordial participation in privileges, the richest unfolding of powers; in science, philosophy, literature, art, industry, commerce, the most liberal communication of nation with nation, and man with man. He believes in developing each and binding all together in human bonds; he believes in the good time coming, the kingdom of God, the heavenly Republic, in which educated reason and experienced conscience shall be the ground of order, peace and felicity."

In the second chapter of the book, entitled, "The Radical's Root," our author, after various similitudes illustrative of rooting and being rooted, and averring that the radical is one who "can never rest until he gets at the roots of things," after rightfully complimenting the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, gives it as his conclusion, that he who will plant himself in the heart of the New Testament, who will find his way into the heart of Jesus himself, will have the divinest qualities and at the same time the most human; will be able to submit himself to the Supreme and give himself to his brother. He does not think, however, that Jesus exhausted humanity, but that its excellencies may be sought elsewhere among the wise and good of our race in every age and clime.

In this statement of faith we fail to see any thing superior to what we have taught us in the plain, primitive Christian Universalism of the New Testament. That accepts the fact of the existence of the religious principle in man, the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, and a revelation of God in accordance with these truths, in Christ as the highest manifestation of God which man has yet known or needs to know, since the religion of Jesus embraces the highest spiritual culture and capability — God all in all; in the immortality of man, his personal, spiritual life beyond the present, and his eternal growth and progress in truth and holiness; in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as confirming these truths, and giving man the profoundest
moral and spiritual instruction that can be found in any other Scripture under heaven, with the presentation of a living person embodying in human form all the excellencies of character and life which this pre-eminent revelation commends and requires. So far we fail to see anything whatever in this radical creed for which we could be induced to exchange our own. Wherein it agrees with ours, we welcome it; but as for its having any deeper root, look which way we will into the infinite, we confess ourselves unable to see it. That, as Mr. Frothingham affirms, "the true radical is known by his patience, cheerfulness, serenity, trust, singleness of purpose, weight of his opinion, freedom from prejudice, openness to discovery, thankfulness for light," that he stands "four-square to all the winds that blow," may be good fact as well as poetry. So does the Christian believer in the Universalism of the New Testament. It is his chief joy that he is rooted and grounded in the love of Christ that passeth human conception, and has its depths in the infinite fulness of God.

Seeing nothing, therefore, in these first three chapters that would induce us to step out of our own glorious faith into the radicalism of Mr. Frothingham, we have something more to say of the book before us.

In the fourth chapter we have quite an earnest discourse on "The Joy of a Free Faith." Our author claims that the Radical Faith is the freest of all; but we have only his assertion for it. If it makes free from the superstition connected with other faiths, and from dogmas which have been always hurtful to Christianity while connected with it, there is nothing in radicalism that we can see, taking our author's definition of it, which makes it any freer than the plain Christianity of the New Testament. For instance, he tells us that the rational faith "restores death to its legitimate place among the phenomena of nature, and by so doing emancipates mankind from a crushing fear." Just this do we say of that Gospel which brings life and immortality to light, delivering those from the fear of death who, because of this fear, "we're
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all their lifetime subject to bondage." But when he says that rationalism leaves "questions respecting the hereafter open to science and philosophy, bidding theology be silent and reason speak," what more has he to say than the veriest heathen of the olden time? We fail to see that his faith can claim superiority to that given us in the plain teachings of the Gospel of Christ. These show us a theology always in agreement with reason, and never in fear of what reason may have to communicate.

With all the pleasant rhetoric of our author about being "footloose" and "out at sea," in his freedom, caring but little for incidental arrivals, we cannot help thinking that it is of some consequence to have anchorage in the truth, to be rooted and grounded in it. And as to freedom, we have never yet seen any definition of it that seemed superior to that to which the Teacher of all ages invites us: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." We think our author has yet to learn that the Christianity of the New Testament always and everywhere encourages the largest and most wholesome mental and spiritual freedom. Neither Mr. Frothingham nor any other teacher of modern radicalism has given us a better rule than that of the apostle: "prove all things; hold fast that which is good. I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ." We prefer Paul's idea of being "footloose," and having the widest sea for voyaging to that of Mr. Frothingham.

Chapter fifth gives us a brilliant dissertation on "Living Faith." And what is this in the estimation of our author? A faith which aims for the creation and consecration of character. And yet we do not see that any character at which radicalism aims is superior to that demanded by Christianity. If the New Testament insists on the acceptance of certain truths on the part of men, it is no less positive respecting the moral and spiritual life of the one who accepts them. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness. By their fruits ye shall know them." This is the Christian rule, as plain as daylight. If much of the teaching of the Church has
been different from this, we agree with all that our author says in condemnation of it. But we cannot because of this lose sight of the fact that no radicalism can be stronger than that of the New Testament in respect to the living faith which it requires of men. The object of Protestantism, as our author affirms, is to bring souls to Christ. It may err in some of its convictions as to what this work may be, as we believe it has erred egregiously, lamentably. But nothing is plainer than that the Gospel is a call to a new life in Christ, a life of self-sacrifice, holiness, love, the highest life that men or angels can realize. "Come unto me; learn of me," is the call of Jesus. And in this coming and learning is involved the heavenly life. The object of apostolic preaching was, that men might "grow into Christ in all things. Whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." We have no thought that modern radicalism can find any better business than this, in the way of creating and consecrating character. If it can, what is it? Mr. Frothingham has not told us.

His coolness in meeting the accusation that radicalism does not form and establish Churches, and organize religious associations, and send out preachers and pastors, does not seem to us very complimentary to the great interests in behalf of which he has written this volume. He confesses that the radicals do not want these aids in their work. "That our papers and magazines flourish briefly and disappear, is a sign that the living water of this dispensation finds living streams more congenial than standing pools." Fine rhetoric again, but we do not see the point made in it against organized, and systematic and persistent effort for the promulgation of principles, and the successful working of practices which our benighted humanity is so much needing at this hour. That radicalism has a work to do, that of "bringing men to themselves" — a very good business, by the way — our author is quite sure; that if this new faith lives, it must be through the fidelity of its friends to the great charge they
have in hand. We think as much, and therefore deem it a
very doubtful indication of their wisdom to ignore the rightful
means of extending the knowledge and operative power of
their principles. If these are worthy of being stated and de-
defended they are worth working for, heartily, intensely, con-
stantly. It is by such earnest working that all reforms go on.
Christianity has thus done so much of her good work for the
world. Radicalism must make up its mind for a similar live-
liness on its part; and the valiant soldiers of its army may
well and duly consider the vast missionary work there is be-
fore them. Failing in this, their victories will not be very
notable. Humanity will be elevated and saved by a religion
that has the hardest and most unpromising work in it.

In "The Gospel of To-day," which is the theme of the next
chapter of this volume, our author has many truthful things
to say. We cannot agree with him that no Gospel is the
same yesterday, to-day and forever, because yesterday and for-
ever are the same. Christ's Gospel has this peculiarity be-
cause it affirms and demands that which man's spiritual na-
ture needs evermore. It involves the highest good unto
which he can attain, and is ever calling him to "glory, honor,
incorruptibleness, eternal life." In Christ's day, Paul's day,
Luther's day, Channing's day, Theodore Parker's day, in all
days, it stands for the same thing — man's spiritual enlighten-
ment and progress. It is needed now to meet the emergen-
cies of our own times, just as it was needed when it first
went out to call the nations to repentance and faith in the
Only Begotten of the Father.

The affirmation of our author that men are not sinners, be-
cause there are so many in the present inventive, driving and
progressive age who have no such thought respecting them-
soever or others, does not seem to us a very wise affirmation.
And we cannot possibly see the agreement of such reasoning
with the vivid representations of human evil conduct
given us in his chapter on "The Infernal and the Celestial
Loves." We should surely think, from these presentations,
that our author had in view those described by the apostle,
who were governed by their animal and not by their higher spiritual nature, who were violators of all law human and divine, and thus sinners, transgressors, disobedient. We find no stronger description of sin and sinning than that given in the case of the fallen woman, on page 189. It makes no difference as to names, weakness, misfortune, miseducation or what not, it is the transgression of the eternal law; and from this Christ came to save men. For this the Gospel is preached, for this the true Christian Church stands, and will forever stand, till sin is finished and universal obedience to this law prevails.

Our author accounts the ethics of the New Testament as very beautiful, designed to work admirably when men and women shall be men and women no longer; and but quite unfitted for this Western world where men listen to Christian instruction on Sundays, but fail to recognize it on other days of the week. "Love does not work well, is not searching enough, clear enough, quickening enough." We are unable to see how he makes this out from his reading of the New Testament. That there are so many now who are hearers and not doers of the Christian word is no more than what we have seen in the past, but it is no disproof of the fact that their greatest need is this love to God and man living within them, which would make them most really efficient in all work pertaining to human material advancement or moral excellence, and which would surely make them instrumental in advancing the interests of the heavenly kingdom here. His pretense that love as Christianity recommends it is an exceedingly inefficient agency in the active work of human life, seems to us blindly at variance with that excellent definition of it, given by the apostle in 1 Corinthians: "Love suffereth long, and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, never faileth." If any words can express strength, we think we have them here. Napoleon the First, whose intellectual perceptions are entitled even in this day of advanced radicalism to respectful consideration,
regarded Jesus as the greatest of all human leaders and desti-
tined to be most effective in his mission, because of the prin-
ciple on which this mission was based—love. The pre-em-
inent excellency of Christianity is that its religion is fitted for
all conditions of righteous practical life among men. Its
constant rule is well stated in the direction of the apostle,
“Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.”

What our Western world and all the busy world most needs
is to have its activities permeated and blessed with the pas-
sive virtues required by the Gospel of Christ. That our
driving, dashing, headstrong life of materialism and earthli-
ness cannot consent to respect these virtues and to be directed
by them according to the Christian requirement, is all the
worse for those who are in it, and for the human society that
is content mainly with such life. No high and permanent
civilization can come of it. And if we are to have such a
blessing in our own or in any other nation, the morality and
religion which give life to it will have to be built up on the
basis of the Sermon on the Mount, and in that love of which
we have already spoken. We have all confidence in that
force recognized in these grand words of apostolic wisdom:
“For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus
judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that
he died for all, that they who live should not henceforth live
unto themselves, but unto him who died for them and rose
again.” This love-power is what the world is waiting for.
We have no thought that its great interests would fail to go
prosperously forward under such an impelling influence. To
pretend that the world will not consent to it, is but an admis-
sion that human civilization and progress will prove a failure.

Our author’s reflection on the picture of Jesus in the wil-
derness (p. 128) appears to lack that appreciation of the para-
ble which it deserves. It was spoken to show the worth of
an erring and wandering one of our race, to teach that heaven
rejoices in the return of the solitary wanderer to the provisions
and enjoyments of its grace. It seems a strange fancy that
the beauty and main intent of this parable should be lightly
esteemed, because its author did not give instead of it an agricultural dissertation on turning the wilderness into a fruitful field! We think this must be original with Mr. F. We have never met with the suggestion before.

In his chapter on "The Scientific Aspect of Prayer," our author admits in some very strong language all that the Christian has ever claimed for this exercise on the part of God's children. He says, "The real question at issue is this: Is God, or is he not, an individual sentient being, a maker, ruler, administrator, in the ordinary sense of these words? If he is, the ordinary discussion about prayer is at an end. Prayer is entirely admissible under that supposition. No one doubted the literal efficacy of prayer before this belief in the individual creating, ruling, guiding God was doubted." Among the many objections offered to Prof. Tyndall's "Prayer Test," he names three which he considers valid and unanswerable, for which we have not room in this paper, but which led him to conclude that Prof. Tyndall's suggestion is not likely to be adopted.

Our author's reason for discarding the common idea of prayer is a very natural one. He does not recognize in God a personal being. The unspeakable fulness of the universe seems to him to disprove the need or utility of prayer. In the survey of this immensity, "the conception of an individual God becomes absolutely impossible." Not more so than it ever has been to finite men. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" These are very old queries, and as we think, capable of being answered in accordance with the idea of God as a person. We can "by searching find out God." His children have been finding him out in all the past of their existence. That we cannot "find him out to perfection," is self-evident; if we could we should be equal to him. But because of his unsearchableness, because of his infinitude, we are not necessarily to question his personality. The immensity of creation has always been one of the realities pressing itself upon the attention of mortals. But most of the wisest of them have
been ready to acknowledge the existence of a creative, intelligent, supplying and supervising power. That God is so great is no reason why his children may not communicate with him in prayer. We like the reply of the boy to the unbeliever, Collins, when asked by the latter where he was going. "To Church," was the reply. "And why are you going there?" "To worship God," was the boy's answer. "What kind of a God?" asked the questioner, "Is he a little or a great God?" "He is so great that the heaven of heavens cannot contain him, and so little that he can dwell in my heart." We are unable to see how this idea of the immensity of the universe should weaken that of the personality of its infinite author and ruler.

In concluding his chapter on "The Scientific Aspects of Prayer," our author says, "All prayer resolves itself into one position: Thy will be done! They who discover and acknowledge that the world they live in is the complete embodiment of the perfect will, are they who most habitually and feelingly offer that pure petition;—theirs is the living piety, for theirs is the living God, and the living communion with him." Surely this is very much like the Christian's conviction, one who believes in the Divine Sovereignty and in the God "of whom, through whom, and unto whom are all things." But what "will" is our author thinking of as he thus writes? whose will? for will, to our simple apprehension is always connected with mind, intelligence, reason. Pantheism does not give us a God with a will above that of man. But the will of God as Christianity reveals it, is the will of a personal being, the one to whom Jesus prayed, and to whom we may come with our human petitions. If this view of God and of prayer be not the true one to him, we see no sense whatever in the prayerful utterance, "Thy will be done."

In chapter tenth, entitled "The Dying and the Living God," we have a very strong and truthful statement in many respects of the old sacrificial theology, that of God himself coming into the world and actually dying for his sinful creatures. It is the repetition in a new form of the absurdities involved in
this dogma. Men have heard too much of a dying God in Christ, when they most need the living one. Surely; and this living God is the very one which Christ makes known to us: "God not of the dead, but of the living," because he is the life, the soul of all; because "all live unto him." His gospel is a living, vital word. It comes to quicken men, to inspire them to righteousness, to urge them on in every new reform, and give them hopefulness continually as to the possibilities of our moral and spiritual nature. We do not see that our author, in all his sparkling passages has any stronger language in support of the idea than such as can be found in the New Testament, where Christian believers are regarded as co-workers with God; as conquerors and more than conquerors through his spirit; as those who were to be "steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as they knew that their labor in him (with or through him) was not in vain." We agree with our author in the concluding words of this chapter: "Time has been when fear and darkness were the spirits that saved the world. In the time to come the world will be saved by light, and joy and hope."

In his chapters on "The Immortalities of Man" and "The Victory over Death," the author considers the great question of the future life of man. He deems man in one sense immortal, because "the death of the body is its transformation; the emancipated force takes other shape, flows in new directions, and performs fresh work; in another sense we have an immortality in the memory of those that love us, and a grander one still in that we live perpetually in humanity, an idea which for thousands of years has been rooted in the world; Pythagoras, Plato and the Positivists of our own time holding it." These immortality, all very well in their way, and all inevitable, do not however meet the question as to the personal identity and continued life of man beyond his present earthly existence, a doctrine which Mr. F. seems to think tends to encourage egotism, but which seems to us one of the most important of all questions to any one really con-
scious of the capabilities of our nature, and with a heart warmed with its purest and strongest affections. If in the language of our author, "all do not hope for it, thinking the hope audacious and extravagant; if all do not claim it because of an excessive modesty," it is because such ones need to be awakened to a consciousness of their own nature and its true relations to the temporal and spiritual, the present and the eternal. To have no desire to enjoy a life beyond the present is not the rule but the exception, in opposition to all the wisest and best of our race. The fact that there is now "a profound scepticism in our modern society," that "worldly men whether of business or pleasure are thinking of other things and giving the matter little attention," does by no means lessen the magnitude of the great question itself, "If a man die shall he live again?"

The strength of faith in the resurrection, our author says, "lies in those elemental feelings, called by Mr. Parker 'the consciousness of immortality.'" Why then, since the advent of Jesus to our world, has there been such an increase of faith in the future life? Long before Christ, Plato, Socrates, and others endeavored to draw from these very elemental feelings the conclusion that they should exist hereafter; but none of them had the assurance of Paul who could say, "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

The death and resurrection of Christ meets and answers these longings after immortality as no other facts in history ever did. What if this record of Jesus be doubted yet by the masses of mankind? What if, as our author alleges, science, chemistry, historical study, criticism, temporal activities and worldly interests, devotion to earthly affairs, release from the rule of priest and Church, disinculce men to regard the old authorities respecting Christ's resurrection and its indication of the rising of mankind into the immortal life? This is no new story. It was something thus nearly two thousand
years ago, when Paul preached "Jesus and the resurrection" at Mars Hill. Some mocked; others said, "We will hear thee again of this matter." What then? Was Paul's testimony false? What if this disinclination to receive the statements of the New Testament respecting the resurrection be as rife at the present as our author affirms? Is this the least evidence that the alleged facts respecting this event recorded in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, are not among the clearest that ever stood out in human history? We affirm that they are, and that those that have denied them and attempted to disprove them in every age, have signally failed. From Celsus down to Strauss and Renan, the same criticism has been going on, with just about the same success. That "something happened" in Judea eighteen hundred years ago, which gave the Christian apostles an assurance strong enough to face the world with the declaration of Christ's resurrection, even Strauss is obliged to admit; and Renan makes a sorry pretence enough that Mary Magdalene was the author of the unfounded story of the resurrection, as also that St. Paul's epilepsy had much to do with his mental and spiritual unsoundness.

Is this the kind of criticism that "takes away the risen form of Jesus," as Mr. F. tells us? If so, what is it worth? and what intelligent Christian believer who has made himself acquainted with the old and unassailable arguments in proof of Christ's resurrection will have a particle of respect for such pretentious affirmations? It is time, we think, that our rationalists and radicals should get up some new reviews of these ancient facts. We are tired of the old humdrum objections. They have become stale. What new is there to be said in contradiction of the many clear and able presentations of the great event of the Gospel history now in possession of all our Churches? What radical or free religionist, or scientist, or positivist will undertake to show fairly and squarely the fallacies of any one of half a hundred of the ablest defences of the actual rising of Christ from the dead (say just for an instance, the arguments of Rev. Mr. Beard of the English Unitarian Church, on this subject)? Who proposes?
Let us see him about the work; and then we can listen with more patience to this very feeble talk about the criticisms that disproves the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Admitting the truth of all that may be said about these "elemental feelings," which bespeak future life for man, yet we find no answer more needed and significant than that given us in him "who died and rose again that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living."

In our judgment of the author of the volume we are noticing, we must make due allowance for his theological training. In getting into "the safest creed" he came through Unitarianism, and his creed still retains an indefiniteness which has long accompanied the theology known by this name. He is one of a very respectable number, who see "liberal Christianity" mainly through Unitarian eyes, and does not seem to realize that there is another creed quite as definite and comprehensive as any that Unitarianism, Radicalism, or Rationalism, German or American, has ever given us; we mean that of the Universalist Church; a Church whose real significance in the history of true liberal Christianity, some prominent Unitarians have somehow failed to discover. But as our author has a way of bringing into prominence other theologians than those who have been distinguished for their Universalism, as for instance, Rev. Theodore Parker, whom he is pleased to regard as "that monumental man, who stood like a solitary oak in the middle of a plain," we would commend to him the expressed opinion of this distinguished man in reference to the faith of the Universalist Church: They (the Universalists) have done more than any other sect to popularize the great truth that God is love; and alone of all other Christian sects, they professedly teach the doctrine of the immortality of man in such a form that it is no curse to the race to find it true." These are fair and just words; and we cannot help thinking that if our author had long ago come squarely in at the door of this faith, he would have had a creed at the present time rather sounder, safer, and more satisfactory to the average mind than that which
his volume presents to us. We believe in the significance of creeds; in the importance of being grounded in a true creed. While we rejoice in that grand Catholicity of the New Testament which declares that "God is no respecter of persons," but that "in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him," we as firmly believe in the indispensableness of the knowledge of the truth to man.

"The Safest Creed" we are convinced there must be, and this creed the plain teaching of the New Testament affords us. It embraces the Fatherhood of God—a personal God, surely; the Brotherhood of Man, this Father’s spiritual offspring; the blessedness of obedience to the Divine laws; the inevitable penalty of transgressing them; the mission of Christ as the exemplar and Saviour of mankind, who is to bring the race, through human and heavenly instrumentalities, out of its "bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." It gives us a resurrection life, not only in the transfusion of our mortal bodies into other material elements, and in the memories of loved survivors, and in the great life of humanity—a life not at all recognized in that well known quotation with which our author’s volume ends, in which man may approach the grave

"Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams,"

but a wakeful, lively, progressive life of spiritual light, heavenly service and love; the life of God, unto which those created in his image are ever called, and in which all souls shall rejoice evermore. When we find any creed that embraces a greater good than this, we shall be inclined to accept it; but until we do, we cannot think of exchanging it for any other of which we have yet heard, in or out of the Churches. It seems to us ample enough to grow in

"while life, and thought, and being last,
Or immortality endures."

We should do injustice to our author and to our conscience, did we not thank him for his true and excellent words respecting the sanctity of the marriage relation; and for his ex-
pressed views of human society in its mutual relations and dependencies. His statements of some of the evils of modern Spiritualism, as affirmed by its well known exponent, Andrew Jackson Davis, also, are well made.

While, therefore, we appreciate the many truthful and excellent things which we find in this volume, the reading of it has served to confirm us, if possible, more strongly than ever in the truth of Peter's question to the Master, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

---

**Article III.**

*The Present Condition of Mahometanism.*


"My followers," Mahomet is reported to have once said, "are like rain of which it is unknown whether the first or last fall will be best." And, certainly, the boast of the prophet seems not altogether unwarranted in the light of recent developments concerning the rapid spread of his religion. Everywhere, Mahometanism, that once seemed in the last stages of dissolution, now appears to be putting on new life and vigor. In the interior wilds of Africa, its missionaries are having a marvellous success: tribe after tribe has cast aside its fetich for the worship of Allah; and judging from present appearance, the day is not far distant when the entire continent will have cast its fortunes with Islam. In the Ottoman Empire a wide-spread revival of religious fervor is taking place; new converts are constantly being added to the number of the faithful, and the precepts of the Koran are observed by all classes with a vigor unknown for generations. In Con-
tral Asia, especially in Bokhara, the tide of fanaticism was at its height before the Russian conquest and, since then, seems not to have fallen in the least. Even in British India, the recent census shows that the Muslim host is constantly on the increase. And thus, from every quarter of the Islamite world, tidings are brought of growing numbers and rising zeal.

This sudden putting forth of new energy on the part of a religion that had long seemed utterly exhausted, may well occasion surprise. In fact, Islam has always been an enigma. Its early triumphs, its swift bound into a high stage of civilization and its equally swift decline—these are among the most difficult problems with which the science of religion has to deal. And its present position is hardly less enigmatical than its past history. The Mahometanism of to-day is full of apparent inconsistencies and surprises. Seemingly the most bare, the most sharply defined and uncompromising system of natural religion that has ever become a popular faith, we yet find the wildest mysticism, theosophic extravagances that would have done honor to Proclus, a pantheonism more luxuriant than that of the Hindoo Puranas, all growing rankly in this thin stony soil of Islam. We know the Koran, but it is almost impossible to tell what a Mahometan really believes. After certain easy rites are complied with, his license of thought is without limits. So long as he does not forget the motto, that "there is no god but God," and does not fail to repeat the five daily prayers, with his face turned precisely towards the Meccan "Ka'abeh," he is welcome to sweep the entire horizon of speculation in search of a theology. No wonder then that Islamite religion, so narrow and severe a conception in the mind of its founder, has come to be the most vague, the most indefinite and heterogeneous system of faith in the world.

What makes this obscurity more dense, is the deference we are apt to pay to the opinions of travellers who have spent a few months or years in the East and therefore deem themselves competent to pronounce oracularly upon its religious condition and prospects. We see very readily that the most
intelligent "Mollah" from Constantinople or Bokhara might pass a year or two, here in America, and yet be a very poor authority concerning the inner life and future prospects of Christianity. We ourselves, who are conversant with the matter in all its many bearings, find it difficult to decide as to the drift of the popular faith; we can hardly tell whether Christianity is in its wane or merely passing through a stage of transition. Evidently the visitor from the East would be at a still greater loss. He would merely observe the externals of our worship; he would gather up a few opinions, some common and some very uncommon ones; and then return as wise as he came, concerning the real religious life of a people whose modes of thought were so entirely alien from his own. The case is even worse with the European tourist in the Orient. Not only are his conceptions made up from casual scraps of information and bits of gossip, gathered at random; not only is his converse almost exclusively with that class of the people who have been brought into the closest contact with European influences and whose opinions have, thereby, been rendered so loose and motley, that they are the poorest possible representatives of the popular faith and the common tendencies of thought; more than that, he finds himself almost absolutely hemmed out from the proverbially thorny path of knowledge by one of the most invincible habits of the Oriental mind. Upon this habit, we must dwell for a moment.

Whether made so by nature or by art, the Oriental is a reticent being. Garrulous enough at times, his reserve increases, unfortunately, in exact proportion to the importance of the matters discussed. When religious or political topics are broached, he becomes a model of caution and impenetrability. In fact, this habit of reserve has, with him, been erected into a philosophical principle which, under the name of the Ketmân, is the constant rule of his intercourse with his fellow-men and especially with heretics and "infidels." According to the Ketmân, it is absurdly unwise and fool-hardy for a man to expose his opinions to the public view: it is better to enjoy them in private, to guard against the annoyance of dis-
cussion, to take a secret pride in misleading opponents who would only sneer at ideas which they could neither appreciate nor understand. This principle is, fundamentally, that of the esoteric philosophy and the religious mysteries of antiquity; only that the Turkish or Persian Musulman is apt to resolve himself into a school of philosophy or a religious brotherhood, the secrets of whose faith are lodged solely within his own bosom. Evidently this habit is the very reverse of that which rules the Western mind. With us, open discussion is the great touch-stone of the truth, to which we are in haste to apply our opinions. Having gained an idea, we are impatient to "ventilate" it. We weary our friends and our foes by incessant harping upon our private opinions. But the Oriental abhors publicity and discussion. If he speaks, it is with the obscurity of an oracle. Always busy with strange speculations, he keeps these speculations — whether for weal or woe, we say not — locked within a profound and impassable reserve. The inmates of the harem are not so jealously veiled from the public gaze as are the disordered phantasimagoria and the wild paradoxes that tenant the dreamy brain of the Oriental thinker.

We see, then, the peculiar difficulties of the case. If the tourist, by any great good fortune, happens to be brought into contact with a representative man, he finds himself seeking information from one who is practicing the Ketman — with one who esteems it his religious duty to mislead the unwary infidel, to shield his faith behind the dense obscurity of Asiatic reserve. No wonder, then, that our travellers gain no very deep insight into the actual condition of Eastern affairs. No wonder that we are told that Islam is in the last stages of decline; that its people are growing negligent of their religious observances and deeply imbued with European ideas and tastes; that rationalism is on the increase; in a word, that the day is rapidly coming when the Koran will be obsolete and Mahomet will be known only as one of the great religious teachers of the past. All of which would be a consummation very flattering to the pride of whatever reli-
gious bigotry is left in Christendom. Whether it would also
be a consummation devoutly to be wished for, by those having
the interests of humanity at heart, one may well doubt, if the
Muslim are to be converted to that greedy, licentious and
drivelling superstition which passes for Christianity in the
East. But whether desirable or not, it certainly seems an
event not very near at hand, judging from what has recently
transpired concerning the rapid growth and the rising zeal of
Islam from India to the Mediterranean.

It follows from all that has been said that it is no easy task
to describe the present condition of Mahometanism. Preju-
dice, hasty observation and the inherent difficulties of the
subject itself have done their best to obscure the whole matter.
Fully conscious of all this, we shall yet attempt to show what
this Mahometan "revival" really betokens, and what influ-
ence it is likely to have upon the future life of the East.

To understand the present drift of the religion we must first
understand its primitive nature and design. That may seem
like beginning very far back and going over well trodden
ground; but we believe that the result will justify the course
we have adopted.

What, then, was the primitive Mahometanism? What its
peculiar secret—source of its strength and superiority to the
religions which it so quickly supplanted. It was the monothe-
istic impulse, respond the most impartial and thoughtful in-
quirers of the present day. Mahomet's conception of the one
God was a fire-brand cast amid the decaying superstitions and
the dry theological subtleties of Asiatic religion; it kindled a
flame that could not be quenched and, in a moment almost,
had prepared the ground for a new upgrowth of civilization.
But this answer, while candid and rational, is, to us, by no
means satisfactory. We do not believe that a merely abstract
theological conception—even one so simple and forcible as
that of monotheism—can be converted into a revolutionary
impulse, overturning long established religions and awakening
a new life among millions of people. The spread of a new ab-

tract conception is the final product of a revolution, not its
cause. A new idea is grasped by the common mind only with great difficulty; and even after it has been taken hold of, there is constant danger of defection and relapse into an older and more familiar order of thought. We see in the history of the Jews how feebly the people grasped this very idea of monotheism, and how apt they were to fall back into polytheistic conceptions, in spite of the constant presence of religious teachers who were inspired, to the very highest degree, by the prophetic genius. Among the Israelites,—who had a far better training and a more exalted order of teachers than the Arabs—monotheism, so far from becoming a grand revolutionary impulse, had a hard struggle to keep itself feebly alive. And universally, a new idea in the popular mind, is a base that requires constant nursing, not a giant ready to execute great projects.

The real creator of revolution is always a moral impulse, not an abstract conception of theology or philosophy. In common every-day life the sentiments and passions are far more potent than ideas; much more is this the case when great masses of rude ignorant men are burning with the white heat of revolution. In such a crisis it is feeling, not dogma, that rules the hour.

We cannot accept, then, the common explanation of the Mahometan movement. Monotheistic the movement undoubtedly was, but that was not the secret of its strength. The Unity of God was a convenient and expressive war-cry; but beneath this theological conception there was something else of a different order—a feeling, a passion, a moral impulse—which banded these great hosts of Islam together, and hurled them on in their wonderful career. What, we are now ready to ask, was this moral impulse which "the Prophet" communicated to his followers, and which became the main-spring of a great religious revolution?

The most constant and fateful element in Eastern life is its contempt for human nature. The Oriental is overpowered by the sense of dependence; he cowers before the brute forces of Nature or is lost in dreams of the Infinite. He looks only
upon the frailty, the misery and sinfulness of man's estate, and has no thought for the nobler qualities that lurk beneath this aspect of squalidness. In the Orient there is pride of birth, of station or of gifts, but nothing of the sense of human dignity. From this tendency almost all of the essential characteristics of Oriental life are derived—it's love of pantheistic speculations which destroy all sense of human individuality—its ascetic contempt for the present life and superstitious engrossment with the affairs of futurity—its dependence upon priests, religious rites and other intermediaries that bridge the awful gulf between the human and the Divine—its exaltation of faith above reason—its castes and other badges of an absolutism which has no conception of human rights—in a word, every thing that distinguishes the civilization of the East from that of the West.

When Mahomet appeared, he found this tendency at its climax. It had seemed at first, that Christianity was to regenerate this cowering and depressed spirit of the Asiatic people; but the promise had not been fulfilled. On the contrary, the new religion had succumbed to the old influences; it had lost its primitive energy, its enthusiasm for humanity, its ethical earnestness and been swallowed up in that whirl of theosophic speculation which is ever ebbing through the East.

But Mahometanism accomplished what Christianity had failed to do. It evoked a new energy, a new moral impulse exactly opposite to the old tendencies of life. It taught men to believe in themselves. The Prophet, it virtually said, was only a man specially commissioned to teach his fellows; distinctions of rank may be useful for certain purposes; but still, all are equal in the great brotherhood of Islam. Away, then, with all priests and intermediaries; let every man come directly into the presence of his Maker. Away, also, with these multiplied rites, these religious austerities that are designed to supply the place of manly effort and human activity; "a day of business," as Mahomet teaches, "equals in merit twenty days of prayer." It is only necessary to believe in God and to do one's duty.
This proud, lofty spirit of self-assertion, this impulse so like that which ruled the life of ancient Greece, is the secret of primitive Mahometanism. So far our task of explanation has been an easy one; but there remains a proposition that does not lie so plainly upon the surface. And that is that this impulse was not a permanent one; that while Islam has retained all of its old formulas of thought, the mainspring of its former activity and power was worn out centuries ago; its people, in spite of their monotheistic orthodoxy, are now ruled by that very tendency—that depressed, dreamy, ascetic spirit of the East—from which the Prophet strove to emancipate them. Mahometanism is like a clock that has "run down;" the mechanism of its organization is still intact; its dial-plate of dogma, so to speak, faces us as steadfastly as ever; but its primitive energy, the free, proud humanistic impulse which put all the rest in motion, is gone and the movement has come to a stand-still.

This exhaustion of the original impulse is very clearly shown in the history of Arabian philosophy. At first this philosophy was thoroughly Greek in its tone and tendencies; it seemed as if the highest and most pronounced results of Hellenic culture were to be reproduced under monotheistic auspices. The Christian schools of Alexandria and Syria found in the speculations of Plato—tinged, as they were, with Oriental tendencies—the nearest approach to their own modes of thinking. But the Arabians took Aristotle for their guide, that bold critic of the unproved and the dreamy, that clear analytic brain upon which no cloud of mysticism or theosophy ever rested, that most perfect representative of the pure Hellenic spirit. In that choice of leaders, we have the key to the whole movement. Arabian philosophy was inspired by the spirit of ancient Greece. Its aspirations were rationalistic, not mystical nor theurgic. It believed in the powers of the free human spirit, and strove to develop them.

But while the current set thus, there was a fatal under-tone which finally carried every thing in the opposite direction. From the very first, the philosophical mind was the scene of a
constant struggle between the new rationalistic impulse and the old tendencies that had always ruled in the East. All the great Mahometan thinkers show the marks of this struggle which ended in defeat and surrender. Alfarabi was a thorough and consistent Aristotelian in his logical doctrine; but when he approaches the deep problems of ontology, he wavers, he compromises and involves himself in those countless inconsistencies and contradictions which are inevitable when the mind is agitated by two conflicting impulses. Avicenna, chief of all Arabian men of science, was torn by the same conflict; in the end, if we may believe the report of Averroes, he renounced philosophy, and plunged in the darkest depths of Oriental mysticism. Even Averroes, in his favorite speculations concerning the Universal Intellect, betrays a bent of mind entirely opposed to that of Aristotle and Greek rationalism. In a word, the Arabian philosophers—even the keenest and most farsighted of them—were never true to their first aspirations. They were always swept back by an unrecognized but irresistible under-current of thought. They claimed to be the pupils of the rationalistic Aristotle; but they beheld their master only through the dense mists of Neo-Platonic mysticism. The only outcome of their speculations was a fruitless attempt to combine two incompatible and mutually destructive systems of thought.

In the end, Arabian philosophy plunged bodily and without reserve into the morass of asceticism, theosophic dreams and Oriental extravagance of every kind. Its last representative of any note, Suhrawardi, was more of a beggar monk than an Aristotelian philosopher. He went about unwashed, unkempt, and clad in the filthiest garments; vermin ran about his face; and the people—as we may well believe, for the orthodox Mus-

---

1 Munk. Dictionnaire de Sciences Phil. Tom III, p 174.
3 Schmolders. Les Ecoles Philosophes chez les Arabes p. 92. Ftilgo, Al Kindi p. 12. Charles Kingsley, in his "Alexandria and her Schools," is more than usually at fault when he says, that there was no Neo-Platonic or mystic element in the Arabic philosophy.
sulman is cleanly, if nothing else—fled in horror from his squalid presence. It was a sad end to a brilliant but hapless struggle. Henceforth the Arabsians forsake philosophy, as Tholuck well says, from sheer weariness and disgust with philosophizing. It was the weariness which always follows when some fierce sudden impulse has been exhausted, and the inevitable re-action has set in.

In this philosophical movement we have an index to the entire history of the Islamite spirit. Everywhere there is manifest the same weariness of spirit, the same tame surrender of first aspirations, the same hateful relapse into tendencies which the great Prophet had momentarily exorcised from the hearts of its followers. Note, for instance, that element of fatalism which now paralyses the Mahometan world, but which it is a great mistake to consider a constituent part of the primitive faith. It is true that Mahomet teaches, at times, the doctrine of predestination, but always in a loose, rhetorical and not in a dogmatic way. The doctrine, with him, does not lead to any denial of the freedom of human movements, which, on the contrary, he frequently asserts with vehemence; it is merely the complement to his conception of the all-wise God; not a dogmatic theory, but the vague incoherent breathing of religious poetry. And furthermore, predestination, even when held in its strictest form, is something very different from Asiatie fatalism. The former is a stimulant rousing men to splendid activities, as we see in the case of the Puritans and the early Mahometans; the latter is a narcotic producing moral lethargy and a coma of civilization from which there is no awakening. And nothing so clearly indicates the backward drift of the Mahometan movement—the slow relapse into a state of moral depression which seems constitutional in the East—as this transformation of the doctrine of Divine Sovereignty, taught in the Koran, into that dead weight of fatalism which now crushes the Islamite world.

With this declension into fatalism, everything else has gone
hand in hand. Mahomet, for instance, had made it his chief accusation against Judaism and Christianity that they had been corrupted and distorted by the reverence for mere traditions; and yet his followers soon yielded to the same tendency, characteristic of the East,—and began to blindly venerate that immense mass of traditions which now forms the body of the Mahometan law. Mahomet, in his free naturalism, had condemned the theurgic sentiment of the East; he claimed to work no miracles, and said that there was need of none; but today every little district of the Islamite world has within it the tomb of some local saint, where more astounding miracles are constantly being performed than ever were witnessed by the side of Catholic shrine or Buddhist tope. Last, but not least in these characteristics of the retrograde movement, was the relapse into asceticism, in spite of the Prophet's express command, "No monkery in Islam."

Enough has been said, we think, to prove our theory of the Mahometan movement. Its primitive impulse was a fierce rebound against the Oriental contempt for human nature,—against the depressed, cowering, priest-ridden and superstitious spirit of the East. But that impulse has long since waned; the old tendencies have gradually reasserted themselves; and it is now hard to say, in what moral characteristic, the Asia of Mahomet differs from the Asia of Vishnu or of Buddha.

But we have been dealing almost exclusively with the past, and it is high time that we should come to that immediate present with which this paper promised to concern itself. Here then, in the face of the indisputable fact of a decline which has been going on for centuries, and which we have endeavored to explain, is the equally patent fact of a great "revival" of Mahometanism which is now taking place throughout almost every part of its domain. What does this new movement betoken? Is it, in the remotest degree, a revival of the old energies of Islam, of its aggressive power and capacity for progress? Or is the revival merely formal and dogmatic, of the letter without the spirit, of the name without the
thing? These questions are of importance because upon them depends the future of a large portion of mankind, with whom the interests of Christendom are very closely interlocked. In order to give some sort of an answer to them, we shall make a brief survey of what has been going on of late in the religious life of Islamite Asia,—and this we propose to do in another paper to follow this.

ARTICLE IV.

Obstacles by Learned Men to Science.

Sir Thomas Browne has given us an instructive work on Vulgar Errors. It seems to us that an equally instructive one might be written on Learned Errors. For there are peculiar prejudices and follies into which the learned fall by very reason of their learning. The practical world has often noticed this, and wondered at the childishly helpless and timid position of the literati in matters of progressive science and its practical applications. It would almost seem that as the children of moral darkness are wiser in their day than the children of light, so the children of intellectual darkness are in advance of the illuminati in matters of worldly wisdom. As the errors and prejudices of the common people incline to credulity and especially to a superstitious belief in the lawless supernatural, those of the learned incline to incredulity, conservatism, opposition to change, and hostility to new theories, new methods, and often to new discoveries. These latter prejudices, which we shall here consider as standing in the way of science and scientific propagation, are due, first, to the jealousy of the different men and departments of science; secondly to an inability, from long thinking and working in a particular way, to think out of the old ruts and conceive of things in the new light which science itself is constantly revealing to them; and thirdly to the abundance of scientific
materials themselves which often so overpower the intellectual as to unnerve it for aggressive action. But whatever may be the cause, the general fact is as we have stated, and as may be shown by reference to any subject of inquiry or enterprise.

When, for example, railroads were first proposed, Stephenson met his principal opposition from learned men. There was scarcely a scientific gentleman or public journal in all England which did not demonstrate their impossibility. Some thought that cows, others that hills, and others that rivers would be insuperable obstacles. Learned doctors appointed to consider such phases of the subject as touched other callings, pronounced them impracticable; because, they said, the tunnels would be injurious to the public health. The sudden plunging into the dark and issuing again into the light would, in their opinion, be deleterious to the eyes, and the noise of the tunnels and bridges would in the end produce general deafness among the people. Professional mechanics thought that they could not go as fast as canal boats, and so would be of no practical benefit; that if they were made to go faster they could not be kept on the track. Even after they were in successful operation the learned town of Oxford refused to let them come to their city. Rugby, forever famous for its schools, tried to do the same, but, failing in part, succeeded in getting from Parliament a provision in their charter prohibiting the company from making a station in that town.

The wise men of Mechlin, in Belgium, would not allow the railroad to run within one mile of their city; the result of which has been that Mechlin, by the loss of its trade, has declined to a third rate town, and its former rival, Antwerp, grown up to a great emporium. The traveller passing by Mechlin, still passes at the distance of a mile from the city, although of late the city is trying very hard to extend itself out over that mile to the railroad. No less a man than the excellent M. Thiers of France has, until a very late period, opposed the construction of railroads in France, as being inferior to the stage coach for travel, and to wagons and canal.
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boats for chattel transportation. He overcame his opposition to railroads and to republics at about the same time.

When it was sought to construct steamboats, Fulton met with all manner of opposition and ridicule from the learned. The scientific men proved first, that they were impossible; and secondly, that they would be of no use if constructed. When they were finally gotten in successful operation, and it was proposed to cross the ocean by steam, Dr. Lardner wrote a book to prove that this was impossible, a copy of which was brought across in the first steamer. Iron clads were universally rejected when presented to our naval authorities for war service. The “Monitor,” which did so much execution at Hampton Roads, was gotten into government employ by stealth, and against the counsel of all the governmental advisers.

The introduction of telegraphs met with about the same opposition. Scientific men pronounced almost unanimously against them, as did every committee of Congress that was appointed to examine into them. When subsequently the inventor, Morse, went to all the principal capitals of Europe, and tried before every court to get an appropriation for an experiment, he met with the same failure. The first appropriation for them was finally made by our own Congress; but it was at the end of the session when the bill passed with a number of others too numerous to receive consideration. And long after the telegraph was gotten into successful operation the legislatures of the states and the federal cabinets on several occasions officially pronounced them impracticable as a means of carrying news; and many in the same capacities now pronounce the postal and domestic telegraph an equally impracticable thing. The project of laying a telegraphic cable across the Atlantic was treated with like disapproval by the learned, and every successive failure of Cyrus W. Field was heralded by them as a demonstration of its impossibility.

Scientific men have always said that no use could be made of balloons. The French, however, during the siege of Paris, found that they could be used to considerable advantage; and
though the scientific men still claim that they can never be largely available, inasmuch as we cannot control their course; yet the people generally believe that in time they will be used as an ordinary means of travel; and we are inclined in this to trust the popular faith, as against the scientific demonstrations. Already of late some progress has been made in France in the matter of controlling their course.

In this and other ways inventions and discoveries have been opposed chiefly by the learned and scientific men themselves; for if the opposition had come only from the ignorant it could not have availed much; as they, being inclined to follow authority, would never have failed to accept truths if the learned had been reasonably unanimous on them. Very often, however, the inventors and discoverers have suffered worse than a rejection of their discoveries. It is said that the inventor of watches was killed for witchcraft. Galileo was compelled to recant for making known the true motion of the earth. Socrates was put to death for teaching a true philosophy, and Christ for teaching a true morality.

And not only every new discovery and every new invention, but every great scheme is pronounced impracticable by the learned until successful, and so is delayed for a long time in its realization and usefulness. We have already instanced the Atlantic Cable. It was the same with the Suez Canal, the Pacific Railroad, the Mt. Cenis Tunnel; and it is now so with the Darien Canal. If we had to depend on the more learned scientists who are teaching the people on these subjects, and not on the less scholastic but more daring adventurers from among the people, we would rarely see the practicability of anything great.

It is the same with regard to new theories, systems, &c. It is said that after Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, no physician living at the time ever accepted it. It was only with the coming on of a new generation of doctors that it came to be accepted as a fact. It was similar with the discovery of the law of gravitation by Newton; and with the early theories of the planetary system. The nebular hypothe-
sis has still to go begging for admission by scientific men, although it is as fully substantiated as any hypothesis can well be. It is the same with the Darwinian theory. Everybody knows how the literary world, and especially learned clergy-men and cosmogonists have resisted the truths of geology; and how they are hardly yet willing to admit geology as a legitimate science. Few scientific men have any sympathy with, or faith in, biology as a science. Still greater is their contempt for social science, and their prejudice against any new science whatever, or any new classification of the sciences. This last prejudice is stronger than the prejudice of the common people against anything that has ever been revealed to them by sciences. Homeopathy is rarely ever received into favor by physicians; and few of them will acknowledge even its most obvious merits. The doctors of the old school in the University of Michigan all threatened to resign if a homeopathic chair was established in that institution. Phrenology has always been discountenanced by scientific men, and especially by physicians and philosophers, who should be first to acknowledge it; so that, although it has the evidences of an organized science, it is left almost entirely to quacks and shallow theorists for propagation. Sir William Hamilton for years distinguished himself by a special opposition to it, just as now the Scottish philosophical school, who profess to give most exclusive attention to the science of the mind, refuse to make any use or acknowledgement of the investigations either of the German philosophers or of such of their countrymen as James Mill and Herbert Spencer, who have gone most profoundly and most scientifically into the subject.

Our public educators and school committees still refuse to teach or allow to be taught phonography; and although this is destined to become the ordinary method of writing, the learned very greatly profess a preference for the old stage-coach round-about way. When Pitman first perfected his system, and tried to get it introduced into England, not only did the universities and public press generally pronounce against it, but the learned theologians of Oxford pronounced
it to be the last work of the devil, and his greatest machine for evil. In like manner the scholastic world almost unanimously object to phonetic spelling. Webster's innovations in this direction have been generally opposed by the learned, especially by lexicographers. The publication of his dictionary gave rise to a conservative one—Worcester's—which, in opposition to Webster's, undertook to teach the English language as it is, and not as it ought to be—a dictionary which, however excellent in other respects, has flourished chiefly by reason of this position. In fact so strong was the opposition which linguists at first made to Webster's innovations that in the subsequent editions of his work he had to go back in many cases to the old orthography. In like manner everybody who thought he had a right to say anything on Lexicography was at first opposed to pictorial dictionaries, and to pictorial encyclopedias. And even after the friends of Webster had introduced cuts, they would not for a long time be reconciled to scattering them through the volume so as to accompany the corresponding words, but insisted on putting them all together in classified order in an appendix.

And we might further add that the project of a universal language, which has been so zealously pushed by certain French writers, and in one or two cases ingeniously constructed for practical use, has never received anything but opposition from the French Academy, although it is certain that a simple and logical language such as they propose will one day be used by the nations. In fact it is a well known reproach that the French Academy, composed of the most scientific men of that nation, have not generally taken up new projects until forced upon them by the people. The decimal system whose merits are on its very face, and cannot but command the approbation of all unprejudiced persons, was not only opposed by the learned societies when forced on the French nation by the popular revolutionists, but is now rejected and reproached by almost every government and learned body as often as the people, who are clamorous for its grand simplicity, force it on their attention. Germany, Eng-
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land, and the United States, though they are gradually com-
pelled to adopt it in part, are trying to adopt it as slowly, and as little of it, as possible; insisting, for what reason heaven only knows, that it is better to have our barley corns, and inches, and feet, and roods, and acres, and miles, and sea-
miles, and geographical miles, and knots, and stages, and posts, than to have the simple metre and its divisions for all distances and weights and surfaces. We must ultimately come to this; and why will not the scientific men and the governments see it? We might also add here that every new system of education, not only as a whole, but as to its excellent features, has been first rejected and most violently resisted by the learned and scientific, and been gotten under headway by second rate practical educators; as the Pestalozzian system, the system of Jacotol, the introduction of object lessons, the modern use of maps, diagrams, &c. The more learned professors still adhere to the almost exclusive study of the Latin and Greek languages in our colleges, and oppose late practical educational improvements. For a long time they persisted in the universities of Germany, Switzerland, Holland and England in delivering all the lectures in Latin instead of the native language. It was only when others beside the professors — as the King's statesmen and students — resisted this, that the learned men reluctantly submitted to a change.

And so likewise all religious, political and social reforms have met their chief opposition from the learned and scientific men, especially from those who were most prominent in this particular department of the reforms. The Reformation was opposed most by the priests, they being the last to see the corruptions of the Church or to wish to correct them. If the princes and laymen had not taken hold of the matter it would not have prevailed at all. The Wesleyan reformation was opposed most by the existing clergyman of England; and although its object was at first, at least, entirely unschismatic, and intended only to reform and elevate the lower classes, it did not receive any encouragement from any body high in
ecclesiastical power. Revivals or great religious movements of any kind are always attacked by the great body of the clergy, in fact by all but those of the particular denomination carrying them on. The creation of a new sect for the better promotion of religion is always opposed by religious teachers as a species of irregularity and fanaticism. The laymen have always heralded and profited by new sects long before the clergymen have thought of recognizing them. And those Churches which think themselves most churchly, or to constitute in fact the Church, are the most uncompromising toward all religious movements and interests except those which themselves are carrying on. Reforms in Church polity have generally been resisted by the clergymen as long as they have seen any hope of defeating them, as lay delegation in the Methodist Church; the expulsion of the Athanasian creed as an obligatory part of the devotion in the Church of England; the recently proposed changes in the prayer-book of Ireland; the various changes in creeds and forms of worship in all Churches. The laity are willing and clamorous for such improvements long before the clergy even give them their serious attention.

In like manner, political reforms are always opposed by politicians, they being the last to see that anything new or better is needed. It is only when the people and the press become too loud to be resisted with safety, that the professional politicians acquiesce. It is always men outside of position, and generally outside of party, that first indicate the new ways that the nations are to follow. Our grave senators and cabinet officers are always for preserving the old issues and old party distinctions. We have an example of this in the late demand for civil service reform, in temperance legislation, in custom house and congress purifications, &c.

So law reforms are generally last taken up by lawyers. They stick to the old forms and old precedents long after all the rest of the world are convinced of their uselessness or injuriousness. No great lawyers that we are aware of ever encouraged the simplification or codification of the laws.
As often as it has been proposed in England to facilitate the division of the great estates and the alienation of land, it has been opposed by lawyers as tending to disintegrate society and uproot the foundations of civilization. Lord Coke was opposed to the whole system of equity; Sir Randall Palmer to the Ballot Bill, and Ortolan to Arbitration. In short, wherever there is progress made in the law in any shape, it is not instigated by a chief justice or attorney general, but by some tyro or politician, or somebody entirely outside of the profession. Lord Brougham, who has perhaps introduced more good reforms in the law than any other man in this century, has been described by a great lawyer as a learned man, who, if he had known something about law, would then have known a little about every thing. Jeremy Bentham, Lord Bacon, and most others who have made improvements in the law have been commonly reckoned as poor lawyers, or no lawyers at all. And if we ever get rid of the evils of the common law as practiced in this country and in England, it will have to be by influences having their origin elsewhere than among lawyers.

And so it is in general that the people or organizations that are most advanced and most competent to effect advancement in a particular respect are least inclined to favor improvement or progress in that respect. The great nations are most opposed to reforms, the great churches to reformation, the great armies to revolutions. There is less advancement and liberal experiment in Russia, England, Prussia and Austria than in Belgium, Switzerland and the South American Republics. And in those great countries, moreover, the monarchs, members of the aristocracy, and others, whose profession it is to rule, and who are particularly charged with the elevation and prosperity of the people, are less favorable to popular advancement than any other class. In most countries the nobility do not even wish the people to learn to read and write, or to know how to do any thing except to be submissive subjects and maintain the political status quo. Masters in like manner have always been opposed to the elevation of their slaves; landlords to that of their tenants; patrons to that of their clients, and priests to that of the people.
In like manner the churches, which are especially charged with the moral interests of humanity, are the slowest to take up new moral and humanitarian projects, such as the abolition of capital punishment, prison reform, temperance, and the abolition of slavery. These are thought by them to be new-fangled ideas, not worthy of theologians and men whose business it is to make people good. If any churches take hold of them it is generally such as have least faith or least ecclesiastical pretensions; as the Unitarians, Quakers and Methodists. Christian ministers have long been opposed to any thing like reducing religion to a science, or to investigating the evidences of Christianity, as also to historical and biblical criticism. Butler's Analogy and Paley's Evidences, though the greatest defences of Christianity, have never been secretly popular with clergymen. Nor have clergymen ever taken zealously to natural theology or to works reconciling the difficulties of religion. When Father Hecker presented to the Pope his powerful defence of Dogma as inculcated by the Catholic church, the Pope instead of approving it, said he would do better to teach dogma than to investigate it. The study of the Scriptures, which of all books has most to do with religion, has been prohibited to the people by the Catholic church. The Methodists for a long time opposed education in their preachers, and even now they do not like to study theology. When Tyndall proposed his prayer test, all the clergymen, who certainly ought to be most anxious for any opportunity, however imperfect, to test the efficacy of prayer, not only denounced the test, but assailed Tyndall as an infidel for proposing it.

In fact the proficient in all departments are the last to appreciate any thing new or out of the ordinary way in that department. Architects are the last to take up with a new style of building, and the last to hold on to the old Greek Basilican and Roman forms. The more learned among them continued to be copyists of antiquity long after tyros, less skilled in the learning and traditions of their art, have made new discoveries and struck out on new plans. In like manner art critics and artists are the last to appreciate a new style in painting. Pro-
fessional theatre critics are the last to recognize a new star on the stage. Kant was the last philosopher to appreciate the extension of his own system by Fichte. Fichte, in like manner, resisted Schelling, who was doing him a similar service; and Schelling in like manner resisted Hegel. A new philosophical school, like a new religious sect, has always been opposed by the old established philosophers; Socrates by the Sophists, DesCartes by the Scholastics, and Kant by the Empiricists.

It is a significant fact, bearing on this subject, that the great discoveries have not generally been made by the proficients in the departments, but more commonly by plain unlearned men, unburdened with the lore and minutiae of the accomplished savan. It has been men like Stephenson, Franklin, Fulton, Morse, Howe, Gutenberg, Raikes and Columbus that have made the discoveries which have most benefited mankind. It was not the learned geographical society of England that could discover Livingston, but a young American journalist, wholly unacquainted with their work, who went down through trackless regions into Central Africa, and found the man whom they had given up for lost.

And so likewise it will be found that nearly all the reformers and innovators have been young and inexperienced men, or else visionary characters whom the prudent world has called "theoretical" or "impractical." Such were the antislavery men; and such are the women's rights men, temperance crusaders, and men who have agitated prison reforms, kindness to animals, &c. Wendell Phillips, Horace Greeley, Mr. Borg, Howard, Wilberforce, Beecher, Tilton and Dio Lewis, all are known to the world as eccentric, and with many persons pass for a little crazed.

And so in the great practical experiment of free government, while all the great statesmen and proficients in political history predicted the early downfall of our American Republic after the revolution, it was the faith of tyro experimenters and of the common people that upheld the enterprise. And during our rebellion when all the statesmen of Europe, and many of the best informed men of our own country, predicted the
fall of our nationality, those who knew less about it were encouraged to keep it up. And so now everybody who pretends to know any thing about government predicts the failure of the French and Spanish Republics, while the less tutored and the more inexperienced republicans of those countries are every day doing wonders that the learned and prudent would never have dreamed could be done. If we had to depend on the practical and established statesmen and rulers of the world for our political progress, we would not only not progress, but would not receive any encouragement for even the most distant realization of our ideals.

And so it is a very general and very unfortunate fact, that the specially trained and professionally employed savans, in no matter what department, are so overloaded with prejudice or borne down by a blindness which their own studies have induced, that they cannot sympathize with the great outline movements of science and of the race, and are not found specially serviceable in the more advanced ranks of the pioneer benefactors. We have no reproach to make against them, much less against science or systematic learning. It is one of the unavoidable misfortunes of our limited intellects that a narrowness of view and sympathy necessarily characterizes our relations to other work and other departments and methods than our own. No man has mind enough to be buried in the lore and minutiae of a particular science, and at the same time to rise over the specialities of that science and take a general view of the whole, and expand in due appreciation of all. But this lesson we may nevertheless gather from the fact — that we should not let ourselves be discouraged or limited in our work and aspirations by the desponding and conservative predictions of the scientific and learned, who are often bewildered by the multiplicity of their own knowledge; nor be confined in our sympathies by the narrowness of sectarian, professional or departmental bigotries.

Had we space we might indicate some relief for the evils of these prejudices and errors. But at present we only indicate the unfortunate fact, a knowledge of which, and of its extent, may itself enable us to escape some of its consequences.
ANTIOCH IN SYRIA.

ARTICLE V.

Antioch in Syria.

Antioch was the second capital of the Christian world, destined to be forever memorable as the place where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians. It became the centre of a new sphere of operations attendant upon the introduction of the Gentile element into the Church, as Jerusalem was the centre of a more exclusive form of faith. From these two capitals there went forth two distinct types of Christianity, the one partial and limited, the other broad and liberal; the one confining its operations to the Jews alone, the other embracing the Gentiles also. These hostile elements which so profoundly agitated the Christian Church in its early ages, in one form or another, have not yet ceased to agitate it. At the present day they exist in the Church as marked and distinct tendencies. The one looks with disfavor upon that class of the community which does not conform to its ideas of doctrine and engage in its ceremonies; the other would embrace in its sympathies all sincere and earnest souls, though differing in statement of creed or in form of worship. The one is the narrow, dogmatic, exclusive tendency; the other is free and liberal in its aspirations and sympathies, and would receive the truth

"Wherever it may be found, Whether on Christian or on heathen ground."

This city is especially dear to our Church as we recognize in the spirit of its early faith that with which we specially sympathize, and at a later period its celebrated theological school taught and disseminated sentiments pertaining to the character of God and the issue of his government kindred to our own. To the Universalist, then, it must ever be a place of peculiar interest.

Antioch is situated in the fertile valley of the Orontes, some three hundred miles north of Jerusalem, sixteen miles east from its seaport Seleucia on the Mediterranean, and twenty-one miles by the course of the river from the Sea. It can be
reached by the traveller from Beirut by water, and from Damascus through the valley of the Orontes, by way of Baalbe, Riblah, Emesa and the Hamath. Its situation is romantic and beautiful, and calls forth the praises of all visitors. Hemmed in by hills on the north and the south, it nests in the valley through which the Orontes passes on amid myrtles, oleanders and bay-trees to the Sea. From the northern extremity of the Gulf Issus, the range of the Taurus dips down the Mediterranean coast towards the south, and meets the Lebanon range coming up from Palestine, and thence the united range turns off to the east. At the point of intersection the river flows through the space left by the two ridges and here on its bank we find the city. It occupies an island and an open space south of the river. On the south rise the precipitous and craggy sides of Mount Sulpius, whose summit was crowned by a citadel, and whose ridge was fortified by a strong wall in the time of the Roman occupation. Some of the buildings of the city extended partly up the slope. Remains of the old Roman wall still exist, from thirty to fifty feet high and fifteen feet in thickness. Four hundred square towers were built upon this wall, with staircases and chambers within. Like Damascus and other large Oriental cities, Antioch had one long straight street lined with stately colonnades, running nearly in the direction of east and west, more than a league in length. The eastern and main entrance was through the Gate of St. Paul, which is still in a tolerably good state of preservation. Thus the name of the great apostle who labored here so successfully in behalf of the Gospel is still associated with the city. Another street extends from the island to the Mount crossing the straight street near the centre of the city. These streets with the gates, colonnades, statues and buildings all in the highest style of art gave it a magnificent appearance.

It was founded by Seleucus, the son of Antiochus Soter, in the year 300 B.C. Like all the ancient cities of the East that have attained greatness and eminence, the selection of

1 See "The Ancient City" by De Cunlages, pp. 177—187. Am. Ed. It is a curious fact that nearly all the Oriental cities whose origin is obscure, are said to have been founded according to the expressed will of the gods.
the site and the origin of the city are reputed to have had a religious or mythological sanction. Seleucus watched the flight of birds from Mount Casius. An eagle lighted on the Mediterranean coast a few miles north of the mouth of the Orontes. There he founded Seleucia. Again the eagle in response to the auguries on Mount Silpius and the site of Antigonia, lighted on the former spot and this settled the question pertaining to the selection of a site for the capital city of the Seleucidae.2 But doubtless it was the superior judgment of the founder rather than the auguries of the gods that determined its location. Its situation near the Sea, midway between the Greek Islands and the countries watered by the Tigris and the Euphrates, was favorable to trade as it was then carried on in the East. And even now missionaries land at Seleucia, and pass through Antioch on their way to their stations in this part of the Turkish Empire. A railway is also contemplated from Seleucia to the Euphrates. For many centuries Antioch flourished and attained great celebrity as a commercial centre. It was adorned with palaces, temples, colonnades, covered walks, Grecian statues, aqueducts, baths and magnificent dwellings with gardens and all the attendants of luxury; was the third city in wealth and population in the Roman Empire, Rome and Alexandria only being superior to it; and richly merited its appellation of “Queen of the East.” It has lived alternately a splendid and a troubled life. Seldom has so prosperous a city suffered so much, or so often risen, Phoenix-like from its ruins.

Under the rule of Orientals and Romans, before Christianity gained a foothold here, its inhabitants were noted for their love of display and sensual enjoyments. Gibbon gives a graphic picture of their licentious and luxurious style of living. “Fashion was the only law, pleasure the only pursuit, and the splendor of dress and furniture was the only distinction of the citizens of Antioch. The arts of luxury were honored; the serious and manly virtues were the subject of ridicule; and the contempt for female modesty and reverent age

announced the universal corruption of the capital of the East. The love of spectacles was the taste, or rather passion, of the Syrians; the most skillful artists were procured from the adjacent cities; a considerable share of the revenue was devoted to the public amusements, and the magnificence of the games of the theatre and the circus was considered as the happiness and as the glory of Antioch."

The vicious tendencies of the people manifested themselves in the frivolous amusements of the theatre and the stadium, sensual indulgences and licentious practices, disgraceful even to a Greek Oriental city. They engaged in sectarian disputes and party strife. They listened to astrologers and other Jewish and Pagan imposters. Their worship consisted of sensual, superstitious rites. Daphne was a beautiful grove, five miles down the river from the city, dedicated to the goddess bearing the name. According to the mythological story, she was changed into a laurel or bay-tree, by her father Peneus at her own instigation, rather than listen to the love of Apollo. Hence the spot was adorned with laurel groves, and a temple dedicated to Apollo and Diana. It was made attractive by temples and other beautiful edifices, fountains, cascades, aqueducts, baths, rural shrines, gardens revelling in floral beauties and fragrant herbs, groves of cypress, laurel and oleander. Fountains sent forth their cooling spray, delicious breezes swept through the groves, flowers and fruits regaled the senses, and the place seemed more of a Paradise than any other spot this side of heaven. Yet it was a perpetual carnival of vice. Its attractions served only to draw crowds of gay and pleasure-seeking people, who came to indulge in their love of amusement and sensual gratification. Pompey was delighted with it and enlarged its borders and still further adorned its groves. Soldiers were forbidden to visit it for fear that amid its enerating luxuries they would lose their energy, and become unfit for the duties of the camp and the field. Poets and philosophers were warned not to subject themselves to its tempting pleasures. Heathen oracles were given forth in the temples

"Decline and Fall, Vol. II. p. 49—50. See also Conybeare, Vol. I., 124."
and at the shrines, and Olympic games were celebrated. Vast sums of money were expended in gaieties and amusements. 4

No wonder, then, that Daphne became the plague-spot of Antioch, and that the people were debauched by it. All these amusements and recreations were entered upon in the name and under the sanction of religion, and this served to increase their harmful influence. So when Julian, the apostate Roman Emperor, had occasion, on his military excursion to the east, to visit Antioch, he longed, on the day of the annual festival to repair to this sacred grove, pay his respects to his favorite god whose temple was still standing, and sacrifice at its shrine. But the altar was deserted, the voice of the oracle silenced, the priests of Apollo banished, and a portion of the ground had been taken for the burial-ground of Babylas, the martyred bishop of Antioch, and other Christians, and a church had been erected over his grave. Christianity had usurped the place consecrated to Pagan deities.

No pagan city more than Antioch needed the purifying influence of the spiritual religion of Jesus. Early in the history of the church the attention of the apostles was directed to it. We find frequent reference to it by the author of the Acts, and the early Christian fathers. It was a city wholly given up to idolatry, and the form which Christianity assumed here at first was different from that which it took in a Jewish city. Probably the Gospel was first preached here about the year A. D. 44, by the disciples who "were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen" Acts xi. 49; for they "travelled as far as Phœnicia, Cyprus and Antioch," at first "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only," though we read that Nicolas "a proselyte of Antioch," was appointed before this time one of the seven deacons in Jerusalem, vi. 5. Soon men from Cyprus and Cyrene, the former an island lying opposite Antioch on the west, came here and "spake unto the Grecians (or Gentiles) preaching the Lord Jesus," v. 20. The prophet Agabus came from Jerusalem to Antioch, and foretold the famine which was impending vs. 27,

28; and Paul and Barnabas were selected to carry relief to the brethren in Judea, vs. 29, 30. "And the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch," v. 26. It was at Antioch that Paul rebuked Peter for his inconsistency in associating with the Gentiles and preaching to them, and afterwards withdrawing from them for fear of the circumcision, Gal. ii. 11. 12. And here was the scene of the early labors of the apostle Paul, and hence he went forth on his first missionary tour with Barnabas xviii. 1—3. Having returned to this city and attended the first apostolic council at Jerusalem, xv. 1—34, where the question of the Jewish ceremonies was discussed, but not settled, he again went forth from Antioch with Silas, vs. 36—41, and preached the Gospel not only in Asia Minor, but across the Mediterranean in the European cities of Philippi, Athens and Corinth, and again returned to Antioch xviii. 22. He also started on his third missionary journey from this city v. 23 and returned no more.

Thus Antioch became the central point for the diffusion of Christianity among the Gentiles. The first preachers here had learned from the dying address of Stephen that God's worship was not to be confined to the temple at Jerusalem, or limited to the Jewish ceremonial; for "the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands, as saith the prophet, heaven is my throne and earth is my footstool; what house will ye build me? saith the Lord, or what is the place of my rest?" Acts vii. 48—9. After presenting the word to "the Jews only," they turned to "the Grecians" (Gentiles), and opened the door of hope to them. They thus took the first "new departure" from the exclusive system of the Jews, who held that all must become Christian, if at all, through the forms and ceremonies of the Jewish church. This occasioned disturbance, and the disciples at Jerusalem became alarmed, and sent Barnabas as a messenger to this pagan city of Antioch to confer with the brethren on this subject, xi. 22. After consulting with them, he, too, became a convert to the faith taught here, that God's grace is universal, and that he "to the Gentiles also hath granted repentance unto life," thus making
the blessings of the Gospel a message of mercy to all men. Instead of returning to Jerusalem to report the result of his investigations, he remained at Antioch and "was glad and exhorted them all that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord," v. 23. After preaching awhile and adding great numbers to the church, he went to Tarsus, a city some eighty miles distant, farther north and around the bay to the west, and prevailed upon Paul to come to Antioch. In this city they labored together a whole year, and taught the new and enlarged faith to great multitudes.

It was this class of people who first received the name of "Christians" to distinguish them as the special followers of Christ from those narrow-minded converts who still believed that Jesus was sent only to the house of Israel. It was probably "the first Universalist Church," strictly and consistently so called, which was gathered after the death and ascension of Jesus; though the doctrine before this had been dimly apprehended at Joppa and Cæsarea, Acts x. 9—35.

The term "Christian" was probably applied to this Gentile branch of the church by those outside of the organization, and not by the disciples themselves. It had not been used before this time, and we find that it was afterwards used only twice by the New Testament writers. It is found in Acts xxii. 28, where Agrippa says to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian;" and again in 1 Peter iv. 16, "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." Even in these cases it may indirectly imply reproach, as the terms "Nazarenes" and "Galileans" were applied to the early Christians as terms of reproach; even as they are still used by Arabs and Turks in Palestine to designate in a contemptuous manner the believers in the Gospel of Christ. Several years after the death of the Master, we find the term used for the first time—not in Jerusalem where Christianity originated, but in a rich and populous pagan city three hundred miles away.

* See this whole subject treated in an article of the *Universalist Quarterly*, April 1870, pp. 184—198, by Rev. Benton Smith.
The Jews used the Hebrew word Messiah to designate the coming Redeemer; and they would not consequently apply the term "Christian," derived from the Greek word Christos, to the followers of him whom they regarded as the false Messiah. And if the word was first used in derision, the improbability of their doing so becomes thus greater. They were a serious people, and they were eagerly looking for the true Messiah, and they would not be likely to designate the followers of the false one by a word synonymous in meaning with their sacred term Messiah. They called them "the sect of the Nazarenes," Acts xxiv. 5. Neither is it probable that the new converts first applied this term to themselves. They were accustomed to call themselves "brethren," "disciples," "saints," "believers," not Christians. The name, then, was given by their pagan enemies to the Greek and Roman converts to distinguish them from the Jews; as we give the names of Pythagoreans, Platonists, Calvinists, Lutherans and Wesleyans to the followers of the great leaders from whom these names are derived.

The people of Antioch were in the habit of treating sacred things with ridicule or silent contempt, and heaping scurrilous epithets upon serious-minded persons. Their vain and fickle disposition, in unison with the heartless pleasures and buffonery of Daphne, led them to do this. Life was a fleet ing show to them. There was nothing serious in it. Apollonius of Tyana was a pagan of a serious mind, and they treated him with insult and contumely, and drove him from the city. They were sadly wanting in respect due to the Emperor Julian on the occasion of his visit to Daphne. Instead of a hecatomb of oxen, they furnished him with only a goose for sacrifice in the temple of the tutelar Apollo. In the reign of Theodosius, the inhabitants rose in rebellion against his government, overthrew and dragged contumeliously through the streets the statues of the Emperor, his father, wife and two sons; for which he subjected the city to severe and humiliat-

7 Gibbon's Decline and Fall, Vol. II. p. 41.
ing conditions, but was finally prevailed upon to spare it from utter destruction. Such people would be inclined to look upon the poor, unpretending, obscure sect of Nazarenes with little favor, and apply to them derisive epithets. It is very natural, then, that they should call them "Christians." Like many other names, as Puritan, Nazarene, Orthodox, Methodist, this term at first was associated with every thing low and mean; but when "the truth as it is in Jesus" wrought an entire revolution in the moral and social character of the world, this term partook of the honor, and became above all others a noble and praise-worthy appellation.

At first, as we have seen, there prevailed among the apostles and disciples of Jesus the idea that His Gospel was designed for the Jews only. The great mass of the world’s inhabitants called Pagans or Gentiles were not to share in its blessings. Jesus was a Jew. All His early disciples were Jews. They came to Him with all their Jewish prejudices clinging to them; and although He said nothing to them to confirm their prejudices, yet they supposed He was simply a Jewish reformer, who came to revise the Jewish law and introduce a purer system of faith and worship. And yet they were not undeceived in their impressions until after their Master had passed away from earth. But Cornelius in his prayers at Caesarea, and Peter in his vision of the sheet let down from heaven to earth wherein were things clean and unclean as they were classified by the Jewish ceremonial law, seemed first to catch a glimpse of the great truth that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that searcheth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him."

Under the inspiration of this truth Paul and his fellow-laborers preached at Antioch, gained many converts and established the cause firmly here. The account of the contentions that arose by reason of the differences of opinion as to the reception of the Gentiles into the church, as given in the Acts of the Apostles, shows how sincere and determined each party was in the maintenance of its opinions. Here was the first

battle-ground between the exclusive and the liberal spirits. The Jews were strenuous against the admission of Gentiles unless they complied with the rites of the Mosaic law. They were bigoted, selfish, exclusive, full of national prejudice and sectarian spite. They had no just and comprehensive conceptions of the field of labor to which Jesus had called them. Their opponents were charitable in their views and feelings, full of love towards the suffering pagans, anxious to convey to them the glad tidings of Gospel salvation. These were the hostile elements. The battle was fierce and long. At last the immediate combatants separated, some going in one direction and some in another. Antioch became the centre of missionary operations. From it, on three special occasions, Paul went forth as pre-eminently "the Apostle of the Gentiles," to labor for the conversion of the world. And we must ever look with peculiar satisfaction upon this city for the noble spirit which was manifested by the band of believers here, as they entered upon the grand mission of disseminating among the nations the broad and liberal faith which received its full exemplification here. While Jerusalem continued to practice the narrow policy of Jewish exclusiveness, Antioch remained true to its first expansive love, and centuries afterwards, as we shall see, it exemplified its faith in the universality of the Gospel by establishing and maintaining a school which became the friendly rival of the celebrated school established many years before in Alexandria.

We would not overlook the fact that Jerusalem was the first centre of missionary work, Acts xi. 19. But this was providential rather than designed on the part of the first actors in it. The persecution that followed the martyrdom of Stephen scattered the disciples, and they carried the Gospel over Palestine, Syria, and the Isles of the Sea. At this time the disciples may have broken away partially from the rigor of the Jewish law. But Judaism was not a missionary religion. It was willing to receive proselytes if the Gentiles would renounce their religion and their nationality, and subject themselves to all the requirements of the Mosaic law. But, like the Jews of
the present age, their ancestors made no special efforts to gain converts and enlarge the sphere of their faith.⁹

The aim of the Gospel was to make itself universal. It was expansive and communicative. The disciples of Jesus desired and labored to reform men through its instrumentality, and make them happier. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," was the key-note of Jesus’ teachings. Even the Jewish Christians who could see nothing attractive beyond the sphere of their Judaistic thought, could not refuse to heed this injunction, though they did not comprehend its spirit, nor anticipate its far-reaching and glorious results. So with their narrow views they were unable to enter with hearty zest upon the missionary work. But the spur to the zeal of the Christians at Antioch was the great truth, now fully realized by them, that the Gentiles as well as the Jews were to be blessed in God’s holy, redeeming, universal love. So we read that after Paul and Barnabas had gone forth on their first missionary tour, and preached the Gospel in Cyprus and Asia Minor, they returned to Antioch, and gathered the church together, when "they rehearsed all that God had done with them; and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles," Acts xiv. 27. With the conviction of the truth, of this sentiment more deeply impressed upon their minds, again and again, these and other missionaries went forth, and under their ministrations great numbers enrolled themselves under the Captain of their salvation who granted unto them "eternal life."

As a denomination we claim to hold and preach the same doctrine which Paul taught to the church at Antioch, the members of which were first called Christians. We believe that the Gospel of Christ is universal in its object and ultimate design, addressed alike to Jews and Gentiles; that it will prove effective in subduing and converting them to Christ; that though the Jews reject it and deny the true Messiah, or, in

⁹ Max Muller in his Westminster Abbey Lecture divides all religions into Missionary and Non-Missionary, and J. F. Clarke, in his "Ten Great Religions" divides them into Ethnic and Catholic, pp. 16—21. Both class Judaism among the Non-Missionary religions.
the language of the Apostle, though "blindness in part is happened to Israel," it will continue only "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in;" when "all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." This result, so glorious and so assured to us, is the inspiring power of Christian Missions. Any other result, less certain and less assuring, must proportionally diminish, instead of increasing, the missionary zeal, and retard the work of reform. The other event of special interest to us in the history of Antioch is the establishment of the celebrated school here in the fourth century. The type of theology which was taught in this school, in common with that of Alexandria in Egypt, was Universalist. These were the first two Theological Schools that existed in the Christian church. The school at Antioch gradually came into existence from the practice, introduced by the elders of the church, of teaching the converts and preparing them for preaching. The principal of these teachers were Lucian and Dorotheus. The school was not permanently established till near the close of the fourth century, and it flourished many years, and exerted a great influence over the churches of Syria. The school at Alexandria had been in active operation for nearly two centuries, but there was need of a school in this region where Christianity had spread and churches had multiplied. Neander thinks that it originated through the indirect influence of Origen, whose lectures on theology were received with much enthusiasm in Cæsarea, Tyre, and other places of Syria. The need of a more rational system of Biblical interpretation than that followed in Alexandria may also have had something to do towards calling the new school into existence. Connected with this school, as teachers, visitors or counsellors were Diodorus of Tarsus, Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Eusebius of Emesa, Chrysostom and Theodore. It introduced a new system of interpretation into the science of theology. It took a medium position between the

extremes of the strictly literal method and the arbitrary, allegorical method of the Alexandrian school; avoiding "the letter which killeth," and following the grammatical mode which endeavors to get hold of the exact idea that lay in the mind of the speaker or writer. It rejected the theory of plenary inspiration, opposed the blind, mystic tendency in the church, gave prominence to the human element in theology, divested the character of Christ of that misty element in which it had been enveloped, and endeavored to look at Him as the divine man who walked over the hills and through the vales of Palestine while He was teaching the people. Its system of interpretation was far in advance of that of Clemens, Origen, and others of the Alexandrian School.11

That the views of Eschatology held by the Antiochian School were Universalist, is seen from the fact that Diodorus, Theodorus, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Theodoret,12 connected with it, were undoubted believers in the final triumph of good over evil; and their influence was very great in this region, and their opinions shared by the students of the school. And even Chrysostom, the eloquent pulpit orator, there is reason to believe, sympathized with this view. His connection with the Universalists Diodorus his teacher, and Theodorus his classmate, his sympathy for the persecuted Origenists who fled from the rage of the Alexandrian bishop Theophilus, and sought refuge in Constantinople, the annoyances to which he was subjected for this act of kindness,13 and the absence of any direct proof of his belief in the doctrine of endless misery except the application of aionios to punishment, would seem to favor this view. Chrysostom, according to Dr. Schaff,14 was "the soundest and worthiest representative of the Antiochian

---

11 For a detailed account of the differences between the Alexandrian and the Antiochian Schools, see Neander’s History of the Church, Vol. III., 498—600, and his Hist. of Dogmas, 296, 418, 417.

12 See Prof. Cone’s Note published in Ballou’s History of Universalism, p. 247, revised Ed.; also Universalist Quarterly April, 1866, pp. 248—51, by the editor, where proofs of Theodoret’s Universalism are given. Neander confirms the statement that this school was Universalist, Hist. Vol. IV. pp. 108—11.

theology," and Origenism was certainly the prevailing doctrine of the Antiochian School during the earlier period of its existence, and probably until it was condemned by the Synod at Constantinople in A.D. 544. It was mixed up, however, with various "heretical" notions which agitated and distracted the church in Antioch during this period.

Chrysostom was a native of Antioch and received his education here chiefly in pagan schools. He was born, as near as we can learn, in the year A.D. 347. In his life-time Antioch was rich and prosperous. His father held a high military position in the staff of the Roman governor of Syria; but as he died while the son was young, the care of the infant child devolved upon the mother Arethusa, who was a Christian. For a while he studied under the celebrated Libanius, "the last glory of expiring Paganism," as Gibbon calls him; but the pernicious influence of his pagan instruction was neutralized by the persuasive appeals of his pious mother, or, in the words of Gibbon, "the Christian hearth was a match for the heathen academy." Though designed for the law, the corrupt practice of this shameless city disgusted him, and turned his attention to the ministry. But so high was his conception of the sacred office that he reached his fortieth year before he would consent to be ordained. When he entered upon the active duties of the ministry, he manifested boldness and zeal which no fear or favor could overcome.

Antioch contained a mixed population. Its proximity to Palestine had induced many Jewish exiles to seek an asylum in it. After a struggle of three hundred years, the Christian element began to predominate over the Pagan and the Jewish, and the city where the followers of Jesus were first called Christians began to be styled Theopolis, "the city of God." But voluptuousness had so long reigned here and in

"That sweet grove of Daphne by Orontes."

as Milton calls it, that it would not give up without a struggle. Chrysostom attacked the vices of the people. He would not let them rest without a determined effort to reform them. He

preached twice a week and every day during the continuance of the larger festivals. Great numbers crowded into the church, and were made to tremble before the thunders of his eloquence. As an orator he was unsurpassed. Few could resist his persuasive appeals. He spoke in a fluent and fervid manner which gained for him the title of "golden-mouthed." Many of his sermons have been preserved. He was accustomed to take advantage of great occasions or crises in the affairs of the city to enforce great moral and spiritual truths upon the people. Mention may be made of the occasion of the great riot in the city, already alluded to, when the people rose in opposition to the heavy taxes which had been imposed upon them, and broke in pieces the statues of Theodosius and other members of the royal family. The riot was speedily quelled, and the city threatened with destruction. At this crisis when the people were waiting in painful suspense the decision of the Emperor, and a delegation had gone to Constantinople to intercede with him in behalf of the doomed city, Chrysostom preached his twenty-one "Homilies on the Statues." The people, not knowing what the morrow would bring forth, were in a fit condition to receive them. The magnitude of the occasion contributed to his eloquence, and great and salutary was the effect upon his hearers. Seldom has eloquence reached a loftier height, or wrought such wide-spread and permanent results.\footnote{The reader is referred to a good sketch of Chrysostom by Rev. Dr. Eadie, in the \textit{Journal of Sacred Lit.} Vol. I. 188. \textit{Also Bib. Sacra}, Vol. I. 669–702.}

Chrysostom effected much in the way of reforming the city and popularizing the Christian religion, and great was his reluctance to leave the scene of his labors and great the sorrow of the people on the occasion of his departure, when he was called as Archbishop to Constantinople, A. D. 398. The church to which he had ministered continued to flourish for two hundred and fifty years, though distracted by contending factions, and made to suffer from the terrible ravages of earthquakes and civil commotions.

Antioch is celebrated for the numerous and stormy Councils held here during the period of the discussions concerning the
nature of Christ and His relation to the Father. Arianism, Sabellianism, Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Origenism and Pelagianism distracted the church, and retarded the growth of practical Christianity. The Synods and Councils did little to allay the excitement or settle the differences. Constantine and his son constructed a magnificent Basilica here which was the scene of Chrysostom’s eloquent efforts. On the occasion of this church being dedicated, A. D. 341, ninety-seven bishops were present, and after the departure of the “Orthodox” party, the Arians condemned Athanasius, as Paul of Samosata had been condemned for his Arian sentiments sixty years before. Athanasius was again condemned in A. D. 354. In A. D. 435 Theodorus of Mopsuestia was defended against the charges of his enemies, and five years later he also was condemned. In A. D. 424 Pelagius was expelled, and in A. D. 542 a decree against Origenism was passed. Between the years 264 and 565, according to a list prepared by Rev. Dr. H. B. Smith, 17 twenty-seven Councils were held at Antioch, chiefly in the interest of one or another party who condemned or approved sentiments held by their opponents.

In A. D. 638 the city was captured by the Saracens, when this proud capital of the East was degraded to “the secondary rank of a provincial town.” After enduring the yoke of the Caliphs a little more than three hundred years, it was retaken by the Greeks under Nicephorus Phocas, who held it a hundred years, when it was betrayed into the hands of the Turks. In A. D. 1097 the Crusaders invested the city on all sides, and fought desperately until it yielded in the following year. They held it for one hundred and seventy years, when it was again captured by the Turks under the sultan of Syria, when 17,000 persons were slaughtered and 100,000 carried into captivity.

It is still in the hands of the Mohammedans. Under their rule it has dwindled down into a mean and dirty village of some 6,000 inhabitants, who dwell chiefly in one-story stone houses, and covers scarcely a third of the space occupied by the Roman city. The houses are small and dilapidated, the

17 Chronological Tables, p. 81.
streets narrow and filthy, and the walls shattered and crumbling. Rev. Dr. W. M. Thomson, the distinguished missionary of the Lebanon region, who visited it in 1846, says, "It is now a village of no political importance, and though the Greek, Greek Catholic and Maronite Patriarchs still call themselves by the august title of "Antioch and all the East," not one of them has a church there. A few Greeks worshipping in a private room, or saying kuddas by some ruin, are the only mementoes of her former ecclesiastical glory. The name of Christ, honored and adored throughout the civilized world, is blasphemed at Antioch. A few fanatical Moslems possess the ancient Capital of the East and of Christianity. . . . Columns buried under rubbish appear here and there, and now and then a broken capital, but the traveller is disappointed in his search for antiquities or inscriptions. It is singularly barren in all these historical elements." 18

Till the commencement of the present century Christians were almost wholly excluded from the city, but within the last fifty years they have obtained a foothold within its walls. Since Dr. Thomson visited it the Greeks have increased so that when the earthquake two years ago ravaged this region, they had within the city a substantial stone-arched church capable of seating five hundred persons, which was utterly ruined. Within a few years American missionaries have occupied most of the towns along the Mediterranean from Sidon to Alexandria and back along the Lebanon and Taurus range, and have a small station in Antioch. This church, too, was thrown down by the earthquake, but the missionaries and their families were saved. Among a people so poor, degraded superstitious and ignorant, no great progress can be expected, for many years to come, in disseminating the Calvinistic form of Christianity. It is too restricted and partial in its spirit and operations. If the city is ever to be redeemed, it must be accomplished through the instrumentality of that broad and genial faith which was, eighteen hundred years ago, professed by that little band of disciples who were here first called Christians.

GERMAN RATIONALISM.

ARTICLE VI.

German Rationalism.

CHRISTIANS in Germany are divided into two classes, Orthodox and Rationalists. The latter regard themselves as Christians, though there is little reason for excluding from their fellowship skeptics and infidels, unless the latter are out and out atheists and scoffers. These would not be countenanced; for present unbelief is distinguished from that of the last century by a more sober treatment of the subject, and by the assumption generally of the Christian name.

There is a great variety of opinions among German Rationalists. But this is scarcely less a distinguishing trait in the Orthodox portion of the community in that country. Indeed, it is common with writers of both schools to put forth mere speculations that are subsequently repudiated. Hence a later edition of an author's work will be greatly changed from an earlier edition. Nor does his pride of opinion keep him from confessing that he was mistaken, even in respect to matters about which he was most positive. It is not, in his view, a disgrace to confess that he did not once know as much as he does now. It is interesting to observe this peculiarity in German authors, which is not seen to the same extent in any other class of writers. It may be added that writers on the Bible are not necessarily far separated in their theories and speculations because one is reckoned an Orthodox and the other a Rationalist. We have in mind two authors, one nominally Orthodox, and the other confessedly Rationalistic, whose views are not very unlike. Where they differ most, the opinions of the latter are most conservative and most rational. The authors referred to are Bleek and De Wette. They are both authors of Introductions to the Old Testament, with the titles given below.¹

¹An Introduction to the Old Testament, by Friedrich Bleek, ... translated from the second edition (Berlin, 1865,) by G. W. Venables, Esq.,—edited by Rev. Edmund Venables, M. A., etc., etc.

Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, from the German of Wilhelm Martin Leberecht De Wette,—translated and enlarged by Theodore Parker, etc., etc.
Besides these, we have read many authors of both schools, who differ more or less from them, and find many things both to approve and condemn. In reading German Rationalistic authors we have been highly gratified at finding them less formidable, as antagonists to divine revelation, than we had supposed. The Germans are great scholars. As Dr. Dwight confessed. "They are a century in advance of any other nation in Biblical knowledge." But their learning is more extensive than profound; and the profoundest scholars are not always sound reasoners.

We propose to review, to some extent, the two authors above named. We will first notice their views of the book of Genesis, and next their opinions and theories on the whole of the Pentateuch. And from the examination thus far it will not be difficult to pronounce a rational judgment of their views concerning the rest of the Bible.

In view of the distance in time, from Moses' day, of most of the facts recorded in Genesis, it follows that the author must have gotten them from tradition and ancient documents, or from direct inspiration. A few of the most rigidly conservative authors have advocated the theory of inspiration; but generally this is abandoned, and in the place of it the author of Genesis is presumed to have derived his materials for the book from authors that wrote before his time, and who may have been nearly contemporary with the events they record. Back of the time when the art of writing was known, the only available means of information was tradition. Even with this theory there is considerable scope for the exercise of inspiration. Many of the facts contained in the book could have been obtained in no other way but by "inspiration of God." The book itself contains a record of many instances of revelations, as well as miraculous interventions. All the facts connected with the creation of the world must have been made known by revelation. The same is true of all the information that men needed, beyond their ability to acquire it, in the infancy and childhood of the race.

Those who have devoted considerable attention to the
sources of Genesis, claim that they detect diversities of style in the different passages and paragraphs that compose the book, and can point out the exact place where these severally begin and end. Though we do not concede all that is claimed by these critics, yet we believe that the book was composed from existing documents handed down from more ancient times. The minuteness and particularity of the history will not permit us to believe that it was supplied by variable and uncertain tradition. Nor must we assume that all the facts were furnished by inspiration, so long as there is reason to believe that other sources were available.

The art of writing was understood in Moses' day; and though we have but few indications of its existence at an earlier period, yet we know it was not a new invention at the time we first meet with it. It may have been practiced in the time of Abraham; and the language that was used on the occasion of the purchase of Machpela for a family burial place is understood by some as implying that Abraham took from the children of Heth a "bill of sale," as an evidence of the transaction. Gen. xxiii. The "signet" of Judah, at a later day, is thought to have the same significance. Gen. xxxviii.

The question of the origin of Genesis was discussed, says Keil, by some of the early fathers of the Church; but they came to no settled conclusions. Tertullian, Augustine and Chrysostom wrote on the subject. But the dark ages soon came on, during which no such questions could be entertained.

In the beginning of the eighteenth century (1707) Vitringa suggested that the book of Genesis was composed of sketches written down by the patriarchs.2

Others have expressed themselves favorable to written sources, but without giving any opinion as to their character. The following names belong on this list,—Le Clerc, R. Simon, J. Rosenmüller. On the other hand, a considerable number

2Schedes et scrinia Patrum, apud Israelitas conservata, Mosem opinamur colligisse, digestisse, ornasse, et ubi desceebant, compilasse; et ex ilius priorem librorum suorum conficiisse.
of eminent men have taken ground in favor of the unity of the book. Of these Hengstenberg, Hävernick and Keil are most distinguished among the Germans, and are probably best known of that class in this country.

Nearly fifty years after Vitringa, the discussion was resumed by Astruc, a French physician and professor of medicine at Paris, who wrote a book entitled "Conjectures upon the Original Memoirs, which Moses appears to have used to compose the book of Genesis." 3

This author held that Moses compiled the book of Genesis from two principal documents, and ten other less important writings,—the two documents being distinguished by the use in one, of Elohim, and in the other of Jehovah, to denote the Divine Being. The subject has been discussed by the ablest men in Germany, and to some extent in other countries. And yet, excepting the number and character of the less important documents, the theory is substantially the same now, with the same class of writers, as when first propounded by the French professor, who obtained its essential principles from Vitringa, who wrote fifty years before.

The difference between Bleek and De Wette, on the composition of Genesis, is that while they are agreed as to the principal or Elohim document, the passages that are ascribed to the Jehovah are understood by Bleek as the work of the compiler of Genesis, as it now is, while De Wette attributes them to a more ancient author. In the Elohim document the Divine Being is called God, in the original Elohim; in the Jehovah document he is called Lord, or Jehovah. In some instances, however, the name Lord occurs, where the original is not Jehovah, but Adonai. These are not numerous, and are easily distinguished from those having Jehovah. The latter is a proper name, while the former is an appellation. Adonai is as applicable to men as to God; but Jehovah is used with respect to God only.

The Elohim document gives a connected history from the

---

3 (Conjectures sur les memoires originaux, dont'il parait que Moyes s'est servi, pour composer le livre de la Genese.) Bruxelles 1768.
beginning of the world to the death of Joseph. With scarcely an exception, the passages belonging to it are so connected that they can be read consecutively, from beginning to end, and make good sense. On the contrary, the Jehovistic passages will be found in unconnected paragraphs, and cannot be read consecutively so as to make good sense; though generally each passage is complete in itself. Much the larger portion of Genesis is from the Elohim document, which seems to have been taken by the author with few if any changes. The other passages, if not original, were selected from one or more writers, as circumstances seemed to require.

Again, the Elohim writing appears to have been much earlier than the other. The latter could not have been earlier than the time of Moses; for before that period the name Jehovah was not in use. This name was first revealed to Moses, as he informs us; and it is expressly said that God was not known by that name at an earlier date. “I am Jehovah, and I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as God Almighty, (El-shaddai,) and by my name Jehovah was not I known to them.” Ex. vi. 2, 3. The revelation of this name to Moses is recorded by him as follows:

“And Moses said unto God, Behold when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say to me What is his name, what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God moreover said unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. This is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.”—Ex. iii. 13–15.

The subsequent intercourse of Moses with Pharaoh confirms this view. Moses demands the release of the children of Israel; and, as he had been instructed, he makes the demand in the name of Jehovah. The king replies, “Who is Jehovah, that I should obey his voice? I know not Jehovah, neither will I let the people go.” Ex. v. 2. On the theory of the
recent revelation of this name Jehovah, the language of Pharaoh is entirely consistent. But if this name had all along been understood as denoting the God of the Hebrews, the language is wholly inexplicable. True, the words of the king: "I know not Jehovah," may be understood in the sense of not recognizing the authority of the God of the Hebrews; and if they stood alone we might adopt that construction, but taken in connection with other passages we have quoted, and especially as preceded by the interrogatory, "Who is Jehovah that I should obey his voice?" that view is not allowable.

The rendering of Lord for Jehovah in these passages gives them an absurd appearance that does not properly belong to them. After God had revealed his name to Moses, and instructed him to go with it to the children of Israel, our version changes the form, and makes him go in the name of the "Lord God of his fathers." In like manner it puts a very absurd question into the mouth of the king of Egypt, "Who is the Lord?", etc. It may be added that in all the intercourse between the Hebrews and Egyptians, so far as it is recorded in Genesis, there appears to have been no use of the name "Jehovah."

We suppose that Moses was the author of the book of Genesis as we now have it; that he used one ancient document, called the Elohist, with scarcely any change; that he combined with this passages from other sources, as he had occasion, and left the book essentially as we now have it; but that slight changes have been made by copyists and compilers to explain some obscure passages, or for other purposes. Block and De Wette have substantially the same opinion of the composition of the book; but without sufficient reason they ascribe the work to some other author besides Moses, and suppose it to belong to a much later age.

That the theory here described regarding the composition of Genesis is the true one, might be argued at much greater length than our limits will permit. A few only of the most convincing reasons will be presented in the present article.

1. Any one who will carefully examine the book will find a
Class of passages, of various lengths, wherein the Deity is referred to as God, the original being Elohim. He will find a smaller number, though in the aggregate a considerable portion of the book, having the word Lord, the original being Jehovah. Some of the former will have an occasional instance of the use of Lord, and the latter a similar use of God; either from a wrong reading, as is the case a few times (iv. 25; vii. 9.), or a wrong rendering (vi. 5.), or from some change by the compiler when he gave the book its present form.

Besides these instances, Lord is sometimes the rendering of Adonai, (xviii. 3, 30, 31, 32; xix. 18; xx. 4.) and God is the rendering of Elohim, (xiv, 18, 19, 20, 22; xvii. 1; xxviii; 3; xlili. 14; xlvii. 3.; xlvii. 3.). In other instances, Adonai and Jehovah are used in combination; and as both could not be rendered Lord, (the rendering of each when used separately), the former is given as Lord and the latter as God. Gen. xv. 2. 8. The impossibility of a uniform rendering of Jehovah by Lord would have suggested to our translators the propriety of giving the original word Jehovah, which will always make good sense.

2. The two passages of which we are speaking are clearly distinguished by the sign of a paragraph (¶) between them. Those who published our English Bible, though they probably knew nothing of the theory under consideration, have put the sign of a paragraph, in nearly all cases, between the two sets of passages, showing them to be separate and distinct. There are at least twenty-eight instances in the book where this sign is used, or there is a division of chapters, exactly where the theory of documents would require it. Of the nine remaining instances, six certainly are in the wrong place; and when put right would indicate the required separation. This leaves but three instances which do not correspond with the theory; and they are as liable to be misplaced as the theory is to be wrong.

3. The book of Genesis contains frequent references, from later to earlier passages, sometimes directly, and sometimes by implication; and these are generally in harmony with the
hypothesis of two classes of passages; in other words, the passage containing the reference, and the passage referred to, belong to the same document. All the exceptions, if there be any, may be accounted for by a similarity in the subject matter of both documents, or by changes that were made when the two were combined as we now have them.

4. Each class of passages has other peculiarities besides the use of Elohim and Jehovah. The following are a few. In the Elohim document God is often called God Almighty; but in the other passages he is never so called. In the former a part of Syria often referred to is called Padanaram; in the latter the same district is designated as Mesopotamia. It is true that the latter name is found but once; but this does not make the circumstance any the less remarkable. An author who had used one form many times would not be likely to vary it once without any apparent reason. See Gen. xxv. 20; xxviii. 6. 7.; xxxi. 18.; xxxv. 9.; xxiv. 10., etc. etc.

The expression "male and female" is not from the same original in both documents. Compare i. 27; v. 2.; vi. 19. with vii. 2. 3.

"Be fruitful and multiply," "After his kind" or "their kind," "This self-same day," and many other expressions are found in the Elohim document, but not in the other; and sometimes when the same expression is used in both, the original is not alike.

The general character of the two documents is dissimilar. The Elohist is more diffuse than the Jehovist; but the latter is distinguished by the circumstance that it contains nearly all the references to those moral actions, as well as forms and ceremonies, that were afterwards enjoined or forbidden by the law of Moses. This might be expected perhaps, from its belonging to a period nearer the giving of the law.

Since the date of writing the two documents was not the same, De Wette endeavors to point out the time to which each should be referred, by certain passages in the book. He finds evidence to show that the Elohist wrote his work in the time of Samuel and Saul; and the Jehovist as late as Hezekiah. Vol. II. pp. 146, 149.
The following is from Bleek: "It appears very probable that the narrative, in its original shape, used the name Elohim only, but that it was subsequently enlarged and otherwise remodelled by another hand, and that thus the name "Jehovah" was introduced." Vol. I. p. 274.

As Bleek holds that the Jehovistic portions of Genesis were no part of a continuous work, like the Elohistic, but were added by the author of Genesis, it follows of course that the time of writing these passages was the same as the time of writing the book. On the time of writing the Elohim document he agrees with De Wette. "We may assume with the greatest probability that the Elohistic writing was not composed until at least a considerable time after taking possession of the land of Canaan."

In another passage he suggests the age of Saul, about four hundred years after Moses, as the earliest period at which this work could have been composed. p. 287. On the time of combining the Elohistic and Jehovistic elements, this author concluded that "the Jehovistic revision did not take place, and consequently that Genesis did not receive its present shape, subsequently to the separation, perhaps not later than the reign of David, and not quite in the latter part of his reign." p. 299.

Let us give the reasons he adduces for this conclusion a candid examination. If these are sound, and are fitted to convince the candid mind, we should not be so fearful of heresy as to desire to set them aside. Are they thus sound and convincing?

These authors claim to find in the book of Genesis (and the same is claimed of the other books of the Pentateuch), certain references to later events than those of which the book gives us the history; and these references, they maintain, prove the late writing of the book. If, for example, the author makes an allusion to the possession of Canaan, then it follows that the book was written after the conquest of that country. If there is a reference to the kings that ruled over

NEW SERIES. VOL. XII 6
the children of Israel, then the writing of the book was as late as the kings.

These authors find an allusion to the conquest of Canaan in the following passages in Genesis. xii. 6.; xiii. 7. We there read that in the time of Abraham and Lot "the Canaanites and Perizzites were in the land." The inference, these authors tell us, is that when this language was penned these tribes were not in the land, and therefore the book was written later than the time of Joshua. The inference is correct if there is no better way to account for these words. The same author tells us that God had promised the land of Canaan to Abraham and his posterity. When that promise was fulfilled the tribes of Canaan would not be its inhabitants. It was not unnatural, therefore, that the writer of this history should remark that as yet these tribes were in the land.

It is admitted that the author meant to represent himself as having written this history at an early period; and yet he executes his design so badly that he betrays the late date by alluding to the conquest of Canaan! More likely, we think, he knew what he was about, and designed his allusion to Canaan as having reference to the promise of God. This view makes the writer consistent with himself, while the other makes him very careless and inconsiderate. See Bleek, Vol. I. p. 229; De Wette, Vol. II. p. 147.

The language of Joseph, Gen. xl. 15., where he speaks of Canaan as "the land of the Hebrews," is adduced as proof that the Hebrews were settled in Canaan when the book was written. See Bleek, Vol. I. p. 231; De Wette, Vol. II. p. 146. This construction makes the whole of that beautiful story of Joseph a fabrication and an imposture. The author declares that Joseph was in Egypt when he used these words, and that they were spoken several hundred years before the conquest of Canaan. Plainly he did not intend this reference to Canaan to be understood as our authors construe it. It is quite obvious that he is the best judge of his meaning. We think he had good reasons for putting these words into the mouth of Joseph, without attaching to them any such mean
ing as is here supposed. Joseph was talking to a fellow prisoner. He was talking of his native land. His father's family still resided there. He calls it the "land of the Hebrews." There was certainly no impropriety in this. It had been the land of the Hebrews for many generations, and was still such. If they were soon to leave it and sojourn in Egypt, the land was still theirs in prospect; and Joseph was well aware of this, and put his brethren under the strongest obligations to carry his bones to that country. With the same strong conviction he carried up the dead body of his father, and placed it in the ancestral tomb. Surely it did not require any reference to the conquest under Joshua to justify this language.

Not only, say our critics, does this book show by such evidence as the foregoing, that it was written after the conquest of Canaan; but by evidence equally convincing, it shows that it was written as late as the Kings! The following passage is urged as proof of this position: "These are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." Gen. xxxvi. 31. This reference stands on the same footing as the others we have noticed. The patriarchs had been told by divine revelation that kings should proceed from them; and it was understood by Moses, and doubtless by others, that the kings referred to, should be such as would rule over the Israelites. Hence when the time should come that kings should be desired, laws were provided that should regulate the choice of them and guide the administration of their government. See Gen. xvii. 6; xxxv. 11; also Deut. xvii. 14—20. In view of this promise and expectation, it was not unnatural that the event should be referred to as confidently expected. The passage teaches simply, that the branch of the Abrahamic family which descended from Esau had kings to rule over them before the other branch that proceeded from Jacob, though the latter had the divine promise to this effect, and the former had not. The fact that Bleek calls such an exposition "unnatural" should not deter us from accepting it. It looks to us much more "natural" than the one he offers us.
It is quite common to represent such passages as we are considering as glosses, added at a late day, to qualify some statements that seemed to require them. This was done by some transcriber or compiler, perhaps by Ezra, who is thought to have had considerable agency in bringing together the books of our Canon. This is not an unreasonable view. All ancient books, that are deemed worthy of preservation in the world, are subject to such treatment. Of course the truth and authenticity of these books are not disproved, nor rendered suspicious, by these changes. This explanation, though not necessary, may be the true one in relation to such passages as the foregoing, and others of a similar kind.

Again, there are some proper names, that are supposed not to have been in use till after the conquest. The occurrence of these, in the book of Genesis, is considered proof of the late writing of the book. The argument is used by both our authors. See Gen. xiii. 18; xiv. 14, etc. The name Bethel dates back to the time of Jacob, and therefore can have no bearing on the present question. When Hebron was named we do not know. Dan is the only name that can be fairly used in the argument. That was named after the conquest. Jud. xviii. 29. But it was exceedingly natural that some copyist or compiler, should drop the old name which had become obsolete, and take the new one. That the writer who composed the history in Genesis long after the assumed events took place, and wished it to pass among the people as having been composed at the time of these events, or soon after (the view our authors take of the subject), should be so thoughtless as to use proper names which he must have known with certainty would expose the fraud attempted to be practiced, is a proposition not to be thought of in connection with such an author as the one who wrote the book of Genesis. It must not be forgotten that, though the thought is not made prominent by these authors, it is their real opinion that the writer of Genesis, and of the whole Pentateuch, was an imposter (though as Bleek thinks, not having a bad design), writing at a late period, and palming his work on the world as that of Moses. With this
view, we should be cautious that our interpretation does not put any thing in the book, that such an author would not have written. He could see all the bearings of such passages as we are noticing as well as we; and therefore it is reasonable to conclude that he saw other ways of understanding them, besides that assumed by Bleek and De Wette. And the fact that some modern interpreters of respectable talents have the same view, is partial confirmation of its accuracy. See Bleek, Vol. I. p. 231, and De Wette, Vol. II. p. 146.

De Wette has a few passages that are not taken notice of by Bleek in the same way. They are Gen. xlix. 5—7; xxv. 23; xxvii. 29. The first of them, he says, was written "when the tribe of Levi was despised." But the passage says nothing of the tribe of Levi. It is spoken of Simeon and Levi not as tribes, but as individuals; and no one can help seeing that the reference to "instruments of cruelty" was suggested by the conduct of these sons of Jacob toward the Shechemites. Gen. xxxiv. 25 etc. The other two passages only contain intimations that Jacob should prevail over his twin brother Esau. The fulfilment of them may have been later than Moses' day, but the passages themselves need not be so understood. If to evade their force our authors deny their inspiration without giving any proof, it is sufficient if we affirm the inspiration without proof. A positive assertion is as good as a negative one. Whether indeed those passages contain an inspired prediction may well be doubted. They may rather be understood as an expression of desire, or an affirmation of what might be reasonably expected from the known character and circumstances of the parties referred to.

The passages that are quoted from other parts of the Pentateuch will be reserved for examination at another time. Other considerations too that tend to show the Mosaic authorship of Genesis and the rest of the Pentateuch, as well as those that are urged against this theory, will then be discussed as fully as our space will permit.
The Opinions of John Wesley.

It is gratifying to note the unfolding of Hope's almost matchless glories in the Moravian Church, but how sad, in the contrast, Wesley's retrograde towards Calvinism. But the record of his early life, with its liberal tendencies and marvellous revealings of Moravian love, is an irrevocable heritage of our Church. And remembering the utterances of his old age, shall we not look for the reappearance, Arethusa-like, of his early trust in God's love and power?

We note, 1. That he condemned the Moravians far less for teaching universal Salvation than for their other "grand errors." Why? Not on account of meagre proof of their Universalism, himself being judge. In proof of our position we submit the following: "I would wish all to observe that the points in question between us and either the German or English Antinomians, are not points of opinion but of practice. We think and let think."—Journal for May 23d, 1745. In a letter written a little later, September 8, 1746, he condemned the Antinomianism and Quietism of the Moravians, but refrained from criticising their Universalism. 1

2. That in 1744, he published "An Extract of Count Zinzendorf's Discourses on the Redemption of Man by the Death of Christ." 12mo. 78 pp. Modern Methodists are not in the habit of publishing Universalist treatises "on the redemption of Man by the Death of Christ."

3. That sometimes the old love would burn through all disguises. The letter just quoted contains the following: "There has not been one day for these seven years wherein my soul has not longed for union."

4. That the Methodist Conference for 1744 agreed that it "had leaned too much toward Calvinism."

5. A new affiliation. Not only were all those sermons, in which Wesley strongly asserts the dogma of endless misery,
written subsequent to his trouble with Whitefield, but he, also, about that time became greatly enamoured of the writings of Bengel, an author who threatens the sinner perhaps with unending woe, but also teaches, if words have any determinate meaning, that the entire creation will at last be freed from sin, through holiness. A few quotations from the "Gnomon" must suffice to illustrate their author's Universalism:

"Death has its goal and boundary. Life is everlasting, and divinely extended. Death is not said to be eternal; life is called eternal."—Com. on Rom. v. 21. "Hath concluded.—Jews and Gentiles. In unbelief. Those who have experienced the power of unbelief at length betake themselves the more sincerely to faith. That—The thing itself will be accomplished. Then all—All together. Might have mercy—His mercy being acknowledged by them, v. 6th, when faith is given them by himself." Com. on Rom. ii. 32. Of Him, etc. Denoting the origin, course and end of all things." Com. on Rom. xi. 36.

"That God may be all in all.—Here is signified something new, but at once the consummation and everlasting. All things (and therefore all men) without any interruption, with no creature to invade, no enemy to disturb, will be subordinated to the Son; the Son to the Father. All things will say, God is all to me. This is τίτλος, this the end and crown. Further, not even an apostle can go." Com. on 1 Cor. xv. 28.

Nor are these sporadic utterances. They are the logical outcome of Bengel's system of interpretation. In his comments on the Apocalypse the reader is taken from height to height, until he at last reaches that summit of love, wisdom and power, where the Creator arises and declares, "Behold, I make all things new."

Yet Bengel believed that the judgment and the destruction of the material creation would precede the "new heavens and new earth" of universal holiness and peace. Wesley's heart beat responsive to these grand conceptions. In his study, while riding through the country, and in the silence of the night time, he would trace in German or Latin the rapt utterances of the Gnomon and the still more sublime Ekkliarte Offenbarung. We first note the pencillings of the new light in
the "Moral and Sacred Poems," when Wesley italicises the mention of the *Gnomon* by the poet Young; and we also trace it, we think, in the startling plainness of certain poems in this collection, the conjoint productions of John and Charles Wesley. This fealty, at least on the part of the elder brother, was life long. In the preface to his New Testament Notes, he says:

"I once designed to write down barely what occurred to my own mind. But no sooner was I acquainted with that great light of the Christian world, Bengelius, than I entirely changed my design, being thoroughly convinced that it might be of more service to the cause of religion, were I barely to translate his *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. Many of his excellent notes I have therefore translated. Many more I have abridged, omitting that part which was purely critical, and giving the substance of the rest."

December 8, 1777, he wrote: 3

"There is no comparison either as to sense, learning or piety, between Bishop Newton and Bengelius. The former is a mere child to the latter. I advise you to give another serious and careful reading to that extract from the comment on the Revelation. There you have one uniform, consistent (view), far beyond any I ever saw. And I very believe the more deeply you ponder it the more you will admire it."

In 1788, while on the verge of this life, Wesley still eulogized Bengel as "the most learned, the most judicious and the most laborious of all our modern commentators." 4 We do not maintain that the former accepted all the minutiae of Bengel's system, but we think it evident that he adopted most of its leading points. We feel confident that a comparison of Wesley's New Testament Notes with the *Gnomon*, to say nothing of the testimony which we have submitted, will corroborate our assertions. Bengel's system, with its threats on the one hand, and its portrayal on the other, of a time when "good will be the final goal of ill," did not come to Wesley in the garb of novelty. Was he not familiar with the writings of Tillotson, Law and the Mystics! At last, however, it pre-

---

sent itself when exigencies favored its adoption, and with the sanction of rare learning and piety. Minor influences may, however, confirm a verdict which they are powerless to evoke. No writer so revolutionized and permanently moulded Wesley's system of Scriptural exegesis as Bengel. This ought to be taken into account, as it is of vital importance, in the examination of Wesley's doctrinal teachings; yet it is persistently overlooked by Methodist writers. Taylor! Law! Bohler! Bengel! How could a man whose religious life had been shaped by such teachers, who was, as we believe, thoroughly wedded so early as 1744 to the writings of the Universalist Bengel, at the same time denounce the Moravians for teaching the doctrine of Universal Salvation? Was the man a hypocrite?

During the last century a distinction was sometimes made between "universal salvation" and "universal restoration." Perhaps the distinction originated in Germany, that land of intellectual subtleties, since it still exists among the Dunkers or German-Baptists of this country. But what is the difference between these dogmas? It appears to be two-fold.

1. According to the former doctrine, no one will be in a state of condemnation at the day of judgment; whereas, according to the latter, the wicked will then be filled with sorrow and remorse.

2. According to the former doctrine all men will yet work out their own salvation; but according to the latter, if we scan aright, the sinner loses the power of self-recovery, and can only be restored to holiness and happiness by the fullest display of God's omnipotence.

We find the following in the writings of Wesley's old college friend, George Stonehouse. He says: "Where this regenerating does not appear before the day of divine wrath is disclosed, there is damnation, or the being condemned to the suffering of that wrath; and thus you arrive at the difference between the terms restored and saved." John Murray made no distinction between "universal restoration" and "universal

4 Universal Restitution (1st ed.) p. 142.
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redemption,' but generally employed the latter phrase. How instructive, then, the following brief extracts from his life:"

"He (Murray) was convinced that only he who believed could be saved; and that he who believed not was indubitably damned. Hence he has frequently said he did not believe in universal salvation because he saw that the majority of mankind were not saved. But he was a firm believer in Universal Redemption." "It was the neglecting to distinguish between salvation and redemption which so frequently drew upon the preacher the charge of prevarication, or, as it was termed by Mr. Croswell, 'hiding.'"

But Murray was a close follower of Relly, while Relly grew up spiritually under the tutelage of Wesley. And was the latter all untouched by the golden tide which, as we have seen, flowed all around him? Perhaps he vitally connected some of these scattered branches of a common faith. His condemnation of "universal salvation" does not prove that he condemned a belief in "universal redemption." Nor is the latter doctrine censured, so far as we can learn, in any part of his manifold works. And was he not profoundly attached to the writings of Bengal? Does the reader say, "Would that we might, during this period of Wesley's apparent retrogression, find such explicit enunciations of Universal Restoration as should make this narrative stand forth radiant with the light of probability?"

"The Moral and Sacred Poems" were published by Wesley, August 1744. They threaten the sinner with unending woe, but they also sweetly minister to hope. Among other things we find an abridgement of the Night Thoughts, containing such words as these:"

"'Tis, from death the terrors fly
When once 'tis understood:
'Tis Nature's call, 'tis God's decree
And is and must be good."

"Oh, when will death, (now stingless) like a fiend,
Give being, once in nature, one abode?"

*Life of Murray (ed. of 1859), p. 400.

† Vol. II. pp. 197, 277, 222. These are but paltry samples. The curious reader can read the "abridgement" for himself, if our statement seems too sweeping.
And this fair view:

"All cloud, all shadow blown remote, and leave
No mystery—but that of Love Divine."

It has long been a mooted question whether the poet Young was not a Universalist. Several considerations favor the supposition, and but for the awful threats which he sometimes hurls at the sinner, no one could doubt his position. In addition to Dr. Whittemore’s statements, we wish to present two considerations never before offered, we believe:

1. We note a great similiarity between the cosmology of the poet and that of Bengel; and we remark,

2. That in Young’s later, undramatic poems, whenever he touches the higher realm, the uniform cadence of his song is that

"To final good the worst events
Through secret channels run;
Finish for man their destined course,
As ‘twas for man begun."

Continuing our survey, we confess surprise at finding Pope’s “Essay on Man” included in the collection. The optimism of this production, poetic copy of Shaftsbury’s thought, is easily apparent. Wesley does not fault the poet’s statement that,

"Respecting Man, whatever wrong we call,
May, must be right, as relative to all;"

though he must have been aware of a subsequent assertion that

"the Universal Cause
Acts not by partial, but by general laws,
And makes what happiness we justly call
Subsist not in the good of one, but all."

Wesley held Pope rigidly responsible for certain erroneous estimates of moral duty, following his limpid verse with notes of correction which are scrupulously, almost querulously, exact. But when the poet’s song rises to its grandest heights, discoursing on God’s love and man’s ultimate destiny, Wesley’s corrective notes fail him. Shall we not interpret this as the silence of assent?

2 Resignation.
We now invite attention to certain poems of this collection, the conjoint productions of John and Charles Wesley. One of these compositions praises that “remnant according to the promise,” who have ever blessed the earth, and concludes with this sublime prophecy: 12

“A tenth shall still return, and grow, And furnish heaven and earth with food, ’Till all mankind to Jesus flow, And every soul is filled with God.”

We now present a longer extract from another poem: 13

“The Lord shall in this mountain spread A table for the world, his guest, Accept mankind in Christ their head, And bid them to the gospel feast.
That covering o’er the people cast, That veil o’er all the nations spread, The Lord himself shall rend at last, And quite destroy in Christ their head.
Jesus again their life shall be, Shall recompense their Eden’s loss, Swallow up death in victory, The bleeding vict’ry of his cross.
He shall, by his renewing grace, blot out the all-infecting sin, That dire reproach of Human Race, And make a world of sinners clean.
Jesus, to whom all power is given, Shall all his strength for us employ; Who cast the Accuser out of heaven, Shall him, with all his works, destroy.

Though Wesley believed that the world would be blessed with two millenial periods, it is generally easy, in view of the following criteria, to determine his reference. The first millenium precedes the death of its participants, the coming of the Lord, the judgment, the conflagration, and the destruction of Satan, while the latter is subsequent to all these events. The first is transient, confined and followed by a lapse into sin, while the ultimate millennium is eternal and all glorious. In point of fact, Wesley, in nearly all his millenial utterances, refers to the ultimate display of grace and truth. Believing in the resurrection of the material body, he was wise enough to suppose that after that event the people would dwell upon this planet.

Recurring to the verses just quoted, it will be observed that the poet refers to a period subsequent to the full display of

the Redeemer’s omnipotence and love, when the “veil” shall have been destroyed, and “Satan with all his works.” Then God will “make a world of sinners clean,” will “accept Man-kind in Christ their head,” so that all shall be “forever perfected in One.”

Perhaps some of our readers may remember “Father Murray’s plaint:

“And down our throats this lie is cram’d,
Let sin be sav’d, the sinner damn’d.”

Can anyone thus fault the following from the Wesleys?

“Yet will I all my word fulfill,
I will, as in a moment’s space,
The doom of sin and Satan seal,
And all their last remains erase.
My love shall all your foes control,
Destroy their being with their power,
The poor, backsliding, fearful soul
Shall fear and fall and sin no more.
The anger shall not always last,
Ye soon shall gain the perfect peace;
The judgment then is all o’erpast,
And wrath and sin forever cease.
The sin mine anger shall destroy,
The sinner, whom my mercies spare,
Shall sing the song of endless joy,
And fruit unto perfection bear.
Sinners, for full redemption hope,
Believe, ye sinners of the Lord,
A scourge for sin he shall stir up,
And slay him with his two-edged sword.
The inbred sin in that great day
The Lord shall from thy soul depart,
The yoke shall all be borne away,
The sinner shall be pure in heart.”

In these manifold assurances Wesley speaks absolutely, generically respecting all the members of a class. Both the Scriptures and usu logendi justify us in referring these promises to every sinner. Those whom the poem once characterizes as “prisoners of the Lord,” and thrice as “sinners,” are described as “bearing fruit unto perfection,” and as “singing the song of endless joy” at a period subsequent to that “great day,” “the judgment.” Nor need we wonder at such statements in view of Wesley’s asseveration that God will at last “destroy the being and the power” of sin and Satan. Can these words be reconciled with anything but the doctrine of Universal Rostoration?

We now present the following additional quotation:

"Yet will I plead the sinner’s cause,
The poor and self-condemned release,
Freed by the sufferings of his cross,
And saved by his own righteousness.
Their sins he shall to death condemn,
*(They here shall find their final doom,)*
*Their sins he shall destroy, not them,*
And by his burning spirit consumes.
That vast, unfathomable sea, (i.e. Christ)
Shall swallow up all of Adam’s line,
And every soul of man shall be
Forever lost in love divine."

Again the “sinner” is sweetly ministered unto, and the unsearchable riches of God’s love proclaimed. Transcending the present state, the judgment is sketched, and the light of mercy seen emerging from its darkness, in the destruction of sin and the salvation of the sinner. According to the Moravian doctrine of “universal salvation,” no one will be condemned at the judgment; but according to these verses and the teachings of Reilly and Murray, the sinner will then be “self-condemned,” and can only be released by the merits of Christ’s righteousness, in its last, most perfect display. And could Universal Restoration be more explicitly inculcated than in the glad prophecy that Christ “shall swallow up all of Adam’s line,” and the words which immediately follow?

Compulsory Education.

Two hundred years ago, in 1671, Sir William Berkley, Colonial Governor of Virginia, uttered the following: "I thank God that there are no free schools nor printing in the colony, and hope there will not be these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects, into the world, and printing has divulged them, and libels against the best government. God keep us from both." What a contrast this to the law which goes into operation in the State of New York this first day of January, 1874. The occasion furnishes us an opportunity to present some facts relating to the subject matter of this law of compulsory education, which may interest and inform our readers. The law alluded to requires every person having the control or charge of any child, between the ages of eight and fourteen years, to see that such child has fourteen weeks' schooling each year, eight weeks of which must be consecutive. The penalty for not doing this is $1 for the first offence, and $5 per week for each week of neglect afterward, up to thirteen weeks in any one year.

No person or company is allowed to employ any child between the ages of eight and fourteen in any business whatever during the school hours of any school day of the public school in the city or school district where such child is, unless such child has had in the year immediately preceding such employment fourteen weeks' schooling; and at the time of employing such child the employer must receive from the child a certificate of the teacher or School Trustee certifying to such schooling. The penalty on the employer for violating this requirement is $5 for each offense, the fine to be added to the school money of the school district in which the offense occurs. Those having the matter in charge, Trustees, Superintendents, &c., failing to enforce the law are subject to a fine not exceeding $250 for each offence.

The Police must clear the streets and public places of the City of habitual truants, and of all loafers and idlers between the ages of eight and fourteen, and put these habitual truants and juvenile idlers to school, not for fourteen weeks in each year only, but for the whole
year, for the fourteen weeks' limit does not apply to this class of children. They can send all who are Catholic to the Catholic Protectory, and all others to the House of Refuge, or they may provide other places for their discipline, instruction and confinement. These are leading features of the act, and they show wisdom, earnestness and resolution on the part of those who have given them legal shape and being.

It is gratifying to the philanthropist to know that this subject is attracting a large measure of attention in our own, and in foreign lands. Several European countries have already settled the question, and the State has taken up its duty to the subject in thorough earnest, compelling parents to avail themselves of their privileges, and see to it that every child born to them is taught to read and write, and so much of arithmetic as will enable him to keep accounts reasonably well. And why should it not be so universally? Every government should be parental in this respect, as well as in all others. Laws are not for restraint only, but for encouragement. It is not enough for governments to repress and punish crime; they should assist and promote virtue, educate the people, and foster enterprise.

As a rule ignorance, idleness and crime are rounds in the same ladder of descent; and it is folly to pretend that government, society has not a right to protect itself from this trinity of evils. And if it has the right to say "Thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not kill," then it has an equal right to say thou shalt not be ignorant. On what ground does it legislate against rum-selling? On the ground that it leads to idleness, poverty and crime. On what ground does it put a thief, a murderer, or an insane person into prison? On the ground that he is dangerous to the peace, order and safety of the community. By the same rule it has a right to protect itself against ignorance which is the mother of vice, and therefore dangerous to the stability and welfare of society. And this being so, it certainly has the right to compel parents to educate their children, so far at least as to give them a fair chance to earn an honest living. And we claim that this is a right of

1 The twenty-fifth annual report of the "New York Prison Association" says, "one-third of the inmates of our common jails cannot read. Only two and seven-tenths of our adult State population are unable to read, while thirty-one per cent. of the criminals cannot read. Thus nearly one-third of the crime is committed by about two-hundredths of the population?" Let us add to this that two-thirds of the prisoners acknowledged to intemperate habits, and a large portion of the remaining third occasionally drunk to intoxication—and "scarcey one in a hundred claimed to be a total abstinent."
every child, which the government of the State or the Nation is under obligations to secure to him, and make practical, even if the parent should object and resist.

As has been justly and forcibly said, "A parent has no more right, under pretence of freedom, to impose upon society an ignorant child, than he has, under the same pretence, to walk the streets naked. A parent has no more right to turn upon the country an ignorant man, than a showman has a right to turn loose a beast of prey in our city streets. That child is to vote upon the destinies of my country, my children and myself, and what right has he to be a base and willful idiot? It is my right that he should be educated, and if he will not become so freely, he should be made so forcibly."

But we do not propose now to discuss the question in the abstract, but to illustrate by facts the statement that some foreign governments, as intimated, have already reduced the doctrine to practice, and that with most gratifying results. An Italian journal, *L'Eco d'Italia*, lately went into an inquiry touching the subject, and has furnished some interesting and very valuable reports regarding the educational condition of different European nations. We give the substance of these in the brief paragraphs which follow:

"In Prussia almost all the children attend school regularly, except in some of the eastern districts. An officer who had charge of the military education of the Landwehr, in twelve years had only met with three young soldiers who could neither read nor write. An inquiry having been instituted, it was found that these three were the children of sailors, who had been born on the river and had never settled in any place. Instruction is obligatory.

In Bavaria, among one hundred conscripts, but seven whose education was incomplete or entirely wanting were found. Instruction also obligatory.

In Baden every child receives instruction; and in Wurttemberg there is not a peasant, or a girl of the lowest class, or a servant in an inn who cannot read, write and account correctly. Every child goes to school, instruction being obligatory.

In Saxony education is compulsory; all inhabitants of the kingdom can read and write, and every child attends school.

In Switzerland all can read and write, and have a good primary education. Education is obligatory, and greater efforts, in proportion to its means, are made to impart primary instruction than in any other European nation.

In all the smaller States of North Germany education is compulsory, and all the children attend school.

In Denmark the same is true. All the Danes, with a few excep-
tions, can read, write and keep accounts. The children all attend school until the age of fourteen.

In Norway almost all the Norwegians can read, write and account passably well. Instruction obligatory.

In Sweden the proportion of inhabitants who can neither read nor write is one in a thousand. Instruction obligatory.

In Holland public assistance is taken away from every indigent family that neglects to send its children to school. It is estimated that the number of illiterate is three per cent."

As it will be seen nearly all these are Protestant countries, or largely so. But the same authority states that France has twenty-three illiterate conscripts in a hundred! and stands twelfth in the list, followed by Belgium, Italy, Austria, Greece, Spain, Portugal, Moldova, Wallachia, Russia and Turkey, in the order named. In Italy, however, the conditions vary much according to the province.

Singularly enough England is not mentioned in this estimate and comparison. We fear the statistics, if given, would lower the general average of Protestant intelligence.*

Let us turn now to Mohammedan Egypt, which has lately given marked attention to education, and seems alive to its importance as an essential element of national development, prosperity and power. All the sons of the present Khedive have received a European education—one has been instructed in Paris, one in England, and a third has, we believe, entered the Prussian army as an officer, which is good guaranty of his educational attainments. The following is from an editorial in the Methodist Quarterly on "The Mohammedan World," published two years ago. Speaking of Egypt, it says:

"Sweeping reforms have, in particular, been effected in the department of public education. Since 1868 public schools have been established by the Government in all the important places of the coun-

*As proof take the following: Candidates for positions in the general post-office at London were obliged to make written statements as to the medical histories of themselves and their families, and these are some of their sad but interesting expressions: "Father had a sunstroke, and I caught it of him;" "My little brother died of some funny name;" "A great white cat drew my sister's breath, and she died of it;" "Apperplexity;" "Parasites;" "Burrniger in the head;" "Rummitanic pains;" "Shortness of breath;" "Indigestion of the lungs;" "Tongerina in the throat;" "Pistoles on the back."

A member of Parliament, Mr. Osborne Morgan, declared in a recent speech that England was the most pauper-stricken, drink-stricken country in Protestant Europe, and attributed it to "the want of education among the working classes." On the other hand Lord Roseberry said, before the social scientists, that compulsory education in Prussia had "not only effaced Jews, but produced the German empire of to-day."
try. They numbered in 1870 about four thousand pupils, who received from the Government not only gratuitous instruction, but their entire support, inclusive of clothing. These schools embrace both the primary and the secondary instruction. The former embraced Arabic reading and writing, arithmetic, drawing, French, or, according to the location of the place, some other foreign languages. From the elementary school the pupils pass into the preparatory department of the secondary school. The course lasts three years, and embraces the study of the Arabic, Turkish, French and English languages; mathematics, drawing, history and geography. After completing this preparatory course the pupil enters one of the special schools which are to finish his education for the service of the State.

These special schools are: 1. The Polytechnical School, the course of which lasts four years. As in France, its pupils are permitted to choose between the civil and the military career. In the former case the pupil enters for two years the School of Administration, and after the service of the State; in the latter case he enters the Military Academy of the Abbasieh at Cairo. The Polytechnical School had, in 1871, seventy-one pupils. 2. The Law School. The students study the law of the Islam, especially that of Egypt, which is now in the course of a radical transformation, and also the Roman law and the present laws of the European countries. 3. The Philological School. 4. The School of Arts and Industry, founded at Balak by Mehemet Ali, and greatly perfected by Ismail Pasha. 5. The Medical School, with which is connected a School of Midwifery, the only one which exists in the East. 6. The Naval School in Alexandria.

Quite recently the Egyptian Government has called the celebrated German Orientalist, H. Brugsch, of Gottingen, to Cairo, in order to organize there an Academy for Archæology, and in particular Egyptological studies.”

To the above we add that now 90,000 children attend the primary schools, and in spite of the Mohammedan prejudice regarding female education, the government has established a large girls’ school at Cairo, where beside an elementary education, sewing, washing and dressmaking are taught.

If now we come to our own country we shall find a like activity in the matter of special education among the Catholics. Their opposition to our public school system, and the reasons for it, have been ably discussed lately in these pages; but our readers may not be as well informed regarding their efforts to educate their children in such fashion as to shield them from Protestant influences, and keep them loyal to the Church. The Catholic World, in a late paper on “The Female Religious of America,” has furnished some very interesting historical memoranda, as well as important statistical information on this point. We have room only for a few facts from the latter depart m
Twenty-five years ago the educational institutions of the Catholic Female Religious societies numbered sixty-six, while now they have nearly four hundred academies alone. In the Diocese of New York there are forty-six of these female schools with more than 20,000 children, beside some 8,000 in orphan asylums and charitable juvenile institutions. In the Philadelphia Diocese there are thirty-five schools, with 10,000 pupils, beside those in the orphan homes. The World says:

"We have no means of ascertaining the number of scholars in the entire country; but if we take the above as a criterion, it will be found that in the United States there are nearly 300,000 girls daily receiving at the hands of the sisters of various congregations a free, thorough and practical Catholic education. If we add to the number of girls in the free schools the fifty or sixty thousand pupils in the 640 academies and select schools, we will find that about 350,000 female children are, in this year of grace 1874, under the more than maternal care of the religious of the Catholic church."

Female children—nothing is said of similar provisions for the male children. Why this distinction? Is an educated woman more easily managed by the priesthood than an educated man? Or is it that educated women are depended on to manage ignorant and intractable men in the interests of the church? Certainly the Catholic boys in our towns and cities do not give evidence of such careful educational culture as seems, according to these statistics, to be so amply secured to the girls.\(^8\) In one instance only boys are mentioned in this record:

"In this (New York) diocese there are 572 girls and very young boys in the female protectory, and 1,297 in seven orphan asylums." Why boys in the female protectory? Is it because there is no such provision for them as for the girls?\(^4\)

\(^8\) Perhaps the policy of the Catholic church in the education of boys may be seen in the action of Laval, first Bishop of Quebec (1668). Parkman says in his new book, "Besides the great seminary where young men were trained for the priesthood, there was a lesser seminary where boys were educated in the hope that they would one day take orders. . . . There was also a sort of farm school, where the children of artisans and peasants were taught farming and various mechanical arts, and thoroughly grounded in the doctrine and discipline of the Church." The Old Regime in Canada, pp. 162, 163. Observe, all education in letters is for the priestly class. Others were taught how to labor, and especially to reverence the dogmas, and obey the discipline of the Church.

\(^4\) It was stated in 1871 that there were 11,817 "Heathen Chinee" in San Francisco, all of whom, according to Census returns, could read and write; while of the Irish Catholics there were 6,585 who could do neither.
1875.]
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The rapid growth of these religio-educational institutions in this country is a fact worthy of thought from all interested in the Catholic question. Let us take two or three examples. Though it is only about thirty years ago that the Sisters of Mercy were introduced into our country, they have already fifty asylums and hospitals, eighty academies and select schools, an immense number of free schools and convents, and considerably over 1,300 members or teachers. The Sisters of Charity entered Philadelphia in 1814, New York in 1817; and now at least one hundred asylums and hospitals are under their charge; about the same number of academies and select schools; while free schools and scholars beyond computation enjoy the blessings of their instruction; and their convents and establishments dot the country in every direction.

Let us rejoice in this earnest work of the Catholic sisters, even if they prefer girls to boys in their labor of love. Every truly educated woman is a blessing to the community, and cannot fail to exert an influence for good over the ignorant, coarse, lawless and godless men with whom she may come in contact. The dignity of her bearing, the elegance of her manners, the wealth of her conversation, the sweetness of her piety, are all restraining, refining, educating forces. Her very presence is a moral power.

We know that knowledge is not virtue; nor is it necessarily success; but we believe that the young man and young woman, coming up into life properly and wisely educated, find themselves with social surroundings and companionships more likely than otherwise to conducive to purity, truth, goodness, moral and social order. And certainly the educated man has open to him a hundred avenues to business and employment, which are closed against the man wholly ignorant of letters, and who therefore is all the more likely to resort to dishonest ways for bread or money—as gambling, theft, burglary and murder. At this point then let the State come in, assert its rights, discharge its duties, compel education for girls and boys alike, and so do what it may, and ought to do, to protect society from the dangers of ignorance, illleness and crime.

As regards the higher studies and institutions for the education of women in the United States, the Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1873 shows that these schools and colleges, so called, number 210 with 24,618 students, while 97 co-educational institutions report 7,357 female students.

The whole number of colleges in the country is, or was last year, 323, with 3,108 instructors, and 25,165 preparatory and 25,010 regular students. The Scientific Schools numbered 68, with 660 instructors and 8,468 students; and beside these there were 89 Colleges of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts.
Christ as a Refiner and Purifier.

This figure, employed to show the nature of salvation, is a favorite one with the Scripture writers and speakers, and helps very greatly to make plain a subject which is important both in theology and morals.

Of course the terms “refiner” and “purifier” are employed in a tropical or figurative sense; but then a figure must be founded in fact—must have resemblance to the thing figured, or it has no point or significance, and becomes both absurd and false. But, before entering upon its exposition, let us have an example of the usage of this metaphor in Scripture:

Behold I will send my messenger, even the messenger of the covenant. Behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts: But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fuller’s soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.—Malachi 3.

Now to liken Christ to a refiner of silver because he saves men from the punishment of sin, or the wrath of God, is to make a comparison where there is no likeness, and to attempt a figure which falls to the ground at the first start. There is no resemblance between one who saves me from torment, or enables me to escape the penalty of a righteous law, and one who sits at the furnace or crucible as “a refiner and purifier of silver.” The two have nothing in common, and in such a figure or comparison there would be neither meaning, point, nor truth.

But the Spirit of prophecy has compared Christ to “a refiner and purifier of silver,” and has employed the figure as illustrative of the character of his saving work in the human soul. Of course the figure is fitting and significant, or we should not have it from such a source. We must, therefore, look for the likeness in another kind of salvation than that taught in church creeds.

1. The figure of the prophet shows, beyond doubt or question, that the salvation is a moral, spiritual, personal experience, and not deliverance from some outward and future evil. The evil is within us, a corruption of our hearts by sin, by moral defilement, from which Christ is to purify us by the power of his truth and grace.

A few passages will suffice to bring this into the light. Peter, speaking of the gentiles (Acts xv.), says, “God put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.” Again he says (1 Pet. i.), “seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth
through the spirit.” Here the heart, the soul, are purified,—which of course is an inward, personal salvation, and not escape from threatened judgments. We are not purified from judgments, though we may be purified by them, spiritually refined and separated from sin, as gold is from the dross in the furnace.

Again, John says, he that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure.” 1 John iii. How is Christ pure? In any sense that would represent him as saved from punishment or the wrath of God? No indeed. He is pure in the sense of entire freedom from sin, a lamb without spot or blemish; and in this sense he whose soul lifted up with the great hope of Christ, strives to be pure as he is pure.

Paul declares that “our Saviour Jesus Christ gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.” Titus ii.

The redemption from iniquity, and the zeal for good works, reveal clearly enough the process indicated by the word purify, and show the fulness of the figure. The Saviour is a refiner and purifier of sin, because his truth, his spirit, is like fire in the heart, separating the spiritual from the sensual, and bringing out the heavenly from mixture with earthly dross, and preparing it to receive anew the image of God and his superscription.

This is one point, then, fully established by the figure: that the salvation which Jesus accomplishes for us is internal, moral and spiritual, and not from any evil outside of the soul itself. It is a spiritual renovation and refining, which, in removing all sinfulness from the heart, may be properly compared to the refining of gold and silver, by separating the pure metal from the dross.

II. There is another important fact brought out by the beautiful metaphor of the prophet: human nature is not totally depraved. Nothing is more plainly proved by the comparison of Christ to a refiner of silver, than the falsehood and absurdity of the dogma of total depravity.

There must be some silver or gold in the ore, however small, or there would be no occasion for a refiner. If the lump was all dross he might pass it through his crucible a hundred times and it would be all dross still. The very name and office of refiner imply something to be refined, something to be extracted from the ore. If it were not so, if it were all waste matter, there would be nothing to repay
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Paul declares that "our Saviour Jesus Christ gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus ii.

The redemption from iniquity, and the zeal for good works, reveal clearly enough the process indicated by the word purify, and show the fitness of the figure. The Saviour is a refiner and purifier of sinful man, because his truth, his spirit, is like fire in the heart, separating the spiritual from the sensual, and bringing out the heavenly from its mixture with earthly dross, and preparing it to receive anew the image of God and his superscription.

This is one point, then, fully established by the figure: that the salvation which Jesus accomplishes for us is internal, moral and spiritual, and not from any evil outside of the soul itself. It is a spiritual renovation and refining, which, in removing all sinfulness from the heart, may be properly compared to the refining of gold and silver, by separating the pure metal from the dross.

II. There is another important fact brought out by the beautiful metaphor of the prophet: human nature is not totally depraved. Nothing is more plainly proved by the comparison of Christ to a refiner of silver, than the falsehood and absurdity of the dogma of total depravity.

There must be some silver or gold in the ore, however small, or there would be no occasion for a refiner. If the lump was all dross he might pass it through his crucible a hundred times and it would be all dross still. The very name and office of refiner imply something to be refined, something to be extracted from the ore. If it were not so, if it were all waste matter, there would be nothing to repay
the labor of smelting and purifying. There is no power or skill in
the universe that can transmute dross into silver or gold.

So with man: if he is totally depraved, if, morally speaking, he is
a mass of corruption, nothing but corruption, then salvation is impos-
sible. From decayed fruit, vegetables or meats, we may remove the
tainted portions and stop the further progress of decomposition; but
of course this implies the existence of some portion that is sound and
healthy. If the whole substance has passed into decay and rotten-
ness, then it is fit only to be cast out and trodden under foot of
man and beast.

But the Saviour is a refiner and purifier. Then there is in man
something to be purified. The heart is not all dross. There is some
pure metal in it, some genuine gold and silver, which may and will
be separated from the dross mixed with it, and be coined anew for
the treasury of heaven.

This is the work of Christ, the thing he came to accomplish, and
he is endowed from on high with the knowledge and power and skill
to enable him to detect and bring out every particle of the pure ma-
terial from every soul of man.

“He shall purify the sons of Levi.” This expression is intended
to show the thoroughness of his work. The sons of Levi, or the Le-
vites, wore the priestly tribe; and so perfect shall the refining process
be that even the priests, who were regarded as ceremonially pure, even
the most perfect, will be passed through the furnace of the Refiner,
and every particle of dross be taken away from them.

III. This leads to the third important fact illustrated by the figure
in review. The refiner does not throw away the gold because he
finds dross mingled with it. The fuller does not destroy his cloth be-
cause it is soiled, or begrimed with stains and dirt. If there were
no dross there would be no need of a refiner. If cloth were never
stained nor soiled there would be no call for soap or washing. If
there were no sin there could be no Saviour.

And yet the popular argument is that men will be lost, cast away
of God, because they are sinners, because they continue wilfully in
sin. But if there is any force or propriety in the figure of the Di-
vine Seer, there is no force or propriety in the argument. We cleanse
the garment if it is soiled; we mend it if it is torn. A stain or rent
is no excuse for throwing away what is really valuable, or may be
made so by a little labor.

If the ore has many fold more of dross than pure metal, still the
refiner prepares his furnace and throws in the mass, increasing the heat till the rich and molten metal separates from the worthless dregs, and the treasure is secured.

The striking simile in review represents Christ as doing the same thing in regard to the souls of men, acting on them through his truth and love and Holy Spirit. The fact that they are sinful is no reason for his abandoning them. He sees enough of the pure gold of God's spirit in every human being to make it worth his labor of saving. He may see even more than we the sinfulness of man, but he sees also more than we the good there is in all hearts. Whatever kindly sympathies, generous impulses, or noble aspirations have found place in the heart, that is so much divine, and worth preservation. There may be evil also in the same heart, and the good may be buried deep beneath it, or locked up behind the rocky barriers of sin; but it is there; and this good is the thing to be recovered and saved, and the thing that will be saved, while the evil will be purged away. It may require the furnace of the refiner to do it. It may be the fire of judgment, or the fire of love, according to circumstances and the character of the ore; but by one process or another the dross will be separated from the pure gold and silver.

No good thing does God suffer to perish, nor does he permit anything to be lost that is worth saving, or which by labor of the refiner can be brought into use, or made to take some shape of beauty. In every human soul God still sees the traces of his own image, and Christ is sent to purify it, however obscured or defaced or soiled by sin, to purify and restore it to its primeval fairness and beauty. And this he is pledged to do, and has the power, the skill and the means to do; and the true Christian cannot doubt that he will accomplish it.

A New Theory of the Exodus.

We have been greatly interested in the brief abstract given by a foreign correspondent of the Congregationalist, of a pamphlet in Arabic and French, recently published in Alexandria, by Dr. Brugsch, the distinguished German scholar, called into Egypt by the Khedive to establish an Archaeological School and Museum, as mentioned in our article on "Compulsory Education."

Who was the Pharaoh that oppressed the Hebrews? What is the true date of the Exodus? Where was Goshen? Raamses? Pithom?
What was the line of march followed by Moses? Where did the host cross the sea? All these, it is well known to Biblical scholars, are still open questions. Dr. Brugsch thinks, however, that he has now closed some of them beyond discussion; and whatever may be said on this point, his researches have certainly brought out some striking facts illustrating the Scripture history. His theory, to be sure, completely revolutionizes the accepted geographical doctrine on the subject; it is not the Red Sea at all that was crossed, but a gulf or arm of the Mediterranean, now called Lake Menzaleh, and known to the ancients as the Serbonian Bog, famous for swallowing up travellers and even armies, according to Diodorus, who is quoted as follows:

"Whole armies have been here engulfed through ignorance of the place and mistake of the road. The sand, being lightly trodden, bears at first, so that others are induced to follow in fatal security, till, warned of danger, they attempt to escape just when all means of safety fail them. For a man so mired can neither swim nor get out, having no foothold."

Strabo makes this treacherous bog or quicksand some two hundred stadia in length, or about twenty-five miles. It had communicated with the Mediterranean by an opening, which was filled up in his time, or about the beginning of the Christian era. Dr. Brugsch calls attention to the fact that the term Red is not found in the "Elohist document," but only in the poem of Moses and Miriam, and its connections.

The first documentary proof cited is a fragment of papyrus in the Museum at Leyden, which proves to be an official letter from an employee of the Egyptian Commissariat to his superior officer, as follows:

*I have obeyed your lordship's orders to furnish corn to the soldiers and also to the Hebrews employed in drawing stone for the great fortifications of the city of Ramses, who are under command of Ameneman, captain of police. I have given them corn every month, according to the good intentions communicated by your lordship.*

Compare this with Exodus i. 11: "The Egyptians did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities, Pithom and Raamases." These two towns are distinctly named in the papyri—Pi-tom, city of the sun-god; and Pi-Ramses. Furthermore, it is declared in the same documents that Ramses was built by King Ramses II., and named in his own honor. This settles who was the Pharaoh of the oppression.
Of course in this connection it is an important question, Where was Ramses or Raamse located? for it was from this city that the Hebrews set out on their march through the wilderness. This question Dr. Brugsch declares answered partly by a papyrus in the British Museum, which contains a description of the city on occasion of a visit from its royal founder. “It is described as a seaport, with ships coming and going,—a grand residence visited by foreign princes.” And, in the style of Oriental exaggeration, it is represented as “reaching from Egypt to Philistia, filled to repletion with delights.” It was the building of this splendid city, together with Pithom, which “made the lives of the Hebrews bitter with hard bondage.” This fact—that Ramses was a sea-port—is certainly strongly confirmatory of our author’s theory; but he addsuce other testimony equally remarkable:

“The monuments, being interrogated on this point, return an unmistakable answer. Ramses was a separate quarter of the ancient city Tanis, inclosing a great sanctuary of the god Amon, and a strong fortress for the defence of the Eastern frontier. Recent excavations among the gigantic ruins of Tanis, on the course of the old Tanitic or eastern mouth of the Nile, once navigable for ships, now shrunk and dwindled, have brought to light two statues covered with hieroglyphs, which show that Ramses II. gave his name to the old royal city of Tanis, called Zan in Egyptian, and in Hebrew, Zoa. Compare Psalm lxxviii. 12, 43. Curiously enough, there is extant, on the walls of the great temple of Karnak, a plan of this city, in which one may distinguish the two banks of the river, united by a bridge, and the neighboring sea.”

This Ramses was the Egyptian end or terminus of the great Pharaonic military road stretching toward Palestine. According to the monuments and papyri, this road ran by the fortress of Migdol, at the edge of the desert. Says Dr. Brugsch: “When the sacred traditions tell us that Pharaoh made the Hebrews build the cities Pithom and Raamases, it means, monumentally speaking, that King Ramses II. and his son, Menephtah I., 1,400 years before Christ, forced the Eprion (Hebrews) to fortify the capitals of two adjoining districts on the south of Lake Menzaleh, to defend the Pharaonic road from Ramses-Tanis to Migdol.” For the rest we quote the correspondant above named:

“It is proved further that Tanis-Ramses was the chief town of a district still known, in the time of the Greeks, under the name of the Nomos Tanites. It was bounded on the west by the Tanitic Nile, on the north by the sea, and its eastern boundary enclosed part of what
is now called Lake Menzaleh, and divided it from the district called Thukut on the monuments; in the Bible Succoth. The capital of this district, according to the monuments, was Pitom. The next identification is of the land of Goshen.

At the south of the two districts thus identified was a third, known to the Greeks as "the Arabian nome," with a capital called by them Phakusa, or Phakusan. The site of this city still figures on the map of modern Egypt, under the name Fauqs. In the monumental lists this same city is written Gosem. It is common enough in Egyptian to prefix to the name of a city the masculine article Pha.

The monuments and papyri prove that the population of these three districts, though subject to the Pharaohs, was of alien—Phoenician—stock. They were occupied with fishing, commerce, and some special lines of industry. They were sometimes employed in public functions, especially in transactions with the inhabitants of Palestine, whose language and customs they understood. The greater part of the ancient, geographical names in these three districts are not Egyptian but Semitic. Curiously enough, the population of that region preserve the same traits to this day.

To come back now to this city of Ramses (Exod. xii. 37.); it is thence that the children of Israel set out, followed the great Pharaonic road, and came of course into the district of Succoth, of which Pitom was the capital. And with them went a crowd of the mixed Phoenician race that dwelt about them. "And they took their journey from Succoth, and encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness."

The author here illustrates the story by an extraordinary document—a papyrus in the British Museum—being the letter of a person employed to pursue two fugitive slaves, escaped from Ramses, who took the very line of flight pursued by the Hebrews. He reports as follows:

"I chased the two slaves, leaving the hall of the royal palace [at Ramses] on the ninth day of the month Epiphi, towards evening. I reached the precincts of Succoth on the tenth of the month, ... I arrived at the fort (Khatom-Etham). There I was informed that a horseman coming from the country had said they had passed by The Wall to the north of Migdol of King Seti Menephtah."

This place called "The Wall" is repeatedly mentioned, both in Egyptian and in classical (?) documents, both before and after the time of the Exodus.

Turn now to Exodus xiv. 2. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they turn and encamp before Pi-hapiroth, between Migdol and the Sea, over against Baal-zephon. Before it shall ye encamp by the sea."

Why this command to turn off the direct route? The reason is given in general terms, in chap. xviii. 17. But in illustration of the matter, Dr. Brugsch quotes the Fugitive Slave Law, or Extradition Treaty, that had been concluded by Ramses II. with the King of the Khethians (Hittites), then the most powerful people of Canaan; it
May be read from a monument at the temple of Karnak. This made the high road impracticable, and occasioned the command to turn (says Brugsch) not to the south but to the north, between Migdol, a well-known point near Pelusium, and the sea.

Serpent Worship.

One of the most singular superstitions which have come down to us from the past, is that of serpent worship. It might well be regarded as matter for wonder that such a loathsome creature as a snake or serpent should ever have become an object of reverence, if it were not in evidence that so many tribes and nations have worshipped the devil to prevent him from doing them harm. This is doubtless the ground of serpent worship—the belief that it had power to injure and destroy them, and that therefore it was wise and prudent, by offering gifts and supplications, to make friends of the Great Spirit Serpent, the ruler and king of them all.

It is astonishing to what extent this strange idolatry prevailed among the primitive peoples. At one period it was almost universal; the serpent appeared in all the ancient mythologies, and largely in the sacred mysteries, wherever celebrated. Several treatises on this superstition were written by ancient authors, as Sanconiaton, Pherecydes, &c.

This worship is supposed to have taken its rise in Chaldea, among the Magi, and by them to have been propagated into various countries to which they emigrated. In Phrygia and on the Hellespont, into which they sent colonies at a very early period, there were tribes called Ophiogeneis, serpent-born, or children of serpents. And they were said to have retained a certain sort of affinity or mysterious relation to serpents; and there was a legend current that their leader who had brought them thither was changed from a serpent to a man. And there was a river in Colchis known as the Ophis, or Serpent, from a people who had settled on the banks, and whose chief was said to be a dragon or serpent, δρακόντας.

The religion of Zoroaster represents the great expanse of the heavens, and even the universe itself, under the symbol of a serpent. It is also the symbol of Ahriman, the author of evil, and in Persia and in various parts of the East, temples were erected and dedicated to the serpent. According to Eusebius they not only worshipped serpents, and held festivals in their honor, but declared them to be the greatest of the gods, and rulers of the whole world—Θεὸς τοῦ μέγας τοῦ, καὶ ἀρχοντὸς τῶν ὅλων.
is now called Lake Menzaleh, and divided it from the district called Thukut on the monuments; in the Bible Succoth. The capital of this district, according to the monuments, was Pitom. The next identification is of the land of Goshen.

At the south of the two districts thus identified was a third, known to the Greeks as "the Arabian nome," with a capital called by them Phakusa, or Phakusan. The site of this city still figures on the map of modern Egypt, under the name Fauq. In the monumental lists this same city is written Gosem. It is common enough in Egyptian to prefix to the name of a city the masculine article Pha.

The monuments and papyri prove that the population of these three districts, though subject to the Pharaohs, was of alien—Phoenician—stock. They were occupied with fishing, commerce, and some special lines of industry. They were sometimes employed in public functions, especially in transactions with the inhabitants of Palestine, whose language and customs they understood. The greater part of the ancient, geographical names in these three districts are not Egyptian but Semitic. Curiously enough, the population of that region preserve the same traits to this day.

To come back now to this city of Ramses (Exod. xii. 37.) it is thence that the children of Israel set out, followed the great Pharaonic road, and came of course into the district of Succoth, of which Pitom was the capital. And with them went a crowd of the mixed Phoenician race that dwelt about them. "And they took their journey from Succoth, and encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness."

The author here illustrates the story by an extraordinary document—a papyrus in the British Museum—being the letter of a person employed to pursue two fugitive slaves, escaped from Ramses, who took the very line of flight pursued by the Hebrews. He reports as follows:

"I chased the two slaves, leaving the hall of the royal palace [at Ramses] on the ninth day of the month Epiphi, towards evening. I reached the precincts of Succoth on the tenth of the month. . . . I arrived at the fort (Khatom-Etham). There I was informed that a horseman coming from the country had said they had passed by The Wall' to the north of Migdol of King Seti Menephtah."

This place called "The Wall" is repeatedly mentioned, both in Egyptian and in classical (?) documents, both before and after the time of the Exodus.

Turn now to Exodus xiv. 2. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they turn and encamp before Pi-hapiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon. Before it shall ye encamp by the sea."

Why this command to turn off the direct route? The reason is given in general terms, in chap. xviii. 17. But in illustration of the matter, Dr. Brugsch quotes the Fugitive Slave Law, or Extradition Treaty, that had been concluded by Ramses II. with the King of the Khethians (Hittites), then the most powerful people of Canaan; it
may be read from a monument at the temple of Karnak. This made the high road impracticable, and occasioned the command to turn [says Brugsch] not to the south but to the north, between Migdol, a well-known point near Pelusium, and the sea.

**Serpent Worship.**

One of the most singular superstitions which have come down to us from the past, is that of serpent worship. It might well be regarded as matter for wonder that such a loathsome creature as a snake or serpent should ever have become an object of reverence, if it were not in evidence that so many tribes and nations have worshipped the devil to prevent him from doing them harm. This is doubtless the ground of serpent worship—the belief that it had power to injure and destroy them, and that therefore it was wise and prudent, by offering gifts and supplications, to make friends of the Great Spirit Serpent, the ruler and king of them all.

It is astonishing to what extent this strange idolatry prevailed among the primitive peoples. At one period it was almost universal; the serpent appeared in all the ancient mythologies, and largely in the sacred mysteries, wherever celebrated. Several treatises on this superstition were written by ancient authors, as Sanconiathon, Phercevdes, &c.

This worship is supposed to have taken its rise in Chaldea, among the Magi, and by them to have been propagated into various countries to which they emigrated. In Phrygia and on the Hellespont, into which they sent colonies at a very early period, there were tribes called Ophiogeneis, serpent-born, or children of serpents. And they were said to have retained a certain sort of affinity or mysterious relation to serpents; and there was a legend current that their leader who had brought them thither was changed from a serpent to a man. And there was a river in Colchis known as the Ophis, or Serpent, from a people who had settled on the banks, and whose chief was said to be a dragon or serpent, ὤμονοτα.

The religion of Zoroaster represents the great expanse of the heavens, and even the universe itself, under the symbol of a serpent. It is also the symbol of Ahriman, the author of evil, and in Persia and in various parts of the East, temples were erected and dedicated to the serpent. According to Eusebius they not only worshipped serpents, and held festivals in their honor, but declared them to be the greatest of the gods, and rulers of the whole world—οὐσ τοῖς μέγασ-τοις, καὶ ἄγγει ὑπὸν ὀλον.
In the mythologies of Greece, the serpent plays an important part, as Bryant, from whom we have drawn these facts, has shown with abundant detail, for which we have no room. We can only mention that by some it was thought that the frantic cry of the Bacchanalians, Eva! Eva! had reference to the great mother of mankind, who was deceived by the serpent. Clement of Alexandria was of this opinion.

"Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, was very partial to the orgies in which the serpent was introduced. Plutarch speaks of rites of this sort among the Edonian women, near Mt. Hermus in Thrace, as carried to absolute madness. Olympias copied these in all their frantic manoeuvres, followed by many attendants, who had each a thyrsus twined with serpents, and serpents in their hair, and in the chaplets which they wore, so that they presented a most fearful appearance to the beholder. Their cries too were very shocking."

It is a curious question, why the author of Genesis should select the serpent as a symbol of temptation, lust or unlawful desires, or, in one word, of evil, in his allegory of the garden of Eden? Was it because of the prevalence of this idolatry in Egypt? The Egyptians, however, made the serpent representative of both good and evil. With singular inconsistency they symbolized the eternal Kneph, the author of all good, under the mythic form of this reptile, and at the same time employed it as a representation of Typhon, the author of all evil, physical and moral. And in their symbolical alphabet the serpent stands for revenge, punishment, cunning subtlety, lust and sensual pleasure.

It was often used to ornament the statues of Isis. Diodorus Siculus says that the kings of Egypt wore a wreath of asps as a head dress, and the priests adopted a similar decoration. Bryant says that the chief deity was styled Ob or Aseth, and his shrine was regarded as oracular or prophetic; that sacred pillars were erected to him, curiously inscribed with hieroglyphics, which had the same name. They were very tall and narrow; hence among the Greeks, who copied from the Egyptians, every thing tapering to a point was styled Obelas and obelliscus," referring to the ob or serpent worship. Hence our word

1 Greek mythology too makes the serpent symbolic of good and evil alike; of Ceres, Aesculapius, and healing on the one hand, and on the other of the Furies, and the impious giants defying the gods. Oriental nations mostly employ it as an emblem of evil, disorder and rebellion. The Phenicians however adored the serpent as a beneficent genius, and the Chinese regard it as representative of wisdom and power, and even clothe the "kings of heaven" in the bodies of serpents. So says Dr. Kalisch, as quoted in Smith's Dictionary.
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obelisk. "This idolatry is alluded to by Moses, who in the name of God forbids the Israelites even to inquire of these demons, Ob and Ideone, which shows that it was of great antiquity. The woman at Endor, who had a familiar spirit, is called Ob or Ahab from her connection with this oracular or prophetic serpent worship."

Some of these statements, perhaps, are to be taken with a grain of allowance, on the ground of theory building; but the fact of the general prevalence of this idolatry in Egypt is beyond question. Was it then on this account that Moses chose the serpent as a symbol of evil, with a view to make this worship abominable in the sight of the Israelites? And will this account for the strong language of the New Testament where we have "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan." Certainly the traditions of the early races regarding the garden of Eden, which made the serpent the tempter and cause of their calamities, having first led men into sin, must have made it hateful in their sight, an object of terror, and therefore tolerated and worshipped only on the ground of hope that, as before remarked, by showing him reverence and attention he might be prevented from doing any further mischief.

Perhaps Moses, whose mission it was to restore the primitive doctrine of Monotheism, and set up the worship of that God who is a spirit, had seen in Egypt so much of the disgusting animal worship universal there, that he resolved to make it abominable by making one of its most popular deities symbolic of all evil. And then in the Decalogue this purpose is furthered by the commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me—thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," &c.

But admitting this supposition, how shall we explain the Brazen Serpent set up in the wilderness, and the command, "Make thee a fiery (brazen) serpent, and set it upon a pole; and it shall come to pass that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it shall live." Num. xxi. 6—9. It would seem to be a dangerous experiment with a people as prone to idolatry as were the Israelites, to set up an image of a serpent for them to look to for help, as having supernatural power to heal them. It was a very easy step from this to the worship of the image; and it would seem from 2 Kings xviii. 4, that this step was actually taken. Hezekiah "brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did

burn incense to it." Now whether this brazen serpent was the identical one made by Moses, or a copy of it by other hands, it is plain that it had become an object of idolatry.

Various theories have been started in explanation of this strange proceeding, but none of them seem very satisfactory. It is the more strange when we remember how readily this same people made the golden calf, and worshipped it; and remember also that Moses in his wrath destroyed it, "ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water." Why, after such an experience of the idolatrous tendencies of this people, and the destruction of this idol, should a brazen serpent be set up among them as a symbol of good, or of healing, and therefore so likely to lead to the results which, as we have seen, followed?

But the most remarkable thing of all is that this serpent worship found its way into the Christian Church, and that at a very early date. The sect was known by the name of Ophite, or serpent worshippers. Tertullian says of them that they exalted the serpent in the most extravagant manner, even preferring it to Christ himself.8

"The serpent, they say, gave us the knowledge of good and evil. And Moses acknowledged his power and majesty when he raised the brazen serpent in the desert. Even the Saviour himself did the same. saying, As the serpent was lifted up by Moses, so must the Son of Man be lifted up. These heretics introduced him even into the Eucharistic benediction."

They caused the bread of the Eucharist to be licked by a serpent, which was kept in a cave for the purpose, and which the communicants are said to have kissed after receiving the sacred elements. They esteemed the serpent as a benefactor of the human race for the reason that, in common with most of the Gnostic sects, they regarded the Demiurgos, or Jehovah of the Old Testament, the God of the Jews, with abhorrence, as the enemy of the Supreme Deity, having rebelled against him, and created this earth for a dominion of his own. Consequently when the serpent led man into temptation, and thus opened his eyes to know both good and evil, he delivered him from the power and dominion of the Demiurgos, and gave him his first true freedom. Hence the Fall of Man, so called, they counted as the greatest of blessings, and so were naturally led to consider the serpent as a benefactor and Saviour, and to offer him divine worship as an acknowledgement of the great debt due to him.

8 Origen says that the Ophites were not Christians; and farther that they admitted none to their assemblies who would not first curse Christ. See Torrey's Neander, i. 446.
Much more might be added showing the extent to which this curious superstition and worship prevailed in every quarter of the globe, our own country included, and among savage tribes and semi-civilized peoples; but what has been offered occupies all the room we can give to the subject in the present number.

*Christianity, or Civilized Heathenism?*

**Modern Christianity a Civilized Heathenism.** By the author of "The Fight in Dame Europa's School." Wm. F. Gill & Co. $1.00.

The work bearing the first title here given, and which has made some noise in England, is marked by many grave defects. It is one-sided and exaggerated in many of its statements; loose in its reasoning on certain points, as in its assertion of the antagonism of Christianity to common sense and civilization, and of Christ's extravagant claims of loyalty and personal devotion to himself from his disciples; wanting in discrimination, as in making the fashionable and worldly class the type of Christians generally; and positively unjust in ignoring the practical goodness, philanthropy and multitudinous charities which adorn the character and life of Christian men and women in every branch of the Church universal.¹

But in spite of its glaring faults it presses home upon the conscience of Christians, in a very sharp and caustic style, some homely and not very pleasant truths, truths which every sincere man and woman has had to face at times in the secret places of thought. Dr. Channing, in his correspondence with Miss Aiken, just published, confessed to often self-reproach for his large share in the refinements, comforts and luxuries of life, while all around him he saw so much poverty, misery and vice. Take the following as an example:

"Mrs. Farrar told you truly that my lot is a singularly happy one. But I cannot escape the painful feeling that whilst I receive so largely I communicate little. I look around me on the ignorance, guilt and misery of the world, and cannot think that I have a right to so much enjoyment without contributing more to the cause of humanity. . . .

I feel more and more deeply how unchristian and guilty the lives of the prosperous classes are—how little genuine sympathy and brother-

¹As, for example, the fact right under the author's eyes, but which he finds it convenient for his argument to overlook, that in London alone more than $15,000,000 are annually given to public charities, to say nothing of the immensely larger sums bestowed by private charity upon the deserving poor.
ly affection we have towards the mass of our fellow-creatures. I see more and more distinctly that society needs a revolution such as history nowhere records. To rise above others is the spirit and soul of society in its present constitution. To help others rise, to use our superiority as the means of elevating those below, is the spirit of Christianity and humanity."

We confess to the same self-accusations, and they have troubled us more or less for years, and yet we do not seriously set about applying the remedy open to us.

And who of our readers has not had a like experience? Who, when he thinks of Christ, poor, homeless, despised, persecuted, going about doing good, weary, hungry and thirsty, without where to lay his head; when he hears him saying to the young man, go and sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven”; when he reads of those first converts and disciples who “had all things in common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, as every man had need”; when he sees Paul surrendering all his worldly interests, hopes and ambitions, all the delights of home and friendship, and counting his loss as gain for the sake of Christ; when he sees him and his fellow disciples cheerfully accepting poverty, hatred, stripes and imprisonments, all manner of perils and sufferings, and even death itself, that they might follow the dear Master and preach his gospel to the poor, and do his work of mercy among the ignorant and wretched and perishing,—who, after such a survey, can turn, on the one hand, to our magnificent churches, and the costly parade of our velvet-cushioned worship, and count the salaries of preachers and singers, and look into the palatial residences of Christian professors, with all their extravagance of furniture, dress, entertainments, and their surplus of comforts and luxuries; and on the other hand, the want and woe, the sickness and hard toil, the ignorance and sin and shame which abound in the streets, and hold high carnival in the dens and hovels, the garrets and cellars within call of those Christian churches and homes,—who can do this and not see how deep and wide the abyss which separates “modern Christianity” from the Christianity of Christ and the New Testament? And who, daily face to face with all this poverty and wretchedness and unrequited toil slowly crushing out the life of so many, and still holding on to his wealth and luxury, his comforts, or anything above the bare necessities of life, can read without keen self-accusation those memorable words of Christ, “I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat,
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naked and ye clothed me not, sick and in prison and ye visited me not: inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not unto me"; or those other words of James: "If a broth-
er or sister be naked, or destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?"

If we really mean to make our religion practical, and follow Christ, and be ready to lay down our lives for the brethren, as he laid down his life for us, what right have we to all these comforts and refine-
ments and elegancies, while hundreds around us are in constant hard
fight with hunger and cold and nakedness? "Whoso hath this world's
goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of
compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"

We know well enough the difficulties which stand in the way of a
practical answer to these questions, and lead good men to hesitate.
We are not ignorant of what may be said about the elegancies, luxu-
ries and even extravagancies of the rich furnishing employment to the
poor, and the abandonment of these bringing the world, civilization
and social progress to a dead halt. But is that civilization Christian
which bestows its benefits and blessings on the few to the exclusion of
the many? Nor are we insensible to the argument that if the
wealth of the world were equally distributed to-day, the same unequal-
ities would return to-morrow. The shiftless, idle and improvident
would speedily waste and destroy their portion, like the prodigal son,
while the industrious, thrifty and saving would accumulate and grow
rich again. This is certainly true; but does not the Christian law of
love and brotherhood go beyond the mere giving and dividing? If
our brother is thus improvident and reckless, does it not require us
to teach him better ways, and to help and encourage him till he has
acquired habits of industry and care for the future? "Bear ye one
another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ,"—not only the bur-
den of poverty, but the burden of ignorance and unthrift.

We know, too, that it is said Christ's teachings are not always to
be understood according to the letter. This also is true; but in set-
ting aside the letter of his law of love, we must be careful not to set
at defiance its spirit on the ground that civilization has so changed
the conditions of society and individual life that strict obedience is
simply impossible. Let us rather honestly say that the standard is
too high for us, that we have not courage and love enough to live up
to it, either in letter or spirit. We fear that in such reasoning, as
the book above named says,

"The plain truth is that our Christian beliefs are immeasurably too
big for any standard of Christian practice which common-sense (rath-
er our selfishness—En.) permits us to follow; and when we find our-
selves in this dilemma, instead of confessing that we have made some
terrible mistake, and that our beliefs are either all wrong, or our ac-
tions indefensible, we are dishonest enough to argue backwards, to
make up our minds what sort of life it will be sensible and sociable
and convenient to lead, and then to pretend that our beliefs were
meant to be qualified in order to agree with our predetermined line
of conduct. In short, finding that Christianity is opposed to our self-
ishness (which Christ must expressly have intended it to be), and
being forced to make definite choice between the one principle and the
other, we accept the philosophy of civilized heathenism as the guide
of our daily life, and keep Christianity for our acts of devotion, for
periods of solemnity, and for times when we think we are going to
die. This is somewhere about what the modern Christian’s imitation
of Christ is worth; and I ask any honest man to say whether such a
contradiction between faith and practice is, or is not, a barefaced,
transparent absurdity."

We have not space for further extracts, but we advise our readers
to look the book over, and while they make allowance for its exag-
geration and false reasoning, they will find much matter for serious
thought. At any rate they will find that the sharp, persistent, re-
 lentless logic with which the Parsee steadily pushes the parson to the
wall, is equally destructive to the pretensions of that great multitude
of among Christians who find it so much easier to praise Christ
than to follow him; and who, while in words they glorify the sweet
humanities of his gospel on Sunday, do all the rest of the week very
quietly set them aside as practically unnatural, fanatical and im-
possible.

* The Religious World.*

We had intended to give our readers at least a generous abstract of
the remarkable article which lately appeared in the *Christian Union,*
from the pen of one of the editors (Merriam) with the title "A Dy-
ing Belief;" but as all our denominational papers have copied it in
full, it has become unnecessary, and so we only make note of the fact
for future reference. The writer fearlessly asserts, and presents proof
of what we have so often declared in these pages, that the doctrine of
endless punishment is a "dying belief;" that it is growing "small by
Degrees and beautifully less" in all the creeds of Christendom; and
that the cause of it is that the moral sense of mankind, the Christian
heart, the universal conscience and reason, have outgrown this shock-
ing dogma; while on the other hand, "universal restoration, which
gets its strongest impulse from the New Testament," is in fellowship
with the noblest and ever-expanding sympathies of human nature, and
the holiest desires of the regenerate heart; and "removes from the
Divine Father the worst imputation that his children ever cast upon
him." Coming from the leading and most widely circulated orthodox
paper in the land, it is certainly a most significant sign in the ecclesi-
astical firmament, and will satisfy our readers that what we have said
in previous numbers is not an overstatement of the present condition
of the religious mind on this subject.

—Dr. Carpenter, in his late work, compares the nerves of the hu-
man body to telegraphic wires, which convey sensations from the outer
corporeal surface to the inner ego or personality. The illustration,
which seems to be a very suggestive one for the spiritualist or immate-
rialist, calls out the following argument from Dr. Whedon, showing
the distinction between thought and the instruments of its expression,
the nerves or brain:

"The telegraphic wire is insensible. The electricity it conveys is
not the thought. The thought does not run along the wire. The wire
merely conveys from one mind to another the symbols which
mind alone at either end interprets and thinks. Thought alone can
comprehend thought. And it will not do to say with the ultra
idealist, that there is no personal subject of thought, but that the uni-
verse is only a succession of pure thoughts. For at each end of the
wire is a living organism in which the idea is thought, and in the
organism is the ego by which the thought is appropriated and claimed
as its own. Descartes" "I think" is not rightly interpreted by Hux-
ley as merely equivalent to "there is thought." It imports not only
"there is thought" generally, or somewhere or other, but there is
thought located here and not elsewhere; and thought that here is be-
ing thought by this one particular self which calls itself I, and by
nothing else. The "I" is as positively asserted as the "think," and
is individualized more precisely. The ego is, therefore, demonstrated
by self-consciousness."

—We heartily endorse the following from the Christian Register.
Our readers would never suspect that this Quarterly is published
within five miles of our principal college, having fifteen professors and
instructors. Were it not for the Packard Professor of Theology, it
would never be known, so far as our pages are concerned, that such an institution was in existence. And the same remark applies to all our colleges and academies, with the single exception of St. Lawrence University,—all honor to its Faculty. They recognize the duty of doing something for our denominational literature, and helping its leading Theological Review to come to the front with similar publications in other denominations:

"Mr. Brigham says that the professors at Ann Arbor 'recognize the additional duty of authorship.' This 'additional duty' should be recognized by professors everywhere, especially in divinity schools. Theological professors should contribute freely to periodicals, if they are not disposed to prepare volumes. They ought to allow the public to share in some of the fresh thoughts on modern religious problems which they are supposed to be giving to their pupils. It is a morbid modesty which results in the barren silence of able and cultivated men, who owe a debt to the literature of their times which they should be glad to pay.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.


The author has condensed a wonderful amount of information into his clear-cut sentences; and only those who have studied the subject will be able to judge of the extent of careful reading required to do it. Not every statement is to be received without question, but whenever there is dissent on the part of the reader, he will find it necessary to examine the subject anew. Sometimes the generalizations of the book seem too sweeping, and founded upon isolated or exceptional cases, and the first chapter is perhaps an example of this; but the author has studied and mastered his subject so thoroughly that it is safe, until farther investigation, to conclude that his errors are of inference rather than of fact.

Milman, in one of his eloquent periods, describes the all-pervading presence of paganism in Greece and Rome, and the perpetual contact and conflict with its protean forms which hindered and antagonized the labors of Paul and the early Christian missionaries. This work of Coulanges illustrates the truth of that description, and shows how the ancient religions held everything in their control, and gave shape and character to the family, the gens, the city, the State, the laws and institutions, the growth and civilization of the peoples; how their domestic and social and business life from birth to death, mar-
riage, domestic worship, civil relations, agriculture, war, travel by sea or land, meetings and partings, public assemblies, festivals, eating and drinking, waking and sleeping, and every action, from the most important to the most trivial, was determined by the dictation, the rules and solemnities of their religious beliefs. Whoever reads this book will see with what singular truth and fitness Paul opened his memorable speech on Mars Hill with the words, "Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are exceedingly religious."

The chapters on the ancient beliefs, the worship of the dead, the sacred fire, the family gods, the gods of the clan and of the city; the priestly character of the father, the continuity of this office in the son, the consequent inequality of the son and daughter, and the rights of succession and property, the growth of the family into the tribe, and the addition of a new tribal worship side by side with the family worship; the foundation of the city, and the union of tribes, the new laws and institutions necessarily following this union, the growth of the plebs in political power, the revolution which gave them citizenship, the formation of the State, the conquests of Rome, the establishment of the empire, and the revolution wrought by Christianity—all this is set forth so clearly, and so fortified with authorities; set forth in such short, compact, luminous sentences that it is a genuine pleasure to read them. And, unless the reader is remarkably well informed on these subjects, the pleasure will be increased by the confident feeling that he knows much more about them than he did before taking up this book.


It was perhaps too much to expect that in a single volume a very full and satisfactory treatment could be given of a subject so vast in its range as that set forth in this title page. The three hundred pages devoted to the classical, or Greek and Roman, pantheon, are, however, all that could be desired, and furnish the best text book on the subject, probably, to be found in the English language. The special department in the British Museum over which the author presides has afforded him ample facilities for producing a perfect work; and we think he has done this so far as its use for a class-book is concerned. We know of nothing better. Indeed, students and literary men generally will find it exceedingly useful and convenient for reference.

But when Mr. Murray, or any one, attempts to give us even a manual of "Norse, Old German, Hindoo and Egyptian" mythology in forty-four pages, it can only end in failure. What could be done in that space Mr. Murray has done; but we trust that in the next edition he will omit the last half of his title, devote the pages it occupies to more extended notes on the works of art embodying the my-
thological legends, and then give us an entire volume on the Scandi-
navian, Egyptian and Hindoo deities.

One thing will attract the attention of the careful reader of this
book,—the manifest unity of thought, however great the diversity of
devolopement, which originated the principle gods of the eastern,
western and northern mythology as explanations of the phenomena
of nature and the problems of human experience.

We cannot close without a word of cordial approbation for the il-
ustrations. They are very beautifully executed, pleasing to the eye,
and equally lessons in art and history. Those of the Northern and
Oriental mythology are especially useful as helps to the very brief
text.

In three volumes. Vols. II. & III. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. $2.00 per volume.

For the first time the whole truth has been told, in these volumes
of Mr. Froude, and told with impartiality, with equal justice to the
virtues and the vices of all parties,—Irish and English, government
and people, Catholics, Churchmen and Presbyterians.

The faults and blunders of English rule, the corruption of the Irish
government, the open bribery and purchase of votes in Parliament,
the appropriation of Irish revenues for pensions to "royal bastards,
mistresses and favorites," the cruel and cowardly abandonment and
sacrifice of Protestant subjects to state policy, the curse of Absentee-
ism, the bigoted and bitter hatred of Dissenters by the bishops and
clergy of the Established Church, the denial to them of political
rights, the destruction of Irish manufactures and commerce for the
benefit of English labor and trade, the wrongs and injuries which
finally drove the Scotch-Presbyterian element into sympathy and
temporary action with the Irish rebellion of 1798, are all set out in
detail and with unflinching truth and justice. There is no room for
criticism here on the score of partisan feeling. Father Burke and
Wendell Phillips may declaim and condemn as they will, but the fair-
minded reader will judge for himself of the honesty of a historian who
reports with such candor and unsparing severity the folly, weakness
and wickedness of his own party and government.

And now for the Irish side of the history. The same spirit of jus-
tice pervades this also. Mr. Froude will not be turned aside from
telling the truth, however shocking, by the clamor of those whose in-
terest it is to hide it; or by the fear of being charged with hatred of
the Irish people and the Catholic Church.

The Irish Rebellion was political and religious, instigated by Irish
patriots, so-called, and Catholic priests. It grew out of confessed
wrong and injustice on the part of the English rulers, but more out
of hatred to Protestant heresy and heretics. In the preliminary
movements the colonial dissenters in the north of Ireland acted with
the native Celtic element, with the view of asserting Irish indepen-
dence; but before the rebellion came to a head they discovered the
tresscherous character of their allies, and shrank from sympathy with a movement which, if victorious, would be followed, as in 1641, with their own destruction by Catholic diabolism. "Remember what I tell you," said one of the rebels, as his last word before his execution, "if you Protestants are ever in the power of the Catholics again, as they are now in yours, they will not leave any of you alive. Even those who campaigned with them, if things had gone well, would in the end have been killed." "To have killed three Protestants was counted a passport to heaven." After the fight at New Ross, copies of the following oath were found on the bodies of the slain: "I swear by our Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered for us on the Cross, and by the Blessed Virgin Mary, that I will burn, destroy and murder all heretics, up to my knees in blood." And that they meant what they swore will appear in the following facts, in which the reader will find the horrors of the French Revolution repeated, the atrocities of the Commune anticipated, and a sharp reminder of the savage barbarities of the St. Bartholomew massacre:

"Day by day other gangs of victims were dragged out of their hiding-places in the neighborhood, carried before the permanent tribunal, and by them handed over to the pikemen. From the 20th of May and onwards these bloody scenes continued without intermission. Every day saw its half-dozen or dozen of them delivered over to the assassins, who, sprinkled with holy water, executed the sentence on the enemies of Ireland and the Church. One poor wretch, who was piked imperfectly, survived to describe the scene. He was brought out with thirteen others, after half an hour's confinement in the windmill. He was asked in what religion he would die. He said he would die a Protestant, as he was born. "You bloody Orange thief," said one of the executioners, "you are damned, and will go to hell when we put the life out of you." He was stabbed in the body and the neck, his clothes were torn from him, and he lay in a pile of bleeding bodies till consciousness returned, when he contrived to crawl into a ditch, where he lay till dusk, and then escaped.

Father John, while he remained on the hill, had his intervals of compunction. After a scene of this kind he called some of the prisoners not yet condemned before him to harangue them into penitence. "You sons of Beliel," he said, cracking his fingers at them, "will you withstand our holy religion, which existed eight hundred years before yours began?" "You see how our pikemen will treat you unless there is great reformation in you."

Now let us go forward a little to the column of pikemen crossing Wexford Bridge, bearing a black banner with a red cross upon it. Before proceeding to business whiskey was served out, and then the cry was "To the goal!" into which some three hundred Protestant prisoners had been huddled. A court of justice is extemporized, in mere mockery, by a brute named Dixon:

"The prisoners were brought one by one before him. Only a single question was asked.—Could it be shown that any one act, which in the estimation of the court could be called good, had been done by the person at the bar? If no witness came forward the sentence was immediate death. The prisoner was passed over to the rebels outside; and surrounded by a yelling mob, in which there were more women than men, he was led out upon the bridge. There, stripped naked, he was placed on his knees in the middle of the road. Two pikemen stood in front of him and two behind. They knelt, said a prayer, then levelling their pikes, rose and ran upon him, held him aloft for a moment writhing on their points, and pitched him over the parapet into the stream. In this way, through that midsummer day, ninety-seven men, whose crime was to be of the Protestant religion—country gentlemen, magistrates, tradesmen, merchants,
clergyman—were ceremoniously and deliberately murdered. During the afternoon Dixon, weary of his functions in the billiard-room, left the judicial work to others, and sat on horseback with his wife, watching the executions. The day wore on. At seven in the evening a fresh batch of victims had been brought, and were in position, waiting their turn for death, when Father Corrin, a Catholic priest, but none the less a noble-minded man, threw himself in the way of the murderers, denounced their infernal work, and insisted that it should end."

One extract more to show the character of those "wild Irish," these devout Catholics, and for the benefit of those dainty critics who pronounce Mr. Froude unjust and hostile to the Celtic race; and let it be remembered that these statements are founded on official documents, and the testimony of eye witnesses. The rebels had shut up thirty or forty prisoners in a house at Scullabaghe, and one hundred and eighty-four in the barn, (sixteen of whom were loyal Catholics, refusing to take part in the outbreak). A party of cowardly savages, who had run away from the battle-field, came to the officer having the prisoners in charge with an order, signed by "Father Murphy," that they should be murdered immediately:

"Those who were in the house were at once brought out and shot on the lawn. The standers-by stabbed them as they fell, with their pikes, and licked the blood from the points. Captain Murphy interpreted his orders to extend only to his male prisoners. The savage rabble who surrounded him were not so easily satisfied. While the bodies on the lawn were being stripped for burial, a party of the wretches rushed for the barn." "The doors were barred on the outside, and the rebels with their pikes thrust blazing fagots into the thatch. The majority must have been instantly suffocated. Those who were near the walls sought chimneys and cracks for air, but were driven back by pike points thrust into the openings. One little child crawled under the door and was escaping; a rebel ran a pike into it as a peasant runs a pitchfork into a cornstack, and tossed it back into the flames."

And all this under pretence of fighting for independence, or the right of the Irish to rule Ireland! The above are not exceptions, but the rule, as the reader of these pages will find. Everywhere prevailed incendiariism, assassination, houghing of soldiers and cattle, murdering and plundering of heretics; and eye-witnesses perjured themselves, and juries refused to convict; for to testify truly, or to convict the guilty, was the sure road to assassination. The reign of terror was universal.

And this rebellion, with all its horrors, was born on the one hand of that spurious patriotism which found speech in the florid and stiltly oratory of Grattan and his disciples, so much admired by school-boys; and on the other, of the fiendish hatred of Irish priests against Protestants who dared to put their doctrines and worship on a level with those of the Church.

The Irish parliament was a political nuisance, the hot-bed of conspiracy, and the stalking ground of these noisy patriots and orators. Its abolition and the resultant political union of Ireland with England was a necessity, and the one good thing that came of the Rebellion. Of course to accomplish this the government went into the parliament market, and bought up members as it would buy any other cattle. All but the Catholics were purchasable, and all equally greedy and mercenary. Protestant Irish and English, lords and landhold-
ers, were bought with pensions, patronage, military commissions, estates, titles, and whatever else was demanded. As a fitting close to our remarks we give a paragraph from a letter of Lord Cornwallis, the same who surrendered at Yorktown, now Viceroy of Ireland:

"I long to kick those whom my public duty obliges me to court. My occupation is to negotiate and job with the most corrupt people under heaven. I despise and hate myself every hour for engaging in such dirty work, and am supported only by the reflection that without union the British Empire must be dissolved. Nothing but a conviction that a union is absolutely necessary could make me endure the shocking task which is imposed upon me."


It is wholly unnecessary to urge any one to read this volume who has read "Foregleams of Immortality," or "The Heart of Christ." It is pervaded with the same sweet spirit of devotion and piety which makes those works so welcome to Christians of all creeds; and at the same time is enriched with paragraphs of clear historical statement and sound logical argument, of which sermon iv., on "Calvary," is a very good example.

On the other hand, the author's drift towards Swedenborgian ideas and interpretations constantly appears, and sometimes leads him to spiritualize the record beyond what, we think, the historical letter will justify; as, for example, in the fifth discourse, on "Resurrection and Ascension." We can hardly accept his statements, that "the scene of the ascension, as described by Luke, Acts i. 9, could not have been on the earth, but beyond the bourne of mortality, in the spirit world, of which, for the time, these disciples had open cognizance"; and that by the ascension "the New Testament writers do not mean an ascent through space into the sky, but into the sphere of celestial and divine being." In a word the ascension was subjective to the witnesses, and not objective.

It may be all well enough to make this narrative serve as the basis of an exhortation to all Christians to rise in thought, feeling and life into this celestial sphere; but that these disciples, who so long afterward still saw everything from the material level, and even had to hold a council at Jerusalem to discuss the question whether the Gentiles should be required to conform to the Mosaic law, (Acts xv.)—that they intended to describe the ascension as a purely spiritual phenomenon, not visible to mortal eyes, not historical in the ordinary sense, seems very improbable, to state it mildly.

So in the sermon "Concerning Death;" while it has some passages full of sweet suggestions, some thoughts beautiful and consoling, and some which parents should specially heed in their talk of death before their children, there are also some statements which seem not wisely made, and reasonings which are more Swedenborgian-spiritual than Scriptural or philosophical. "Sleep is another false image under which death is described, borrowed from the heathen." There may be some spiritual meaning to this which we do not discover; but
did Paul, in his frequent use of this "false image," borrow of the heathen? And is not the epitaph, "Asleep in Jesus," which is treated so lightly, taken from the Scriptures rather than the heathen?

And if the passage from the earthly to the heavenly state makes no change in the conditions and surroundings of the soul, if the future life is the exact counterpart of this, with the same moral drift, the same passions, desires and temptations, in what consists the value or the attraction of that life to the great majority of mankind? And why do Christ and Paul and Peter represent it in such glowing language? And why is it written that though sown in weakness it is raised in power, though sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory? What is the it that is sown in weakness and dishonor, and raised in power and glory? Not this body, "this dust." Mr. Sears does not believe in such a resurrection. Whatever the it is which is raised, lifted up, it is certainly lifted up into better and more favorable conditions, or there is no meaning to this language. And so we cannot believe that "death wakens bad men to the evil companionship which they love, and the dismal surroundings which it creates."

In the sermon on "The Universal Redemption," Mr. Sears is sufficiently "universal," applying the term "creature" not only to mankind, but to "all dumb creatures," "everything that moveth upon the earth," and to "the fish of the sea;" and yet farther, to nature, to "all insensate and inanimate things." In this sermon, and in all of them, there are many beautiful thoughts and sentiments, which breathe a piety so sincere, a love so tender and impartial, a faith so living and inspiring, that unless one is on the watch the book will run away with his heart at the expense of his reason,—in other words, he will be likely to accept everything Mr. Sears says, without objection or criticism. We should be glad to give some of the choice things we have noted, but, forever cramped for space, we can only refer the reader to the book itself.

5. The Old Régime in Canada. By Francis Parkman. Little, Brown & Co. $2.50.

The three leading features of the instructive narrative contained in this volume are the following:

1. The conflict between the ecclesiastical and political authorities, in which Laval, the bishop of Quebec, shows his strength of character and overpowering influence, and becomes the incarnation of Catholic policy in all ages and countries.

2. The assertion and establishment of the royal authority, in which appear the fostering care and paternal interest of Louis XIV., and his minister Colbert, for the Colony; their incessant watch over all its civil, religious, business and domestic affairs; their persistent purpose to secure to France pre-eminence in North America, and the methods employed to build up its power and secure its possessions.

3. The pleasing and informing sketches of the social and domestic condition of the colonists, their houses, food, occupations, laws,
customs, superstitions, and general manner of life; and of the zeal, the labors, sufferings and martyrdoms of the Jesuit missionaries.

In the struggle between Laval and the military and civil authorities, we see the cunning and diplomacy, the treachery and deceit of the Jesuit in full play; the one end, sought by any and all means, utterly regardless of their moral character, provided they help to establish the Church as supreme and absolute, above the State, above the law, a law and a State unto itself. This is abundantly demonstrated by the means he employed to secure the recall of governors who would not yield to his dictation, to protect his favorites and tools from the punishment of their frauds and crimes, and to deceive the King and his Minister; which last is betrayed by the difference in the tone of his letters to the monarch and the Pope. "He believed firmly," says Mr. Parkman, "that the princes and rulers of this world ought to be subject to the guidance and control of the Pope, the vicar of Christ on earth; and that he would be guilty before Heaven if he did not uphold the supremacy of the Church over the powers both of earth and hell."

It is curious to see how well the King and Colbert understood the aim of the bishop and the priests, and how secretly and persistently they operated to checkmate them. The latter, writing to Talon, the governor, says:

"Watch the bishop and the Jesuits, who have hitherto nominated governors for the king, and used every means to procure the recall of those chosen without their participation; filled offices with their adherents, and tolerated no secular priests except those of one mind with them." "It is easy," replies the governor, "to incur the ill-will of the Jesuits if one does not accept all their opinions, and abandon one's self to their direction, even in temporal matters."

That is a curious part of the narrative which details the measures by which the king sought to nourish, develop and increase the strength and population of Canada. Money and troops, men and women, girls for wives and servants, were sent forward with most lavish generosity; and there were bounties of money, of lands, houses, cattle, provisions, &c., on marriages and children; all with a view to build up, as speedily as possible, a power which should finally drive out the Dutch and English, and hold the continent for France. In eight years, 1665—1673, the king sent out about a thousand girls.

"Orders were issued a little before the arrival of the yearly ships from France, that all single men should marry within a fortnight after the landing of the prospective brides. No mercy was shown the obstinate bachelor. Talon issued an order forbidding unmarried men to hunt, fish, trade with the Indians, or go into the woods under any pretence whatever. In short, they were made as miserable as possible. Colbert goes further. He writes to the Intendant, 'those who may seem to have absolutely renounced marriage should be made to bear additional burdens, and be excluded from all honors; it would be well even to add some mark of infamy.' Any father of a family who, without showing good cause, neglected to marry his children when they had reached (boys) the age of twenty and (girls) sixteen, was fined and required to present himself every six months to the local authorities to declare the reason of such delay. The success of these measures was complete."

It would please us to give some of Mr. Parkman's pictures of Ca-
nadian home-life and industries, of customs and character, of priests and parishes, as well as some of his charming sketches of scenery; to reproduce his stories of missionary enterprise, and of the military expeditions against the Indians, especially that of the heroic Donatus and his companions; but want of room forbids. One thing, however, we must say,—that this history shows the extraordinary devotion and sincerity, the self-consecration and self-immolation of the Jesuit missionary in a light which compels respect and admiration, in spite of all their faults; shows also the same elements of consecration, heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of those noble women who, as nuns, gave up everything, left France, came over into the Canada wilderness, and cheerfully endured hunger and cold, and all manner of exposures and hardships, that they might convert and teach the Indians, administer spiritual comfort to their countrymen, nurse the sick and wounded, and live and die for Christ and the Church. There is no page in the annals of Christendom, nor in the history of martyrdom that surpasses in beauty and pathos the story of the sublime devotion to God and man of these wonderful Catholic men and women. We have said some sharp, though true, things of the Jesuits; but this tribute to the better side of their character is justly due, and cheerfully rendered.


An octavo of 800 pages, containing a full and satisfactory history of the German race, from its first appearance in Europe, in the fourth century before Christ, down to the formation of the new German Empire. It embraces all that the majority of readers would care to know about this wonderful people; and it is sufficiently special in details illustrative of the principles and motives involved in the various political revolutions, religious convulsions, the rise and fall of men and dynasties, to answer the ordinary demands of the reader civil and ecclesiastical history. It is for this class that the work has been prepared. It cannot fail to become popular and useful among all such; and teachers and professors in our academies and colleges will do well to give it a careful examination. In a course of historical reading we know of no work that we should prefer in its place.

Beginning with the earliest Roman knowledge of the German races, the author follows them through all their changes, conflicts, conquests and growths, with interesting and very informing sketches of the civilization and social conditions of the German peoples, including reviews of the Church and Inquisition, the Knights and the Crusades, the Monks and the Minstrels, the growth and power of the Cities, Architecture and the great Cathedrals, the spread of German colonization, the Black Death of 1348, the Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, &c., down to the supremacy of Prussia, the war with France, and the foundation of the present German empire.

If we had not said so much on the subject, we should be glad to set out before the reader the leading features of the religious struggle
now going on in Germany. But if he will read chapter vii, and be-
held the Emperor of Germany, Henry IV., eight hundred years ago, st-
anding barefoot in the snow, without food, at the gate of the Pope, beg-
ing for pardon; he will see precisely what would come to pass in
Germany to-day if the present Pope had the power of Hildebrand.
Fortunately the world has moved since the 11th century, and William
L. and Bismarck and Moltke represent the new order of things, in
which a Romish priest can no longer make and unmake kings at his
will.

    Universalist Publishing House. $4.60 the set.

This series is issued in a very neat and attractive style; and, put
up in tasty, gilt-edged boxes, it makes as pretty and useful a present
for children as could be desired. And, as we expect to go to press
before the holidays, we would call the attention of parents and friends
to these volumes as every way suitable for a Christmas, New Year's
or Birthday gift. That they are perfectly safe as regards objection-
able doctrinal matter is guaranteed by the name of the author; and
the stories, while pleasing as stories, are made to teach excellent les-
sions in morals and manners, to show our little people that the only
way to be cheerful, happy and beloved, is to be polite, kind and truth-
ful, to be good and do good, and all this not in the way of preaching,
but as the natural outcome and conclusion of the narrative.
The several volumes are "A Little Light," "Patient Johnny,
"Open Doors," "Borrowing," "Merry Madge," and "The May Par-
ty." We hope they will soon find place on the shelves of all Sun-
day School libraries, and on the what-nots in the corners of Christian
tian homes.

8. Running to Waste. The Story of a Tomboy. By George M. Baker. Author of
   $1.50.

We have read this book with increasing interest to the end; and
we think the author has shown himself capable of doing good work in
the new field upon which he has entered. His characters are all
well drawn, natural, easy and human. We have known every one of
them in actual life. We think the heroine is partly taken from a
well-known artist, now in Florence, whose remarkable genius was
hidden at first under the guise of the tomboy. And as for cross-
gained, unreasonable, obstinate, good, generous, helpful Deacon
Thompson, and his blessed wife, and Harry, and Aunt Hilda, and the
Sleepers, we have seen them all out of his book, whether the author
has or not.

The story shows how a great sorrow is sometimes only the open
door to a great blessing; how it quickens the sleeping possibilities of
our nature, and discloses to us the new life and activity and triumph
which lie before us. The lesson of it all is, that what seems waste
nadian home-life and industries, of customs and character, of priests and parishes, as well as some of his charming sketches of scenery; to reproduce his stories of missionary enterprise, and of the military expeditions against the Indians, especially that of the heroic Daulac and his companions; but want of room forbids. One thing, however, we must say,—that this history shows the extraordinary devotion and sincerity, the self-consecration and self-immolation of the Jesuit missionary in a light which compels respect and admiration, in spite of all their faults; shows also the same elements of consecration, heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of those noble women who, as nuns, gave up everything, left France, came over into the Canada wilderness, and cheerfully endured hunger and cold, and all manner of exposures and hardships, that they might convert and teach the Indians, administer spiritual comfort to their countrymen, nurse the sick and wounded, and live and die for Christ and the Church. There is no page in the annals of Christendom, nor in the history of martyrdom that surpasses in beauty and pathos the story of the sublime devotion to God and man of these wonderful Catholic men and women. We have said some sharp, though true, things of the Jesuits; but this tribute to the better side of their character is justly due, and cheerfully rendered.


An octavo of 800 pages, containing a full and satisfactory history of the German race, from its first appearance in Europe, in the fourth century before Christ, down to the formation of the new German Empire. It embraces all that the majority of readers would care to know about this wonderful people; and it is sufficiently special in its details illustrative of the principles and motives involved in the various political revolutions, religious convulsions, the rise and fall of men and dynasties, to answer the ordinary demands of the reader of civil and ecclesiastical history. It is for this class that the work has been prepared. It cannot fail to become popular and useful among all such; and teachers and professors in our academies and colleges will do well to give it a careful examination. In a course of historical reading we know of no work that we should prefer in its place.

Beginning with the earliest Roman knowledge of the German races, the author follows them through all their changes, conflicts, conquests and growths, with interesting and very informing sketches of the civilization and social conditions of the German peoples, including reviews of the Church and Inquisition, the Knights and the Crusades, the Monks and the Minstrels, the growth and power of the Cities, Architecture and the great Cathedrals, the spread of German colonization, the Black Death of 1348, the Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, &c., down to the supremacy of Prussia, the war with France, and the foundation of the present German empire.

If we had not said so much on the subject, we should be glad to set out before the reader the leading features of the religious struggle
now going on in Germany. But if he will read chapter vii, and be-
hold the Emperor of Germany, Henry IV., eight hundred years ago,
standing barefoot in the snow, without food, at the gate of the Pope,
begging for pardon; he will see precisely what would come to pass in
Germany to-day if the present Pope had the power of Hildebrand.
Fortunately the world has moved since the 11th century, and William
I. and Bismarck and Moltke represent the new order of things, in
which a Roman priest can no longer make and unmake kings at his
will.


This series is issued in a very neat and attractive style; and, put
up in tasty, gilt-edged boxes, it makes as pretty and useful a present
for children as could be desired. And, as we expect to go to press
before the holidays, we would call the attention of parents and friends
to these volumes as every way suitable for a Christmas, New Year's
or Birthday gift. That they are perfectly safe as regards objection-
able doctrinal matter is guaranteed by the name of the author; and
the stories, while pleasing as stories, are made to teach excellent les-
sions in morals and manners, to show our little people that the only
way to be cheerful, happy and beloved, is to be polite, kind and truth-
ful, to be good and do good, and all this not in the way of preaching,
but as the natural outcome and conclusion of the narrative.

The several volumes are "A Little Light," "Patient Johnny,"
"Open Doors," "Borrowing," "Merry Madge," and "The May Party." We hope they will soon find place on the shelves of all Sun-
day School libraries, and on the what-nots in the corners of Christian
tian homes.


We have read this book with increasing interest to the end; and
we think the author has shown himself capable of doing good work in
the new field upon which he has entered. His characters are all
well drawn, natural, easy and human. We have known every one of
them in actual life. We think the heroine is partly taken from a
well-known artist, now in Florence, whose remarkable genius was
hidden at first under the guise of the tomboy. And as for cross-
grained, unreasonable, obstinate, good, generous, helpful Deacon
Thompson, and his blessed wife, and Harry, and Aunt Hilda, and the
Sleepers, we have seen them all out of his book, whether the author
has or not.

The story shows how a great sorrow is sometimes only the open
door to a great blessing; how it quickens the sleeping possibilities of
our nature, and discloses to us the new life and activity and triumph
which lie before us. The lesson of it all is, that what seems waste
and loss is often only preparation; that we should never lose heart, but press on, assured that in the end courage, labor, endurance will win.

BOOK NOTES.

The Repository. Dec. 1875. [We sincerely regret to record the death of our Repository. It has been given up with great reluctance; but it was found impossible to maintain a purely literary and home magazine in the face of such rivals as the Atlantic, Old and New, Harper’s, Scribner’s Appleton’s and others. The Repository was edited with equal ability and good taste, and its corps of contributors was made up of our most talented and promising writers, especially those from among our female authors. Very many of its homes will miss its pleasant face, and mourn its departure.

The Universalist Register for 1875 comes to us looking as fresh and neat as ever. It is filled with valuable statistical information regarding our Conventions, Societies, Papers, Churches, Colleges and Schools, with the names and post-office address of all our 674 ministers, and a list of the various publications of the House. In addition we have interesting biographical sketches of those of our preachers, and others, who have died during the year. Those of McMorris, Bartholomew, Warren Skinner, Greenwood, Drew, Henry Bowen and George W. Batin should be read of all who know how to honor zeal, earnestness, goodness and loyalty to truth and conscience. The Register should go into every Universalist household. pp. 166. price 25 cts.

Cherryfield Soldiers’ Monument. Exercises of Dedication. [The address, by Ex-Governor Israel Washburn, Jr., of Portland, answers the question, “How shall we pay the debt we owe to the soldiers and sailors of our country?” in a way worthy of the man and of the subject. The thorough political honesty and patriotism of the speaker find here a fitting occasion for utterance, and scourge public and private corruption as they deserve. He shows that there is cause for alarm; danger is everywhere,—in business, in society, in all the walks of private life, as well as on the wider theatre of public affairs.” Economy, retrenchment, reform, responsibility and purity must be the popular watchwords.” If we were editor of a weekly religious journal we should copy the greater portion of this address as better far than most sermons.]


Books to be noticed in our next: The Paraclete: An Essay on the Personality and Ministry of the Holy Ghost, with some reference to Current Discussions. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. $2.00


Quiet Hours. A Collection of Poems. Roberts Brothers.
Many years ago, it was announced during the week among the attendants at our old parish Church in Portsmouth, N. H., that a famous convert from "orthodoxy" — the author of several learned books, and a warrior against whom the "evangelical" hosts were pouring their hottest fire, was to "preach for us" the next Sunday. When Sunday came, it proved to be one of those dark, raw days which so tempt all who can to keep housed; but moved by the curiosity so natural under such circumstances — the propriety of which as a motive for church-going, we will not here stop to discuss, the people were out in good numbers — the writer, then a boy, among the rest. In due time, the preacher appeared. He was a

1 In resuming these sketches, temporarily suspended for other labor, I cannot forbear to make my acknowledgments to Rev. A. St. John Chambré, for the article in the Quarterly of January, 1875, entitled, "Hosea Ballou and Edward Turner. — A Contribution to the 'Truth of History.'" I thank him, as I am sure all who read the paper thanked him, for the fresh materials which he thus put into the case, and especially for the courteous and kindly spirit in which he made it, and, so far as they made it necessary, animadverted upon the sketch to which he had occasion to refer. He did me only justice in expressing so strongly his conviction that, "held in reverent remembrance by our whole church" as Father Ballou is, he is held "by no one more so than by" me — as my sketch of him, I think, sufficiently shows. My only thought in these papers is, fairly and faithfully to reproduce the men of whom I write; and called in the sketch of Father Turner, whom I also greatly revere, to touch upon matters somewhat in controversy, I thought it only fair to let him speak for himself. If, in any respect, the facts were not correctly stated, or if, judicially dealing with what, on the evidence before me, I had reason to accept as the facts, I fell into error, no one will more rejoice than myself to have the mistake corrected. Mr. Chambré and myself, possibly, might not precisely agree in our judgment touching a certain course of action under certain contingencies; but we do agree in thinking that it would be manifestly unjust to hold Father Ballou, or any honorable man, responsible for results all connection with which he solemnly disclaimed. Mr. C.'s "Contribution" has only deepened my wish to look further into the correspondence, a portion of which he has presented; and I hope I need not say that it would afford me great pleasure to find reason entirely to modify the sketch which he challenges, in the particulars mentioned, because fully assured that in nothing was there the slightest foundation for the opinion which, his statement renders it certain, Father Turner entertained as to Father Ballou's complicity with those who were not his friends.
stubbed little man, about five feet high, and came tripping up the aisle on his toes, with a kind of swinging movement of his body and arms, as of skating. He carried a blue cotton umbrella, which he carefully deposited at the foot of the pulpit stairs, and then—what was quite unusual with those who preached there—stopped to take off his cloak, or overcoat, and to lay it away very deliberately beside his hat. Then he climbed the high winding stairs into the pulpit—an oval, box-like structure, standing out from the wall, perched not ungracefully on small Corinthian pillars:—who of us that used to sit under it in our childhood will ever lose the memory of that Portsmouth pulpit? Taking his seat, he was in full view of all on our side of the house, and we had an opportunity to study him.

I shall never forget how he looked. Perhaps the most noticeable thing about him was the way in which his hair was arranged. It was nearly all gone except that at the back of the head. This, sparse and thin, was brought up over the crown in two divisions, partially covering each side, and then, tied a little beyond the middle, was spread into a fan-like ending, just on the edge of his forehead. It was of a brownish sandy color, and his complexion corresponded. His nose was large and prominent, his head of good size, and his face rather long than round—all of the traditional Scottish type. He could not have been called a handsome man, his whole appearance being much too odd and quaint for this; but he had a look of downright and sturdy honesty, which could not fail to interest a stranger and to create a prepossession in his favor. Soon he arose and commenced the service. His voice was low, and of limited compass, with that peculiar nasal quality which never fails to attest a free use of snuff. He spoke, too, with the broadest of broad Scotch brogues, and with an accent on account of which his speech had a kind of hitch, or jerk, which caused his words to come in seeming spurts, though in a continuous flow. This, with his brogue being considered, would be a very great impediment to a poor Englishman's understanding of his discourse.

2 Those who saw him only in the later years of his life will fail to recognize this portion of the portrait, for the reason that he then wore a light full wig.
rendered it difficult to understand him unless he was closely watched, and even then some words, as he pronounced them, were not easily interpreted. In prayer, particularly, this hitching flow of his words was very marked, and was accompanied with a singular spasmodic play, or movement, of the ears and scalp from forehead to crown, as if what he said was being thus mechanically worked into utterance. The effect of all this was very peculiar. It was so unique, so entirely unlike anything we had ever seen before, that it could not but attract the attention of all, and especially of children. Of the text, or sermon, I remember nothing. I only remember that I went home, saying, "What a queer little man that minister is!" and that the older people, while talking of the difficulty of understanding much that he said, agreed that the sermon, so far as they could understand it, was sound and sensible.

This was my first sight of Walter Balfour, a man whom I afterward came to know well and to love much, and whose name will always stand in our records as one of those most prominent in our earlier Universalist controversies.

Externally his life was quite uneventful. He was born in the parish of St. Ninians, Scotland, a place about two miles west of the field of Bannockburn. It has hitherto been thought that his birth occurred about 1776; but his son informs me that recent discovered evidence assigns it to Aug. 15, 1775. The invariable and scarcely need be said, is a promise made in these lines, but whether his family had a connection with the name so distinguished in the past ages. As little can it be ascertained what portion of his youth were passed, or what was given to his mind. He is also said to have been aware, to have been marries for reading, and also is connected with his father's death. I have Esq., and is
stances, his father being a weaver; and we may not unreasonably infer that, at a suitable age, he was put to some manual labor, probably somehow in connection with the employment of his father, and that he thus contributed as he could towards the support of the family. We obtain the first

Our Scottish brother, Rev. A. G. Laurie, kindly sends me this extract from his diary, kept while last in Scotland, in 1868, adding, "I wish with all my heart that, when I write to Father Balfour, I could have forgotten your present need, and told you of Father Balfour's youth and early studies, Ewing had, probably, a good deal to say; but, after seventeen years, all but these brief items has vanished from my memory."

SEPT. 27th. Out to Bannockburn, taking St. Ninian's on my way. Saw Mr. Ewing, Father Balfour's friend—a hale, hearty man yet, eighty-eight years old. He gave me the history of Bro. B.'s family. The eldest brother 'listed, and perished in the Whitsun week.' Another brother, went abroad, and returned to die by falling from a wall at night. Another turned sailor, and died of fever in Jamaica. The only other was Father B. This old man, Ewing, took care of Balfour's father till he died."

ADDENDUM. Conversing with an intelligent Scotch gentleman, a member of my congregation, since this sketch was finished, I am told by him, touching the probable circumstances of Father Balfour's early life, we are not to think of the hand-weavers at the time of his birth, as at all such a class as the machine-weavers of England, or Scotland, to-day. The weavers were then, he says, a "well-to-do" people, commonly owning their own looms, and working at them in their own homes. Thus comparatively independent, they had much time for reading, and not unfrequently read with an open book before them at their work. They were, therefore, much above the peasantry and ordinary laboring class, especially marked for their intelligence and general information. Judging from these statements, therefore, the probability is that young Balfour's position and opportunities were much more favorable than the fact that he was a weaver's son would indicate, taking the existing class as a ground of opinion.

Concerning this, Rev. A. G. Laurie, a Scotsman to the core, says, "Your inference would be correct enough for England. But judging from his early connection with the Bible-reading band, and his later entering upon his studies, the 'suitable age' for a boy in Scotland, in such a station, with such proclivities, would either be at a much later term of life than in England, or more probably, would never arrive. Almost every Presbyterisan family in Scotland, of humble station, has one son, who, in his parents' hope, is destined to 'wag his paw in a pu'pit.' And to that child, indicated as they think by God, by just such premonitions as seem to have been given by young Balfour, extraordinary privileges are accorded, and for him, by the whole family, extraordinary sacrifices are made. He is kept at school as long as possible, that he may prepare himself for college, and is maintained there for four years with a self-denial on their and his own part, which folk here would deem incredible, oatmeal and water being often his almost only fare, his annual living costing frequenctly only from twenty to forty dollars a year. You remember Sydney Smith's original motto for the Edinburgh Review. 'We cultivate literature on a little oatmeal.' He said in fun that it was declined by Jeffrey because it hit too near the mark. There was some point in the fun; at least, if, for 'literature,' you substitute 'theology,' there was: and the point of the joke was in its truth. If, therefore, in his early days, at ten, twelve, or fourteen years of age, Balfour gave out symptoms of capacity for the ministry, while the 'manual labor' would devolve upon his brothers, he would be left as much as possible to his books, in the fond hope that he would fit himself for college and the ministry. From what cause, in his case, that [college] hope was blighted, we cannot tell. But while it lasted, it would secure him the opportunities for an education beyond those of the other boys, if, as it would prolong his school-days two or three years beyond theirs — though theirs would include time enough for a solid mastery of the rudiments
distinct view of him — at what age we know not — as one of a small band, Dr. Whittemore speaks of it as "a select number of twelve or fifteen," who met every week for the study of the Bible and for prayer and religious conversation, each being pledged in turn to lead in prayer and in Bible exposition or exhortation.

His connection with this devout company seems to have been the pivot on which his life turned, illustrating what little things frequently give shape to important careers. Mr. Robert Haldane, a wealthy resident of the vicinity, being deeply interested in religion, was moved to spend largely for its furtherance. To this end, among other means, he resolved to educate a number of young men for the ministry. Twenty-five were chosen, among them, young Balfour, it is fair to conclude because of what he had shown himself to be, in these meetings for prayer and Bible study. The instruction to which he was thus introduced is said to have been very thorough; and none who ever knew him will doubt that he made the most of it. Especially did he give much attention to Greek and Hebrew. How old he was when he entered on these studies, or how long they continued, there is nothing to intimate; but at length he began to preach, and ere long determined to emigrate to America — it is the impression of his family, in no sense as a missionary, but still under the patronage of his friend, Mr. Haldane. With this purpose of emigration in view, he attended a course of theological lectures in Edinburgh, where he made the acquaintance of a young of an English education, — likely an elemental knowledge of Latin, and certainly the mental discipline — intellectually a very stringent one — of the Shorter Catechism. We certainly are a queer people. That Shorter Catechism, dealing with the abstracted problems of metaphysics, is supposed to be such an easy and natural pabulum for the Scottish brain, that, as I well remember, it used, as its preface, on its first page, to have the A, B, C! The meaning whereof is that any Scottish boy or girl who has mastered the alphabet, is immediately ready for the study of the 'Chief End of Man,' 'Effectual Calling,' and 'Free-will and Predestination!?' Wherefore my hypothetical conclusion, from the few facts that appear concerning his early days, and from what I know of our Scottish family ways, is, that, as the Bible boy of the household, young Balfour had a thoroughly good grounding in such an education as was well fitted to prepare him for the Calvinistic ministry."

This conclusion, certainly, on the grounds stated, seems a very probable one; and, accepting it, the presumption is, that, when afterwards selected as one of Mr. Haldane's beneficiaries, he was better prepared for the studies upon which he entered than would otherwise have been possible.
American, subsequently Rev. John Codman, D.D., for many years pastor of a Congregational church in Dorchester, Mass. After a year at Edinburgh, he sailed with his friend Codman for London, and thence, not long after, in 1806, without Codman, for Halifax, N. S. Having here spent the winter, he made his way, in the spring of 1807, being then in his thirty-second year, to New England, and soon, if not at once, to Charlestown, where ever after his home in this world was to be.

The Congregational pastor at Charlestown, at this time, was Dr. Jedediah Morse, father of Prof. Morse, of Electric Telegraph celebrity, and then one of the leading clergymen of his order in New England. Letters from Codman doubtless took Mr. Balfour to him. He soon attracted attention by the readiness and good sense of his extemporaneous talks in Dr. Morse’s "vestry-meetings," and shortly was welcomed into his pulpit. The way was thus speedily opened for him into the best circles, and as the result, he was married, Dec. 4, 1809, to Miss Mary Devens, a grand-daughter of Commissary Devens, "in his day, one of the most wealthy and respected citizens of the town." The Baptist pastor was called to make the twain one, which suggests that, for some reason, Mr. Balfour had already separated from Dr. Morse and the "orthodox." Possibly it was because of his views touching the administration of the Communion—he, as his son informs me, holding to its administration every Sunday. Possibly it was because he already found himself approaching the conclusions concerning baptism which he subsequently reached. At all events, we soon find him ministering in a hall to a small and apparently independent congregation, though still occupying the recognized "evangelical" platform. Not long after—following Dr. Whittemore's chronology, he came definitely to regard immersion as the Scriptural form of baptism, and thereupon was baptized by the same minister who had married him.

6 Of this marriage, eight children, four sons and four daughters, were born, of whom four, two sons and two daughters, survive. Mrs. Balfour died in 1858.
This being done, for the next ten or twelve years he is nearly lost to our view, in a life that gave little or no sign. Without compensation except as the people remembered him occasionally in their free-will offerings, he preached twice every Sabbath to his “little flock,” by whom he seems to have been greatly beloved, judging from the fond attachment for him which tradition in my wife’s family ascribes to an aunt of hers, a member of the congregation. For a time, also, while thus preaching, he kept a Dry Goods Store “upon the main street in Charlestown,” though permitting nothing to divert him from the steady pursuit of his theological and Biblical studies so far as his opportunities would allow. But who can tell how, through these years, he was in training for his Providential work, or how far what he afterward became and did was the direct result of the stores he laid by through the patient and plodding application to which he gave himself, in this life apparently so little promising any such issues? How much would be gained if this fast, impatient time would but learn these lessons of quiet, patient, thorough preparation!

At length, a change came, and the work for which Mr. Balfour had so unconsciously been preparing was upon him. In May, 1819, Channing preached his celebrated “Baltimore Sermon,” at the ordination of Rev. Jared Sparks. It was as if a bomb-shelf had suddenly exploded in the Calvinistic camp! The “Unitarian controversy” had been raging for several years; but, at this time, it had somewhat subsided, so that something like peace seemed to be settling upon the warring churches. This sermon burst like a thunder-clap from a sky from which all appearances of a cloud were thought to be departing! Never before had Calvinism been so arraigned from the “Unitarian” side, or had “the standing order” been so shocked and stirred. At once, everything was in commotion. As Halleck says of the surprised Turks at the attack of Bozzaris, the cry was

“To arms! . . . The Greek! the Greek!”

Very soon, as one of the “orthodox” champions, Prof. Stuart stepped into the arena, in his “Letters to Channing;” but,
intent only on establishing one point, he forgot duly to guard himself at others. Hence, laboring to establish the "spiritual worship" of Christ, he quoted Phil. ii. 10, 11, and Rev. v. 8-14, and, having said after the first, "Things in heaven, earth and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the universe," added after the second, "If this be not spiritual worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine." These declarations—remarkable, coming from such a source—at once arrested Mr. Balfour's attention. He was greatly perplexed, and in his perplexity, naturally turned to Prof. Stuart for relief. The story, however, can best be told in his own words. He says:

"Until the year 1819, a serious thought never occupied my mind, that the doctrine of endless punishment might be false. In the belief of this doctrine I had been educated from my childhood. The books I read, the preaching I heard, and all my religious intercourse, tended to deepen my early impressions that it was Scriptural. . . . In the course of my reading, I had perused several books on the subject of universal restoration, but they only tended to confirm me in the belief that endless punishment was true, and that reformation in hell and salvation from it could not be established from the Bible. I deemed Universalism a great error, sometimes discussed the subject with Universalists, and always thought I had the best of the argument. The first thing which staggered my faith in the doctrine of endless punishment was reading that paragraph [above referred to] in Mr. Stuart's Letters. His statements, I was unable to controvert, and the texts on which they were founded seemed to support them. This gave rise to my first three letters. . . . They were written to solicit from Mr. Stuart some explanation, how he reconciled his statements with this doctrine. As he had shaken my faith in it, I thought I had some claim on him to say something to re-establish it. The signature I assumed, 'An Inquirer after Truth,' though in one sense fictitious, was in another real, for my letters were written in sincerity, anxious to see where the truth lay on this subject. And believing as I had done, that Universalists were in a great error, I was
also desirous that Mr. Stuart should so answer my letters as
to convince them of it." 7

The first of these Letters of Mr. Balfour to Prof. Stuart was
dated Jan. 29, 1820; the last, Aug. 11, 1821. There were
ten of them in all. Originally, as he intimates above, he
planned but three. After the publication of the third, in
March, he waited until July for some reply, when he sent the
Professor a private note, by mail, assuring him that the letters
were not from a Universalist, but from one whose mind he
had seriously disturbed, and pleading with him to come to his
relief. Still the Professor was silent. Then, in December,
Mr. Balfour published his private note, and, after waiting an-
other month, followed with five other letters, "occasioned,"
as he tells us, "by observing other things in Mr. Stuart's
book, and [by] my own investigation of some Greek phrases,
which he had explained." "In investigating the Scriptural
sense of these phrases," he adds, "my doubts were increased
as to the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment. This
made me still more anxious that he should come forward with
some explanation." At length, in June, the Professor ad-
dressed a brief note to the editor of the Universalist Magazine,
in which the letters had appeared, excusing his silence on the
grounds that he was pressed for time, and that the letters
were anonymous, only designed, as he thought, "to solicit a
dispute." To this, Mr. Balfour replied, and thus his attempt
to get light from Prof. Stuart ended.

These Letters, extending over a year and a half, occasioned
no little stir, especially among Universalists, who saw in them
evidence of a strong hand. The interest, doubtless, was all
the greater, because of the element of curiosity that mingled
in it. Who is it? was the question. No one knew. When
his final communication came to hand, a new editor of the
Magazine thought to discover him by acknowledging its
receipt, adding that he would "find a letter in the Post-
office," — it having been arranged with the delivery-clerk that,
if the letter was called for, steps should at once be taken to

7 "Introduction" to his Letters to Stuart, pp. iii, iv.
stubbed little man, about five feet high, and came tripping up the aisle on his toes, with a kind of swinging movement of his body and arms, as of skating. He carried a blue cotton umbrella, which he carefully deposited at the foot of the pulpit stairs, and then — what was quite unusual with those who preached there — stopped to take off his cloak, or overcoat, and to lay it away very deliberately beside his hat. Then he climbed the high winding stairs into the pulpit — an oval, box-like structure, standing out from the wall, perched not ungracefully on small Corinthian pillars: — who of us that used to sit under it in our childhood will ever lose the memory of that Portsmouth pulpit? Taking his seat, he was in full view of all on our side of the house, and we had an opportunity to study him.

I shall never forget how he looked. Perhaps the most noticeable thing about him was the way in which his hair was arranged. It was nearly all gone except that at the back of the head. This, sparse and thin, was brought up over the crown in two divisions, partially covering each side; and then, tied a little beyond the middle, was spread into a fan-like ending, just on the edge of his forehead. It was of a brownish sandy color, and his complexion corresponded. His nose was large and prominent, his head of good size, and his face rather long than round — all of the traditional Scottish type. He could not have been called a handsome man, his whole appearance being much too odd and quaint for this; but he had a look of downright and sturdy honesty, which could not fail to interest a stranger and to create a prepossession in his favor. Soon he arose and commenced the service. His voice was low, and of limited compass, with that peculiar nasal quality which never fails to attest a free use of snuff. He spoke, too, with the broadest of broad Scotch brogues, and with an accent on account of which his speech had a kind of hitch, or jerk, which caused his words to come in seeming spurts, though in a continuous flow. This, with his brogue,

2 Those who saw him only in the latter years of his life will fail to recognize this portion of the portrait, for the reason that he then wore a light full wig.
rendered it difficult to understand him unless he was closely watched, and even then some words, as he pronounced them, were not easily interpreted. In prayer, particularly, this hitching flow of his words was very marked, and was accompanied with a singular spasmodic play, or movement, of the ears and scalp from forehead to crown, as if what he said was being thus mechanically worked into utterance. The effect of all this was very peculiar. It was so unique, so entirely unlike anything we had ever seen before, that it could not but attract the attention of all, and especially of children. Of the text, or sermon, I remember nothing. I only remember that I went home, saying, "What a queer little man that minister is!" and that the older people, while talking of the difficulty of understanding much that he said, agreed that the sermon, so far as they could understand it, was sound and sensible.

This was my first sight of Walter Balfour, a man whom I afterward came to know well and to love much, and whose name will always stand in our records as one of those most prominent in our earlier Universalist controversies.

Externally his life was quite uneventful. He was born in the parish of St. Ninians, Scotland, a place about two miles west of the field of Bannockburn. It has lithero been thought that his birth occurred about 1776; but his son informs me that recently discovered evidence assigns it to Aug. 15, 1775. The name of Balfour, it scarcely need be said, is a prominent one in Scottish history, but whether his family had any connection with those who made the name so distinguished, there is nothing to inform us. As little can it be ascertained how his boyhood and early youth were passed, or what were his opportunities for attendance at school. He is said, though on what authority I am not aware, to have been marked from the first by a great fondness for reading, and also by the decidedly religious turn of his mind. But all that is certainly known is, that he was born in humble circum-

---

*My chief reliance for the few obtainable facts of his biography has been upon Dr. Whittemore's little "Memoir," published in 1862, shortly after his death. I have occasion, also, to confess obligation to his son, David M. Balfour, Esq., and to Rev. A. G. Laurie, for information on various minor points.*
stances, his father being a weaver; and we may not unreasonably infer that, at a suitable age, he was put to some manual labor, probably somehow in connection with the employment of his father, and that he thus contributed as he could towards the support of the family. We obtain the first

4 Our Scottish brother, Rev. A. G. Laurie, kindly sends me this extract from his diary, kept while last in Scotland, in 1858, adding, "I wish with all my heart that, when at St. Ninian's, I could have foreseen the present needs. As to Father Balfour's youth and early studies, Ewing had, probably, a good deal to say; but, after seventeen years, all but these brief items has vanished from my memory."

"EXTRACT. 27th. Out to Bannockburn, taking St. Ninian's on my way. Saw Mr. Ewing, Father Balfour's friend—a hale, hearty man yet, eighty-eight years old. He gave me the history of Bro. B.'s family. The eldest brother 'listed,' and perished in the Watchman expedition. Another 'listed,' went abroad, and returned to die by falling from a wall at night. Another turned sailor, and died of fever in Jamaica. The only other was Father B. This old man, Ewing, took care of Balfour's father till he died."

ADDENDUM. Concurring with an intelligent Scotch gentleman, a member of my congregation, since this sketch was finished, I am told by him, touching the probable circumstances of Father Balfour's early life, that we are not to think of the hand-weavers at the time of his birth, as at all such a class as the machine-weavers of England, or Scotland, to-day. The weavers were then, he says, a "well-to-do" people, commonly owning their own looms, and working at them in their own homes. Thus comparatively independent, they had much time for reading, and not unfrequently read with an open book before them at their work. They were, therefore, much above the peasantry and ordinary laboring class, especially marked for their intelligence and general information. Judging from these statements, therefore, the probability is that young Balfour's position and opportunities were much more favorable than the fact that he was a weaver's son would indicate, taking the existing class as a ground of opinion.

5 Concerning this, Rev. A. G. Laurie, a Scotsman to the core, says,

"Your inference would be correct enough for England. But judging from his early connection with the Bible-reading band, and his later entering upon his studies, the 'suitable age' for a boy in Scotland, in such a station, with such proclivities, would either be at a much later term of life than in England, or more probably, would never arrive. Almost every Presbyterian family in Scotland, of humble station, has one son, who, in his parents' hope, is destined to 'wag his paw in a pu' pit.' And to that child, indicated as they think by God, by just such premonitions as seem to have been given by young Balfour, extraordinary privileges are accorded, and for him, by the whole family, extraordinary sacrifices are made. He is kept at school as long as possible, that he may prepare himself for college, and is maintained there for four years with a self-denial on their and his own part, which folk here would deem incredible, oatmeal and water being often his almost only fare, his annual living costing frequently only from twenty to forty dollars a year. You remember Sydney Smith's original motto for the Edinburgh Review, 'We cultivate literature on a little oatmeal.' He said in fun that it was declined by Jeffrey because it hit too near the mark. There was some point in the fun; at least, if, for 'literature,' you substitute 'theology,' there was; and the point of the latter was, its truth. If, therefore, in his early days, or at twelve, or fourteen years of age, Balfour gave out symptoms of capacity for the ministry, while the 'manual labor' would devolve upon his brothers, he would be left as much as possible to his books, in the fond hope that he would fit himself for college and the ministry. From what cause, in his case, that [college] hope was blighted, we cannot tell. But while it lasted, it would secure him the opportunities for an education beyond those of the labor boys, in a day when it would prolong his school-days two or three years beyond theirs — though theirs would include time enough for a solid mastery of the rudiments
distinct view of him — at what age we know not — as one of a small band, Dr. Whittemore speaks of it as "a select number of twelve or fifteen," who met every week for the study of the Bible and for prayer and religious conversation, each being pledged in turn to lead in prayer and in Bible exposition or exhortation.

His connection with this devout company seems to have been the pivot on which his life turned, illustrating what little things frequently give shape to important careers. Mr. Robert Haldane, a wealthy resident of the vicinity, being deeply interested in religion, was moved to spend largely for its furtherance. To this end, among other means, he resolved to educate a number of young men for the ministry. Twenty-five were chosen, among them, young Balfour, it is fair to conclude because of what he had shown himself to be, in these meetings for prayer and Bible study. The instruction to which he was thus introduced is said to have been very thorough; and none who ever knew him will doubt that he made the most of it. Especially did he give much attention to Greek and Hebrew. How old he was when he entered on these studies, or how long they continued, there is nothing to intimate; but at length he began to preach, and ere long determined to emigrate to America — it is the impression of his family, in no sense as a missionary, but still under the patronage of his friend, Mr. Haldane. With this purpose of emigration in view, he attended a course of theological lectures in Edinburgh, where he made the acquaintance of a young

of an English education, — likely an elemental knowledge of Latin, and certainly the mental discipline — intellectually a very stringent one — of the Shorter Catechism. We certainly are a queer people. That Shorter Catechism, dealing with the abstrusest problems of metaphysics, is supposed to be such an easy and natural pabulum for the Scottish brain, that, as I well remember, it used, as its prefix, on its first page, to have the A, B, C! The meaning whereof is that any Scottish boy or girl who has mastered the alphabet, is immediately ready for the study of the 'Chief End of Man,' 'Effectual Calling,' and 'Free-will and Predestination.' Wherefore my hypothetical conclusion, from the few facts that appear concerning his early days, and from what I know of our Scottish family ways, is, that, as the Bible boy of the household, young Balfour had a thoroughly good grounding in such an education as was well fitted to prepare him for the Calvinistic ministry.'
American, subsequently Rev. John Codman, D.D., for many years pastor of a Congregational church in Dorchester, Mass. After a year at Edinburgh, he sailed with his friend Codman for London, and thence, not long after, in 1806, without Codman, for Halifax, N. S. Having here spent the winter, he made his way, in the spring of 1807, being then in his thirty-second year, to New England, and soon, if not at once, to Charlestown, where ever after his home in this world was to be.

The Congregational pastor at Charlestown, at this time, was Dr. Jedediah Morse, father of Prof. Morse, of Electric Telegraph celebrity, and then one of the leading clergymen of his order in New England. Letters from Codman doubtless took Mr. Balfour to him. He soon attracted attention by the readiness and good sense of his extemporaneous talks in Dr. Morso's "vestry-meetings," and shortly was welcomed into his pulpit. The way was thus speedily opened for him into the best circles, and as the result, he was married, Dec. 4, 1809, to Miss Mary Devens, a grand-daughter of Commissary Devens, "in his day, one of the most wealthy and respected citizens of the town."8 The Baptist pastor was called to make the twain one, which suggests that, for some reason, Mr. Balfour had already separated from Dr. Morse and the "orthodox." Possibly it was because of his views touching the administration of the Communion—he, as his son informs me, holding to its administration every Sunday. Possibly it was because he already found himself approaching the conclusions concerning baptism which he subsequently reached. At all events, we soon find him ministering in a hall to a small and apparently independent congregation, though still occupying the recognized "evangelical" platform. Not long after—following Dr. Whittemore's chronology, he came definitely to regard immersion as the Scriptural form of baptism, and thereupon was baptized by the same minister who had married him.

8 Of this marriage, eight children, four sons and four daughters, were born, of whom four, two sons and two daughters, survive. Mrs. Balfour died in 1844.
This being done, for the next ten or twelve years he is nearly lost to our view, in a life that gave little or no sign. Without compensation except as the people remembered him occasionally in their free-will offerings, he preached twice every Sabbath to his “little flock,” by whom he seems to have been greatly beloved, judging from the fond attachment for him which tradition in my wife’s family ascribes to an aunt of hers, a member of the congregation. For a time, also, while thus preaching, he kept a Dry Goods Store “upon the main street in Charlestown,” though permitting nothing to divert him from the steady pursuit of his theological and Biblical studies so far as his opportunities would allow. But who can tell how, through these years, he was in training for his Providential work, or how far what he afterward became and did was the direct result of the stores he laid by through the patient and plodding application to which he gave himself, in this life apparently so little promising any such issues? How much would be gained if this fast, impatient time would but learn these lessons of quiet, patient, thorough preparation!

At length, a change came, and the work for which Mr. Balfour had so unconsciously been preparing was upon him. In May, 1819, Channing preached his celebrated “Baltimore Sermon,” at the ordination of Rev. Jared Sparks. It was as if a bomb-shell had suddenly exploded in the Calvinistic camp! The “Unitarian controversy” had been raging for several years; but, at this time, it had somewhat subsided, so that something like peace seemed to be settling upon the warring churches. This sermon burst like a thunder-clap from a sky from which all appearances of a cloud were thought to be departing! Never before had Calvinism been so arraigned from the “Unitarian” side, or had “the standing order” been so shocked and stirred. At once, everything was in commotion. As Halleck says of the surprised Turks at the attack of Bozzaris, the cry was

"To arms! . . . The Greek! the Greek!"

Very soon, as one of the “orthodox” champions, Prof. Stuart stepped into the arena, in his “Letters to Channing;” but,
intent only on establishing one point, he forgot duly to guard himself at others. Hence, laboring to establish the "spiritual worship" of Christ, he quoted Phil. ii. 10, 11, and Rev. v. 8-14, and, having said after the first, "Things in heaven, earth and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the universe," added after the second, "If this be not spiritual worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine." These declarations—remarkable, coming from such a source—at once arrested Mr. Balfour's attention. He was greatly perplexed, and in his perplexity, naturally turned to Prof. Stuart for relief. The story, however, can best be told in his own words. He says:

"Until the year 1819, a serious thought never occupied my mind, that the doctrine of endless punishment might be false. In the belief of this doctrine I had been educated from my childhood. The books I read, the preaching I heard, and all my religious intercourse, tended to deepen my early impressions that it was Scriptural... In the course of my reading, I had perused several books on the subject of universal restoration, but they only tended to confirm me in the belief that endless punishment was true, and that reformation in hell and salvation from it could not be established from the Bible. I deemed Universalism a great error, sometimes discussed the subject with Universalists, and always thought I had the best of the argument. The first thing which staggered my faith in the doctrine of endless punishment was reading that paragraph [above referred to] in Mr. Stuart’s Letters. His statements, I was unable to controvert, and the texts on which they were founded seemed to support them. This gave rise to my first three letters.... They were written to solicit from Mr. Stuart some explanation, how he reconciled his statements with this doctrine. As he had shaken my faith in it, I thought I had some claim on him to say something to re-establish it. The signature I assumed, ‘An Inquirer after Truth,’ though in one sense fictitious, was in another real, for my letters were written in sincerity, anxious to see where the truth lay on this subject. And believing as I had done, that Universalists were in a great error, I was
also desirous that Mr. Stuart should so answer my letters as to convince them of it.”

The first of these Letters of Mr. Balfour to Prof. Stuart was dated Jan. 29, 1820; the last, Aug. 11, 1821. There were ten of them in all. Originally, as he intimates above, he planned but three. After the publication of the third, in March, he waited until July for some reply, when he sent the Professor a private note, by mail, assuring him that the letters were not from a Universalist, but from one whose mind he had seriously disturbed, and pleading with him to come to his relief. Still the Professor was silent. Then, in December, Mr. Balfour published his private note, and, after waiting another month, followed with five other letters, “occasioned,” as he tells us, “by observing other things in Mr. Stuart’s book, and [by] my own investigation of some Greek phrases, which he had explained.” “In investigating the Scriptural sense of these phrases,” he adds, “my doubts were increased as to the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment. This made me still more anxious that he should come forward with some explanation.” At length, in June, the Professor addressed a brief note to the editor of the Universalist Magazine, in which the letters had appeared, excusing his silence on the grounds that he was pressed for time, and that the letters were anonymous, only designed, as he thought, “to solicit a dispute.” To this, Mr. Balfour replied, and thus his attempt to get light from Prof. Stuart ended.

These Letters, extending over a year and a half, occasioned no little stir, especially among Universalists, who saw in them evidence of a strong hand. The interest, doubtless, was all the greater, because of the element of curiosity that mingled in it. Who is it? was the question. No one knew. When his final communication came to hand, a new editor of the Magazine thought to discover him by acknowledging its receipt, adding that he would “find a letter in the Post-office,” — it having been arranged with the delivery-clerk that, if the letter was called for, steps should at once be taken to

footnote: 1 “Introduction” to his Letters to Stuart, pp. iii, iv.
ascertain who took it, or where it went. But, as Dr. Whitter- 
mor e says, "the Inquirer was too wary for the editor." The 
letter was never called for.

Hereupon, the author of the Letters became silent, and dis- 
appeared from view. Once only, he broke silence, in answer 
to a correspondent of the Magazine, who, referring to his re- 
peated declarations that he did not wish to be a Universalist, 
but was afraid he should have to be, asked an explanation, 
saying, "I should think, sir, if the doctrine of universal sal- 
vation were as congenial to the benevolence of your soul as 
you have represented, you would not use every proper means 
to avoid believing it." To this a satisfactory reply was given; 
and then nothing more was heard from the writer until the 
last Sunday in May, 1823, when, having completed the elabo- 
rate investigations in which Prof. Stuart’s paragraph had in- 
duced him to engage, Mr. Balfour surprised his congregation 
by announcing that he had become a Universalist. The veil 
was then lifted, and An Inquirer after Truth declared himself.

The excitement thus occasioned, especially in Charlestown, 
was widespread and intense. Though having no reputation 
as an eloquent preacher, Mr. Balfour commanded universal 
respect as a good man, well-versed in the Scriptures, and 
learned in the original languages in which they were written.

8 Concerning these investigations, he gives this account:

"When Mr. Stuart declined all explanation how he reconciled his statements with 
the doctrine of endless punishment, I determined to make a pretty thorough examina- 
tion of the subject for my own satisfaction. The substance of my investigations 
have been published in my First and Second Inquiries, Essays, and other publications. 
Whether my books have done any good or evil to the world, they have Mr. Stuart to 
thank for them. A little timely explanation from him might have prevented them 
from being written. When I wrote the Letters [to him], I had as little thought of 
writing a book in favor of Universal Salvation as I had of creating a new world. All 
my prejudices and habits of thinking, as well as my honor and interest, were strongly 
in favor of the doctrine of endless punishment. To Mr. Stuart, of Andover, I am in-
depted for making me a Universalist, and to him the world are indebted for my books. 
If I have embraced an error, and have published it to the world, let all who think so 
know that he is the man who led me astray; [who] was urged to give some explana-
tion, but declined it; and that nothing has been said by him, or any other person, to 
show me my error." Introduction to Letters to Stuart, pp. v, vi.

9 As some question has been raised as to his denominational status up to this time, it 
may be well to note that, announcing his conversion, the Magazine spoke of him as 
having "been for several years a Baptist minister," and that he says of himself, 
"When I came to judge for myself, I became an Independent or Congregationalist; I 
then became a Baptist, and am now a Universalist." Letters to Hudson, p. 22.
That such a man should become a Universalist, was, to all outside Universalist circles, a surprise indeed! As for the Universalists, it hardly need be said that they welcomed him cordially, and, when they knew that it was he who had written the *Letters to Stuart*, with delight. His conversion was announced in the *Magazine of May 31, 1823.*

And now commenced Mr. Balfour’s career as a theological writer and controversialist — a career scarcely paralleled in this country, and that continued for twelve years, almost without a day’s interruption. He was the target, at which alike the cymbals and the small arms of “orthodoxy” were aimed — not to speak of other assailants. After complying with the request of the Universalist parish in Charlestown to deliver a course of sermons, unfolding the results of his studies, he issued, in July, the prospectus for his *First Inquiry.*10 The book appeared in February, 1824. Immediately, it attracted attention. After a few months, a call was made through the press upon the “orthodox” ministry, to refute the book, or to confess that they were deceiving the people. Rev. James Sabine, a Congregational minister, who had for some reason fallen into disfavor with his brethren, and who subsequently went into the Episcopal Church, was the only respondent. He announced his readiness to reply to Mr. Balfour, if any church could be opened to him for the purpose, and when no “evangelical” church was offered, the Universalist parish in Charlestown, greatly to their credit, placed theirs at his service. There he gave six lectures. To these, in 1825, Mr. Balfour replied.11 Meanwhile, he was not idle in his investigations. He sent labored and valuable articles to the Universalist press, mainly to the *Magazine,* which did great service in Scriptural exegesis. Through the same medium, also, in the year last named, he addressed a notable *Letter* to Dr. Lyman Beecher, then of Litchfield, Conn., based upon a strong

10 *An Inquiry into the Scriptural Import of the words SHEOL, HADES, TARTARUS, and GENNENA,* all translated HELL in the Common English Version.

11 *A Reply to Mr. Sabine’s Lectures on the Inquiry, &c., in two parts: 1st. A Defense of the Inquiry; 2d. His Proofs of a Future Retribution considered.*
statement of the Doctor in another direction, touching the silence with which the Inquiry had been treated. Then, in June, 1826, he put forth his Second Inquiry. In the spring of 1827, Hudson's Letters to Ballou appeared; and thereupon, in February, 1828, Mr. Balfour followed with his Essays. Mr. Hudson replied early in 1829; and in the same year, Mr. Balfour went again to press with his Letters on the Immortality of the Soul, in reply. In the meantime, Rev. Dr. Allen, President of Bowdoin College, in a Lecture to his students, in the summer of 1828, though making no mention of Mr. Balfour, or his books, assumed to deal with his positions; and though the pamphlet (forty pages) was so weak and superficial that it was said to have been withdrawn from sale, Mr. Balfour, in his determination to let nothing pass that pretended to be a reply to him, issued an answer to it in November of the same year. In December of this same year, also, having heard a lecture of Dr. Lyman Beecher, then of Boston, on the Rich Man and Lazarus, in which his views were contested, he issued a Letter to him. Then in January, 1831, Prof. Stuart having, the fall preceding, published his Exegetical Essays, he put forth his Reply. In July, 1833, he issued, in a small volume, his Letters to Rev. Moses Stuart, those originally published in the Magazine, with an Introduction and Concluding Remarks. Finally, in 1834, he published his

12 "An Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan: and into the Extent of Duration expressed by the terms Olím, Aion, and Aionios, rendered Everlasting, Forever, &c., in the common version, and especially when applied to Punishment."


14 "Letters on the Immortality of the Soul, the Intermediate State of the Dead, and a Future Retribution, in reply to Mr. Charles Hudson, of West- minster, Mass."

15 "Letter to Dr. Allen, President of Bowdoin College, in reply to his Lecture on Universal Salvation, addressed to the students of the college."

16 "Reply to Professor Stuart's Exegetical Essays on Several Words relating to Future Punishment."
1875.]

**Biographical Sketches.**

*Letter to Whitman,* and thus ended his formal controversial labors.

From this enumeration of his books, it is manifest that he must, during this whole period, have been most unremittingly employed. During all these years, too, he preached nearly every Sabbath, frequently travelling considerable distances to his appointments, besides being a frequent contributor to the *Expositor* and our denominational journals. In 1834, Rev. Parsons Cooke published his *Modern Universalism Exposed;* but Mr. Balfour chose not to follow him with a book, contenting himself with a series of Letters to Mr. Cooke, in the *Trumpet,* extending over parts of 1834 and 1835. He closed by saying, "Will you be pleased to select one or two of your strongest texts, on which you are willing to rest the doctrine of endless misery, and let us thoroughly examine their true meaning?" But Mr. Cooke declined; and thus, says Dr. Whittimore, "ended the last controversy in which Mr. Balfour ever engaged. There were small matters which came up, from time to time, and which claimed his attention, but nothing that might properly be dignified by the name of a controversy."

He was now (1835) sixty years old. He continued to preach—for the first few years, almost every Sunday, attending, also, nearly all the Conferences and other occasional meetings in the neighborhood, and then, at intervals, up to the year 1847. His last sermon was given at Malden, Mass.,

17 "A Letter to Rev. Bernard Whitman, on the term Geenna, rendered Hell in the Common Version."

18 He was a devotee at his desk or table, laboring there without discomfort, for the reason that he sat in a low chair, with his side to his table, bringing his arm nearly at a level from the shoulder as he wrote, so saving himself from the necessity of the usual stoop. I mention this fact, thinking that it may, as a suggestion, prove as valuable to others as it has to myself. For several years after entering the ministry, sitting at my study-table in an ordinary chair, and leaning over to my writing as the posture commonly is, I suffered greatly from heart-burn and dyspeptic troubles. Speaking to Father Balfour of these things, he told me of his own custom, and advised me to adopt it. Acting upon the advice, I have for years sat sideways at my desk, in a low rocking chair, and am sure that to Father Balfour's suggestion I owe, under God, an exemption from much suffering, and perhaps the ability to accomplish the large amount of writing I have had to do.
on Sunday, Sept. 26th, of this year. Paralysis had attacked him—probably in 1843, or '44, 19 and from that time, his vigor was gone. He still used his pen, however, for some time after he ceased to preach. One of the most interesting of these last productions was a Letter in the Trumpet, in the spring of 1849, to Prof. Stuart, on his confession of the perplexity and anguish occasioned by the doctrine of endless woe. The article last written by him was a notice of "Lynch's Dead Sea Expedition," and of Chapin's "Discourses on the Lord's Prayer," dated Feb. 6, and published in the Ladies' Repository for April, 1850,—though he sent an article to the Trumpet a month later, written six months before.

These were his last words through the press. Disease gradually did its work, wasting and enfeebling him; and at length having been for some time utterly helpless, he passed forward to the immortals, on Saturday morning, Jan. 3, 1852, at the ripe age of seventy-six years and (nearly) six months.

[To be continued.]

ARTICLE IX.

Science vs. Religion.

The recent remarkable address of Prof. Tyndall, on the occasion of his inauguration as President of the British Association, precipitates a conflict between science and faith, which careful observers of the tendencies of modern thought have for a long time believed to be sooner or later, inevitable.

The force of circumstances and his own acknowledged genius have given Prof. Tyndall a leading position among

19 There is some uncertainty as to these dates, his son being "inclined to think" that the first attack was in 1839. But Dr. Whittamore quotes these words from an editorial of August, 1846 (probably his own), introducing an article of Father Balfour's: "His health, we are sorry to say, is far from being perfect. A slight paralysis that came upon him two or three years ago, has much enfeebled his step," &c. This, in the absence of distinct recollection, has seemed to me to indicate the dates above given as most probably correct.
those who represent the special methods and tendencies of modern scientific inquiry, in those respects in which it comes in conflict with the fundamental propositions of Christian faith; and he seems to have taken advantage of the occasion to make from the conspicuous platform of the British Association, a statement of the position which science assumes toward the religious convictions of mankind. How far he is supported in his statement by the Association does not at present appear.

Many leading and representative men in the various branches of the Christian church, have been not without hope that certain “Foremost minds of the time,” would find the results of scientific investigation and discovery to be not incompatible with faith, and that they would finally decline to identify themselves with a purely “materialistic” philosophy. It would seem that this attitude of hopeful expectation, which has been maintained with “gracious patience” until it has well nigh come to be a predominating popular sentiment, that only the perplexities of science are now the consolation of faith, is not likely to be justified by the facts, and that this hope is in a fair way to be broken.

Prof. Tyndall is understood to have committed himself and, to a certain extent, the British Association, and in a larger sense, modern science, to an unqualified endorsement of the doctrines of “Materialism.”

Seizing upon an auspicious occasion, and summoning uncommon courage,—as Champion of the “Knowable” against the mysteries of “Emotion,” he gives his adhesion to a theory which necessarily implies the utter annihilation of all faith; putting himself in antagonism not only with Christianity, but with Theism as well; making his statements in the plainest terms, and defiantly invoking the usual persecution and martyrdom.

This being true, the antagonism is of a kind that admits of no compromise; for there, is no possible modification of Christian faith that can be made to harmonize with the theory enunciated, and the issue is fairly joined.

It may be, however, that upon a critical examination all
this does not appear, for by analysis the address is far from being clear as to the author's meaning upon this very important point: and, besides, we are fairly warned that "the 'materialism' enunciated may be different from what is supposed."

There are passages in the address which make it seem impossible that Prof. Tyndall commits himself to a "Materialism" which excludes the idea of God, and the manifestations of a human soul, in the awe, and wonder, and reverence, and love of the Beautiful which are inwoven in the very nature of man; or "the religious sentiment," which he declares to have an "immovable basis in the emotional nature of man," and to yield which, its "reasonable satisfaction," he pronounces "the problem of problems at the present hour."

It is of some significance also, we may suppose, that he proposes "a radical change of our notions of Matter." This of itself would seem to imply some new theory of materialism, peculiar to this address. What is this New Materialism? Rejecting the hypothesis that any form of life could rise out of such Matter as is pictured by Democritus, and representing the definitions of the text-books as "intended to cover" only "its purely physical conditions and properties," and as being therefore far from complete; he traces the line of life backward, as it approaches more and more to purely physical conditions, until it reaches at last "the 'protogenesis' of Haeckel, in which we have a type distinguishable from a fragment of albumen only by its finely granular character;" and professes to see in this Matter certain potencies by which it develops all things, without any intermeddling of a Creator. "Fundamentally considered," he declares, "it is by the operation of an inscrutable mystery that life is evolved, and species differentiated, and mind unfolded, from their prepotent elements in the immeasurable past;" and adds, "There is, you will observe, no very rank materialism here."

Whether there is or not, depends upon how he is to be understood, which is by no means certain. We could have wished for "clearness and thoroughness," here; and are
greatly disappointed with the obscurity which we encounter instead, in the disingenuous theory of causation through which his vision runs backward into an indistinctness so complete that no one will dispute it. That he ascribes to Matter unusual powers, is true, but he brings forward no new definitions in justification.

Only two courses are possible. Either we must open wide our doors to the conception of creative acts, or we must discard the conception entirely. If we discard the conception of creative acts, we must radically change our notions of matter. In other words, if we abandon the conception of creative acts, we must carry the idea of creative power over to matter.

This is what we are asked to do, and this is the "superiority" of science!

The confession which Prof. Tyndall feels bound to make is, that "prolonging the vision backward across the boundary of the experimental evidence," he "discerns in Matter the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." In view of his sneer at the theologians for believing, and asking others to believe as facts, what is only hypothesis, it may fairly be remembered that Prof. Tyndall assumes from first to last the truth of this theory, which is at best, only a scientific hypothesis; and which, by the terms of his own statement, is, as to its essential facts, as much involved in "inscrutable mystery" as any theological hypothesis, and sustains precisely the same relation to the "Knowable."

Prof. Tyndall believes this theory to be true; he does not know it to be. Be it so, if so it should be found. Let it be proved that Matter is thus productive, that it contains "the promise and potency of every form and quality of life," that it must no longer be conceived of as "empty capacity," but as "the universal mother, who brings forth all things as the fruit of her own womb;" and still we need not loose our faith in God, or greatly modify our best conception of the probable process of creation. It would still logically remain to account for the production of matter endowed with such "promise and potency of life."
Whether this be the "no very rank materialism" of the address, we do not know; but certain it is, that the idea of a Creator is as necessarily associated with Prof. Tyndall's notion of Matter and its "propotent elements," as with the theory of the creation of "a few original forms capable of self-development," or the theory of "successive creative acts," or any other hypothesis; and the idea of a Divine Creation is at least logically conceivable by the process which this "New Materialism" involves.

But the question of Prof. Tyndall's meaning is not nearly so important, as the question of how he will be understood,—especially by the votaries of modern unbelief. That they will understand him to mean precisely what he says in his "confession," neither more nor less, according to "the obvious import of his words," is already made sufficiently apparent. That he is regarded as an important accession to their forces, is equally evident.

It is a fact—over which, were disguise possible, it would be unwise to attempt to draw any veil—that under the influence of modern scientific speculation, the time is developing strong atheistic tendencies. This fact is not one to be met with denunciation, nor to be ignored; but a fact that must command the serious attention of all thoughtful Christian men.

When the Roman soldiers had captured Jerusalem, and the temple, breaking into the "Holy of Holies" and finding no image therein, they proclaimed that there was no God in the temple, and that the Hebrews worshipped—nothing. And so modern "scientific atheism," having taken the Cosmos, peers into its hitherto hidden spaces with such eyes as it may, and finding no Material God, concludes that there is no God.

Let it be conceded that theology has its perplexities. The problems of God, of the creation, of the meaning of the world and history are tremendous immensities, into which man peers with straining eyes, sending far his questionings only to have them come back to him baffled,—he knows not why, to whom it seems as if there should be clear and final answers.
For a nature born to question. The Universe is a tremendous problem. Still more tremendous is the problem of its Creator.

Our very knowledges, though such splendid realities, testifying to grand powers in man, still mock us with a taunt of our helplessness, everywhere at the point of supreme interest; for every where just beyond the point of knowledge lies the unknowable, without a knowledge of which it is felt that nothing is truly known. In the Christian ideal of a spiritual world, and spiritual life—the loftiest theme, involving the profoundest of all human interests, and the dearest of all human hopes,—the idea of the Being and attributes of God is fundamental; and yet God is the stupendous secret.

"Who, by searching, can find out God?" No man, "by searching," certainly. There is no analysis that is profound enough, or fine enough.

But to admit all this, is only to admit that, in the midst of infinity, there are as yet limitations to our knowledge; and, with respect to the supreme object of knowledge, a possible fault in the methods of our pursuit.

There are those indeed, who profess to know all about these things. God, and the Mysteries of His Being, the inmost processes of His thought, His purpose, and His immeasurable plan, and how things came to be as they are, are all familiar to them. But men of thought sweep aside their charlatanry with a gesture of impatience, and stand amazed and perplexed before the unsolved problems of Being and Life. These things cannot well be without their influence, especially when taken in connection with the now very generally conceded unreason of the standard theology. And the Christian church cannot afford to be blind or indifferent to the extent to which the popular mind, perplexed with the problem of things, and with the difficulties of the theological explanation, in the mental reaction which follows baffled effort, falls into the current of modern unbelief, which simplifies all questions by brusquely eliminating the idea of God, and all the sanctions of a spiritual economy from the world of nature and of life.
Now it is the strength of scientific atheism, that it comes at an opportune time to make this growing popular unbelief intellectually respectable, by the plausible persuasion of an ingenuous speculation, which positively assigns the Most High no place in the universe. There is no rude denial, except among the coarse and ignorant; but there is the subtle poison of insinuation, and of inference; the skilful effect of a studied purpose to ignore the Being and providence of God; to produce the impression that the world began, and gets on without Him, by the inevitable procedure of "self-sufficient forces" in the "prepotent elements of Matter;" and that it is the sense of the "foremost minds of the time," that He does not exist; or, at least, that His existence is exceedingly hypothetical. Shutting the door against the conception of creative acts, it "discerns in matter the promise and potency of every form and quality of life," and "derives man in his totality, from the interaction of organism and environments;" leaving it to be inferred that all necessity for a Creator is thus obviated.

It sees the tide of "mechanical forces" as having "swept on from all eternity," and contrives to state what it sees in such way as to have men believe there is nothing else to be seen. It professes to have ascertained that however far the search is extended, no God is found.

It is nothing that its processes are no more calculated to bring men to the truth of God in nature, than the processes of chemical analysis are calculated to bring men to the axioms of mathematics or music. The processes are insisted upon, and we are warned that they are not to be opposed; that "all religious theories, schemes, and systems, which embrace notions of cosmogony," must submit to be controlled by them, because they are "science."

The discovery of God — the proof of His existence — is not a matter of telescopic observation, or microscopic research, or chemical analysis; and it is a wretched logic to say: These instruments have taken us among the stars, and opened the world of minute wonders around us, and let us into the mystery of the relations and properties of matter; and, since God has not been found, He evidently does not exist!
We may profess surprise that men should adopt such a process of reasoning; but what we have to consider, is the fact that men do so reason, and that this reasoning is gaining a wide-spread influence among the thinking masses of this generation. We may be assured that it is unreasonable to dispute it, that it is childish to combat it, because it is science, and because "it has proved disastrous to oppose science in the past;" but we need not have our breath quite taken away by this flourish with which a new disciple so evidently whistles up his courage immediately after having thrown off "all disguise."

If the argument, by which certain scientific facts and theories are pressed into the service of atheism, is sophistical, this fact may be shown. If, after all that may be proved to be true in science, there still remain grand truths upon which man's belief in God and in the Divine Order of spiritual verities repose, and which justify this belief, then appeal may be made to those truths,—and must be, in an argument, for truth as the ground of faith.

The assumption which runs through the whole argument of modern unbelief, and that upon which its entire force depends, is, that God, if He exists, can be found by exploration or analysis, and made apparent somewhere, that He is to be sought and found, if to be found at all, as one would find the engineer of some public work, or the master mechanic in a machine shop; and that not being so found after diligent search, He probably does not exist. Grant all that can be claimed for this argument, that the search has been pushed carefully, and to the utmost, backward toward the origin of things; does it follow, that because God is not physically discoverable, He does not exist?

But, it is said, "No mind is discernable in nature." No. Push the search as you may, by every method known to physical science, and no mind is discoverable in nature. What then? Shall we therefore say that the Infinite Mind does not exist? What this argument is worth may be shown by a parallel application.
Prosecute the search as you may, with scalpel, and microscope, and analysis, increasing at every step the delicacy of the process, until you have exhausted the utmost possibilities of the scientific method, and no mind is discoverable in a Poem, a work of Art, or in Man himself. Shall we say therefore that mind in man is an hypothesis? that having pursued the investigation so far, and failed to discover it, we may pronounce definitely that mind does not exist in man? This is precisely the form and force of the argument against the existence of God. Whether it be with the problem of the Creator, or of man, that it deals, it will forever hold true that this mechanical method of investigation, pursued to whatsoever length it may be, will be eternally at fault. It not only fails at the point of supreme interest, but it fails every where. It can no more solve the ultimate problem of a single atom, than of the universe. It can no more solve the problem of man, than it can solve the problem of God.

What then is to be confessed? Evidently that the truth escapes the processes of this method. How then are we to come upon the evidences of the existence of God?

We must begin with something that we know. Any appeal to hereditary reverences, to what we believe, to what the world has believed through all ages, will be taken as a confession of weakness. Whether God exists or not, there is man. Of him we are certain. But of how much are we certain in him? "Of twenty-four or six pounds of common earths, and four pails of water," the formula of "science" assures us.

But we are sure of more than this, by its own terms: "Curiously, yet in a way something beyond our discernment, combined and wrought up into an organism, the highest things in it being nerves and nerve centers; the whole being apparently designed as the instrument of certain nerve sensations."

Combined and wrought up by whom? By the "promise and potency of Matter"? Be it so. Whose work then is this promise and potency of matter? and to what does the door of "evident design" open? Of the elements and structure of
the physical constitution of man, we know some things, relatively; but do we know, can we be sure of anything farther? Let it be conceded, as to the process of his creation, that he is "combined and wrought up," or "evolved" by the "potency" which modern science "discerns in matter;" of what can we be certain in man? What is it, ultimately, that organizes and builds this body, by this, or any other process of creation? that plays upon these nerves, sweeping them with such intelligent and certain touch, and with such magnificent results, opening into such a world of consciousness, thought, and emotion?

If we say it is "Mind," we are assured that scalpel, and microscope, and modern chemistry, have pushed their exhaustive analysis clear through this human composition, and find no mind; that consciousness, thought, and emotion, are forms of nerve sensation, which is the highest thing we know, or can know.

Whether it is or not, we shall see; but in the meantime, we are certain that we feel, that we think, that we know, that we will. We are certain also, that feeling, thought, conviction, will, are phenomena of something within us deeper than themselves,—of something Personal, that feels, and thinks, and knows, and wills; and which, while other things have their utilities, has its interests as the objects of its thoughts; and that is in an infinitely more real and strict sense Ourselves, than the bodily form which it inhabits and animates.

Of this Personal force, of which all "sensations" are mere phenomena, this self, this me, we are as certain as we are of the body. What this Force is, may be proved by what it does,—by the quality it displays in its work. In the first place then, it is Self-conscious; and, from the ground of self-consciousness, constructive. It elaborates the body. Directly to it is traceable all that is conditioned in the physical constitution of man, and its maintenance. Without it the whole mechanism not only ceases to exist, but without it had never been at all.

And so, of all that has been wrought in the interests of
Civilization; the instruments of industry, of art, and of science, and of its production, and direction. The mightiest originating force in this world, it is to be said, without any figure of speech, that man lives in a world of its creation. What it has constructed, it has originated—in the world of utilities and its instruments, and in the larger world of ideas, convictions and sentiments.

The man whose habit of thought is most mechanical, can hardly fail to grasp the fact that in all this human achievement, the force at work has been this interior personal force, in which we recognize, and are conscious of, our self-hood. He realizes the fact that there is an expression of something higher than “mere sensations” in the idea of justice, in the sentiment of love, and the ideal of the beautiful, which are somehow at the heart of all that is admirable in the industries, equities, laws, arts, and literatures of the world in which man lives. In all this achievement it has displayed the qualities of intelligence, of moral perception, and sentiment, and will; the power of acting from rational motives, from cause to effect, for rational ends,—all the qualities and powers, which we inevitably associate with the idea of Mind. We say, therefore, that while men are grasping and analyzing tissues, and tracing nerves to their roots, professing to be able never to see, or touch, or in any way discover mind; mind is proved.

This mind in man discovers and proves the Infinite Mind, which it reflects, as the mathematical faculty reflects the world of mathematical truth. As the things belonging to the senses, are discerned by the senses, so the things of the soul, are discerned by the soul. Precisely as the mind of man discovers and proves mathematical truth, and the principles that belong to it, it discovers and proves the truth of God, and the qualities that belong to this truth.

Its supreme Affirmation is that of Mind, the sole originating and constructive cause of all things. We know that Mind can create. We see it continually doing this with respect to the world of civilization, in which we live,—expressing its qualities in its work, in such way that it may be said in the
widest and most literal sense, that Civilization is mind of man manifest. And so the Infinite Mind expresses its quality in the creation of the universe, in such way that in the most literal sense, the universe is Mind of God manifest.

We cannot logically think of Matter otherwise than as having been created. We cannot conceive of it as originating anything, we cannot imagine for it any office, other than that of plastic obedience to a Power superior to itself, and of which all its forms are subservient phenomena.

We speak of the "prerogatives of mind," but we never speak of the prerogatives of matter. Matter is said to "obey its own laws," but no research has ever yet been able to discover any single law of matter. We say of mind, that it obeys its own laws, but to say that mind obeys the laws of mind, is equivalent to saying it obeys its own reason, and moral sentiment. To say this of matter, would be to say what is contrary to all we know.

We conceive of laws, only as methods of intelligence, and so attributes of mind; and what are called laws of matter," are the methods of a Reason which conditions matter, and of which all its so-called facts are phenomena. We see that all things are thus directly traceable back to some aspect of the Law of an Infinite Mind, which conditions things according to its purpose,—that all things are conditioned by such qualities or attributes as the human mind necessarily associates with the idea of God.

Now, looking the elaborate persuasion of scientific atheism fairly in the face, we ask, has anything discovered by the research through which it seeks to justify its denial, proved or tended to prove that Matter and the laws which are every where apparent in the universe, can account for their own origin? that matter can design and create, that it can act from a moral motive? or that it can act at all, otherwise than as it yields to a power which conditions and pervades all its forms.

Research, however far extended, has discovered only what lies in the familiar form of things immediately around us, that
matter obeys the laws of reason, and does not produce them; that if the direction of that reason be changed, as from a lower to a higher form, it obeys the new direction; that the whole mighty order of things is a grand testimony of what the Infinite Mind can do; as the world of ideas, arts, and laws, is a grand testimony of what the mind of man can do.

We reply to the annihilating process of this one-sided speculation, that the great Truth which it professes not to see, is only discoverable under that law of discovery, as well authenticated as any other known law, by which "spiritual things are spiritually discerned."

That we do not know how to condition the Personality of God, is no more against the truth of His existence, than the fact that we do not know how to condition the personality of man — the "Me," which so eludes us — is against the fact of his existence. The one problem is no more mysterious nor difficult, than the other.

Not only does the highest human reason thus discover Mind as the productive cause of all thing, but it also hears a voice, which it discerns as the voice of God, in the world of moral and aesthetic relation, obligation, and retribution.

Physical research, with scalpel, and microscope, and crucible, may solve some of the problems of man's physical constitution; but it cannot touch the mystery of moral and aesthetic laws, nor lay bare the sources and springs of the imperative mood of man's spiritual nature, nor out of the Matter of his body construct Conscience, and the Beauty of Holiness.

These are the revelations in the human soul of God, the Moral Administrator. And here we know where to find Him. Here we come to His seat. Here we may order our cause before Him. Here the heavens open around us.

If then, the speculative mood of the understanding, with excessive claim for the consideration of some particular facts involved in that aspect of things which belongs to it, bring up the idea of nature and nature's laws with a view to an explanation of the problem of things, there are three things which any philosophy must demand and insist upon in the
the conception of Nature's laws—logical direction, force, order; that is to say, Wisdom, Strength and Beauty, which are the Aspects of the Mind of God in the Universe.

These are the very essence and quality of law, apart from which it is not possible to conceive of law in any true or philosophical sense; and in connection with which it is not possible to conceive of law except as a method, or process, blending such ideas of intelligence and resource and purpose and adjustment and administration, as would, in the case of Nature's laws, imply the action of the Infinite Mind.

Add to all this the considerations which grow out of the revelation of our Human Sonship, which shows us what is the quality of the Divine Nature, and the truth is still more apparent. The law of this revelation is shown us in the sonship of Jesus Christ, which revealed the Father.

The essence and chief significance of Christianity is in this fact, in which it affords an example of the way in which God becomes known to us in that depth and reality of His nature which cannot be expressed in any verbal statement—that can only be shown in the revelation of personal being, under which the Father appears in the Son.

We maintain that this revelation is complete and valid,—that the spiritual nature of man proves the being of God, as the child proves the existence of the parent,—and not only the being, but also the nature, quality, character of God, under the sanctions of that law of all Being, according to which the father must appear in the child, in such way that we can apprehend it as an authentic revelation.
The Wrestling of Jacob at the Brook Jabbok.

One of the most prominent figures on the canvass of the Old Testament is Jacob, and the fortunes of his house form the staple of its history. The promise that in him and his seed all the families and kindreds of the earth should be blessed, is at once the ground work and the inspiring theme of Hebrew prophecy and poetry. The twelve tribes of Israel, however numerous, wherever scattered abroad, whether enslaved in foreign lands or dwelling in peace and safety in the land of promise, are ever a chosen and peculiar people, "to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." Rom. ix 4.

The genealogies, drawn out with such punctilious care and such wearisome repetitions in the Old Testament and the New, have their nexus in Jacob, from whom Christ came. All that precedes in the Mosaic History seems but a preparation for his appearance on the scene—a background on which to exhibit his honorable descent and glorious progeny. His wanderings and experiences, his virtues and vices, his high calling and "strange, eventful history," are the salient features of Old Testament history and legend; and the story of his wrestling with "a man" at the brook Jabbok, as recorded in Genesis xxxii, is invested with a peculiar interest from the mystery surrounding it, from the traditions concerning it, from the various interpretations given of it, and because it marked an important epoch and turning point in his life. We have long desired to see a rational exposition of it, for as commonly interpreted we fail to get any clear or consistent idea of its meaning. The points we propose to discuss in this paper relate to the person of Jacob's antagonist, the occasion, the nature, and the consequences of the conflict.

We are aware of the embarrassment under which one labors when he leaves the beaten track of commentators, and dis-
turbes associations hallowed by long usage, as well as of the
difficulty arising from the great antiquity of the event, and
the brevity of the record which only gives us a mere casual
glimpse into a rude and remote age. The events we are to
consider took place some one hundred or two hundred years
previous to the Trojan war, according to Gladstone's chro-
nology; i.e. 3,000 years ago, or nearly as many years previous
to the birth of Christ as have elapsed since that epoch.
Hence the obscurity and mystery which have gathered around
them, and the legends which have grown out of them.

The first thing, obviously, for an interpreter to do is to
seek for the real facts, the historical data connected with his
subject, and the next is to trace out the agreement or discord
of speculation and theory with such data; and by the concurre-
ence of various lines of evidence he may hope to group into
a connected and consistent narrative the scattered and frag-
mentary memoranda of ancient Hebrew story.

As we have said, the incident of the wrestling marked an
important epoch in Jacob's life. In the history of his early
da ys and his dealings with his father, his brother, and his
uncle Laban, we see the adroit and subtle schemer, intriguing
for power and preterment and seeking his own advancement
equally disregardful of the rights of others and unscrupulous
in the use of means for gaining his ends. By his treatment
of Esau while they both dwelt with their father, Jacob fully
earned the title of Supplanter, that being the signification of
his name in Hebrew. Taking advantage of Esau's necessity
and folly Jacob bought his birthright, and then at the instiga-
tion, and aided by the craft of his mother, with whom he was
a favorite, and to make assurance doubly sure, he deceived
Isaac, who was blind with age and unsuspicous of the arts
and unable to detect the imposture practised upon him by
Jacob, so that the latter obtained the paternal blessing to-
gether with the prerogatives and honors which custom in that
age assigned to the oldest son. By shrewd devices he gained
great wealth while managing the business of his father-in-law
Laban.
It would seem that up to the time of obtaining the birthright from Esau, the two brothers had shared the wanderings of Isaac in the south country, but on account of the feuds in the family, Jacob had been sent away into Padan-Aram, i.e., Mesopotamia, to seek a wife from among his kindred; and after living there twenty-one years he set out with his wives, his children, and his possessions, to return to the land which had been given to him and his seed for an everlasting possession. As he journeyed westward towards Esau’s dominions he was naturally apprehensive of his brother’s resentment, and sent forward messengers with a liberal present to learn Esau’s intentions and propitiate his favor. As Matthew Henry pithily remarks:

“Jacob sends a very humble message to Esau. It does not appear that his way led through Esau’s country, or that he needed to ask leave for a passage; but his way led near it, and he would not go by him without paying him the respect which was due to a brother, a twin brother, an only brother, an elder brother, and a brother offended.”

When the messengers brought back word that Esau was coming with a force of four hundred men, though it does not appear to have been with hostile intent, “Jacob was greatly afraid and distressed, and divided the people that was with him and also his flocks and herds into two bands; for he reasoned with himself, If Esau shall come to the one company and smite it, then the other company, which is left, shall escape.” Gen. xxxii. 7–8. Halting for the night and being fearful of his brother’s animosity, he tries to conciliate him by a princely present, consisting of “two hundred she-goats and twenty he-goats, two hundred ewes and twenty rams, thirty milch camels with their colts, forty kine and ten bulls, twenty she-asses and ten foals,” in all five hundred and eighty of the choicest of his flocks and herds, indicative at once of Jacob’s great wealth and his earnest desire to be at peace with his brother. Then sending forward his cattle in detachments he instructed his men to say to Esau that “his servant Jacob,” (he seems ashamed to call himself a brother) was following in
person to greet him and ask permission to pass through his territory. All this having been arranged Jacob sent his wives and children across the Jabbok—a small stream coming down from the mountains of Gilead on the east, and emptying into the Jordan about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, on the bank of which brook he was encamped. At this juncture we read that,

"Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. And as he passed over Penuel the sun rose upon him, and he halted upon his thigh." Gen. xxxii. 24-31.

Such are the circumstances connected with the wrestling, and the question arises, With whom did Jacob wrestle? All we know from the text is that it was "a man"; but what man, of what name or nation, no hint is afforded us. Yet notwithstanding this explicit statement of Moses, and the absence of all further knowledge, commentators have generally assumed that Jacob wrestled with God, or with an angel representative of God, and then, as if struck with the incongruity and absurdity of supposing him to have literally wrestled with the Almighty, they generally proceed to explain the language as symbolical; the wrestling being reduced, by an accommodating exegesis, to a season of intense, prolonged supplication for succor in a time of imminent peril. But how wrestling with a man can be made to mean praying to God is what needs clearing up. The exposition is very elastic, sufficiently marvellous, very convenient for certain doctrinal purposes, falls in with an immemorial Jewish tradition and so passes current for sound doctrine. But we were always perplexed by its inherent difficulties, and we ask what reason or propriety there can be in calling prayer a wrestling match? And as we read of Jacob's lameness, the dislocation of his hip-joint, as the result of his wrestling, we ask again, how could a night spent in
prayer produce such results? On these points we feel that there are good grounds for looking upon the common orthodox exposition of this subject as lame and unsatisfactory, and all the theories and assumptions relied upon to support it seem rather to darken than elucidate the matter.

The current exposition is found in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, (American Edition) which speaks first of Jacob’s spending a night “wrestling with God;” then of his “wrestling with an angel,” and then of his “wrestling with the Representative of the Almighty,” all in the compass of a few paragraphs, without the slightest notice being taken of the statement in Genesis that “there wrestled a man with Jacob.”

In a late mystical work 1 it is gravely argued that Jehovah contended with Jacob and yielded before him; and by Jehovah it is assumed that Jesus Christ, in a preexistent state, is meant. But this is an assumption that, to avail anything in argument, ought first to be proved. The same theory is advocated by Dr. Adam Clarke, who with assumption heaped on assumption contends that Christ preexisted as a co-eternal, co-equal person of the Godhead, that Christ is called in the text a man, that a man means an angel in human form, that angel stands for the Almighty, and lastly that wrestling means praying! Now there seem to be difficulties of a very formidable kind in this series of assumptions, difficulties in fact which are absolutely insurmountable.

The idea fallen back upon in all these cases, that the wrestling is to be understood symbolically, i.e. that Jacob spent the night in prayer, involves nothing absurd, considering Jacob's perplexities, the anxiety that weighed upon him, the extraordinary precautions he had taken for the safety of his family and the reproachful memories which must have thronged upon him at that juncture; but the difficulty of that theory is that it is not supported by the text, is only a matter of tradition, or a remote inference from the circumstances in which Jacob was placed.

All that the text says is that “There wrestled a man with

1 Yahuah Christ or The Memorial Name, by Alexander McWhorter. Boston. 1887.
Jacob until the breaking of the day." That it was God, or Christ in a preëxistent state, or an angel in human form, that wrestled with Jacob, or that he spent the night in prayer, is all hypothetical. No one of those suppositions has any terra firma of historical fact to stand on, and all of them are equally at fault in failing to satisfy the conditions of the narrative, even making all due allowance for the haze of distance, the halo of poetic legend, patriotic pride and national tradition through which the Jews have been accustomed to read and interpret it. We are unable to perceive how the wrestling in this case can be understood symbolically. We fail to discover any break or seam in the narrative at which the language ceases to bear a literal, and begins to have a metaphorical or spiritual sense.

As we read the story we feel quite sure of a real Jacob of flesh and blood like ourselves, a man peculiar in many respects, a shepherd, domestic in his habits, given to amassing wealth, sensitive, meditative, with an instinctive feeling of the extraordinary mission to which Providence had called him; and who, at this juncture, is anxious for the morrow and apprehensive of trouble with an offended and long-alienated brother who has a small army of followers in his train. There is also a real brook Jabbok, a little rivulet now known as the Wady Zaruka, flowing into the Jordan from the east. There is too "a man," an actual, tangible opponent, confronting Jacob; and there is a real, a severe and protracted trial of strength between them; and there results from the encounter a physical dislocation or serious strain of Jacob's hip-joint, a shrinking of the cord that binds the femur to its socket; there is a rising of the sun upon the scene, and the limping of one of the combatants in consequence of the injury he has received in the contest.

And yet, notwithstanding all these facts soberly and plainly related, commentators tell us with the utmost simplicity and gravity that the patriarch had only been engaged in his nightly vigils praying for deliverance from the wrath of Esau; or, as an alternative, it is held to have been a dream, or at the most
a mere seeming contest with a visionary, shadowy and impalpable foe. How men manage to separate the doings of that day from the dreamings of the night, we are at a loss to conceive, for it is all of a piece. When we ask what in fact was really done by Jacob, or what really happened to him, with whom he wrestled, with what intent, or on what provocation, we get no satisfactory, no intelligible answer.

Look for a moment at the series of assumptions. Jacob wrestled with God, with Christ in a preëxistent state, with an angel in human form, with a man, he dreamed of wrestling with one of these, he spent the night in prayer to God for succor in his helpless condition! So various is the answer we get to our inquiry, and it seems rather an evasion than an explanation of the real point; it is a wilderness of assertions and assumptions which are mutually repugnant, neither susceptible of proof nor of comprehension. Why and how a mere symbolic wrestling, or a dreaming of wrestling, or a night spent in prayer, should be followed by lameness of the hip joint, we cannot understand. It is all a nebulous theory, an when we try it by the Mosaic text, and attempt to reduce to plain matter-of-fact, there is nothing left but the residuum of an old Jewish tradition, which is not necessarily to be accepted as true merely because its origin and growth are hidden in mystery.

The popular traditional view of the matter involves a miracle, but so far as we can see there is nothing in the transaction which is out of the order of nature, or which involves or requires the intervention of supernatural agency. We see nothing in this narrative more than what was natural under the circumstances, besetting the age, suited to the habits of shepherd princes migrating from place to place with their families and dependents, their flocks and herds, and surrounded by wandering uncivilized tribes that lived in a chronic state of jealousy and strife. In taking the “man,” with whom Jacob wrestled, in the usual and obvious sense of the term, and understanding the whole narrative in its plain and natural import, in the absence of reasons for giving it a metaphorical s
mystical signification, we feel that we are following a safe and salutary rule of interpretation; and if its validity or applicability to the case in hand be objected to, it behooves the objector to show some good reason for understanding the words, "There wrestled a man with Jacob" to mean, "There wrestled Almighty God," or "an angel with Jacob," for these statements do not seem to be equivalent, but essentially variant.

We are not unmindful that the traditional interpretation of this passage is supposed to be sustained by what is said of Jacob by the prophet Hosea:

"By his strength he had power with God; yes, he had power over the angel and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him; he found him at Bethel and there he spake with him, even the Lord of Hosts. The Lord is his memorial." xii. 3-6.

So reads the common version. Let us compare with it the version of Dr. Noyes who preserves in his translation the poetical and rhythmical structure of the original, as follows:

"And in his strength he contended with God; Yes, he contended with the angel and prevailed; He wept and made supplication to him. At Bethel he found him, And there he spake with him, Jehovah, God of hosts, Jehovah, is his name."

Now it is evident at a glance that some allowance is to be made here for poetic license, and also for the coloring of national tradition reflected in these words. Dr. Noyes, speaking of the characteristics of Hosea's style, says that, so far as his language is concerned,

"He is by far the most difficult of the prophets. He is sententious, concise and abrupt. He often omits the connective particles, and it is sometimes impossible to discover the connection of his thoughts. He is more remarkable for the copiousness of his figures than for his skilful use of them. In the general character of his imagery he is at greater variance with the taste of the western world than any of the prophets."

Considering then the poetical form and Oriental style of Hosea's prophecy, it would be exceedingly hazardous to rely upon it to fill out the gaps in the Mosaic history. Even if Hosea favors the current interpretation of the incident under
notice, this would only prove that the popular traditional account of it had already in his time, (B. C. 786–725,) been generally accepted by his countrymen. Between the time of Jacob and that of Hosea there was an interval of about one thousand years, a period long enough surely for the legend to have taken shape and become current along with other traditions and superstitions which in so many cases have overlaid and confused the text of Scripture. Hosea professedly writes poetry, not history. He adds nothing to our knowledge of Jacob gathered from Moses, but only groups together certain isolated events in his career, dwells upon them, amplifies them, and embellishes them with the pride of an Israelite and the taste of a poet. He refers distinctly to Jacob's visit to Bethel when on his way to Padan-Aram, where in a dream he saw the ladder reaching unto heaven with the angels of God ascending and descending upon it, as related in Gen. xxviii; and where he set up a pillar of stones as a memorial, and named the place Bethel, i. e. "House of God," though "the name of that city was called Luz at the time."

Hosea's poetical allusions to Jacob's career are by no means authoritative or conclusive as to the purport of the wrestling; for, in the first place, it is by no means certain that Hosea had that transaction in mind, and, in the second place, the highest view we can take of prophetic inspiration does not forbid us to suppose that the prophet may have assumed a current legendary interpretation of a historical event thus incidentally cited. We know that such interpretations of transactions by no means miraculous grew common among the Hebrews before the latest books of the Old Testament were written.

We have already referred to the theory that the wrestling took place only in a dream. This was the opinion of the late Dr. Charles Follen. But the apprehension of trouble with Esau was real; the lameness of Jacob was something more than an illusion of the fancy, at least it is related by Moses as something quite real; and if it was all a dream he must be a wise man who can draw the line between sleeping and waking.

*Ency. Amst. ix. 100.*
between dreaming and reality, in such a melange of fact and
fancy as that theory makes the narrative to be.

The preceding context shows with what anxious care Jacob
makes preparation for meeting his brother whom he had not
seen for more than twenty years. Having good reason to fear
Esau's resentment he took the utmost precaution both to guard
against a surprise and to assure Esau of his kind intentions;
and we cannot resist the conviction that Jacob had an actual
physical contest with a man either one of Esau's train or
one of a neighboring clan, because of Jacob's lameness, which
could not have been caused by dreaming of wrestling nor by
a contest with an apparition. And as to the idea that the
wrestling was symbolical of prayer, there is an insuperable ob-
jection to that in the statement: "Therefore the children of
Israel eat not of the sinew that shrank, which is upon the
hollow of the thigh, unto this day." This custom has been
observed in all ages since until now, and it presupposes a
literal struggle and literal lameness. As Matthew Henry
says: "It became a fixed custom of the Israelites, in commem-
oration of this event, never to eat the sinew or tendon in any
beast by which the hip-bone is fixed in its cup; by this ob-
servance they preserved the remembrance of the occasion and
did honor to their ancestor."

Calmet says: "They take great care to cut away the
sinew of the thigh of such animals as they intend to eat, ac-
cording to Genesis xxxii. 32, and as great nicety is required
in taking away this sinew as it should be done, and few know
how to do it exactly, so in order to make sure of the observance,
the Jews in several places in Germany and Italy abstain from
the hind quarters entirely." 3

Now is it credible that so singular a custom could have
become a distinctive national peculiarity, and been perpetuated
in all lands where there are Jews, and still have no other
basis than a dream, a night spent in prayer or a contest with

3 An Israelite of our acquaintance informs us that even in America this custom is
observed by every true Israelite wherever practicable, i.e. wherever there is a Rabbi
to superintend the business and enforce the rule. Calmet's Dict. Art. Meat. Jahn's
Archaeology 146.
an apparition? Here is a custom to be accounted for which came into vogue "a long antiquity ago," and it is still religiously observed by all true Israelites, and it is better accounted for by a literal wrestling than by any other theory.

In the absence of any positive knowledge of the "man," with whom Jacob wrestled, or of the provocation or induction that led to the contest, it is perhaps in vain to indulge in conjectures. It has however been plausibly argued that while Jacob was at the ford of the Jabbok, in the vicinity of rude predatory tribes, waiting to learn the result of his humble message to Esau, he might have noticed indications of hostility from some tribes encamped in the vicinity, and, after the fashion of those times, was challenged to a trial of strength by one of their well-known champions. Such a challenge, according to ancient usages, he was not at liberty to decline but with a view to the safety of his family and possessions, in case he should be worsted in the contest, he sent them across the ford in the early part of the night, as already stated. The conflict was long and the scales of victory hung with an even poise. Jacob's antagonist, by a sleight of hand known to wrestlers, gave him a sudden blow in the region of the tendon of Achilles with such force as to dislocate the hip-joint Jacob though lamed by the blow was unsubdued.

Another theory, as to the manner in which Jacob's lameness might have been caused, is suggested by Dr. Adam Clarke. He says that the statement that Jacob's antagonist "touched the hollow of his thigh" may mean no more than that Jacob received a stroke on the groin, not a touch merely, as in the common version, for the Hebrew naga, translated touch, often signifies "to smite with violence;" which stroke, even if com

4 Boston Christian Register, Sept. 17, 1863.
5 Tendo-Achilles is the technical name given by anatomists to the tendon by which the gastrocnemius internus or solas, arising from the head of the fibula and the back of the tibia, is inserted into the os calcis, and its office is to extend the foot. Its name comes from the mythological tale that Thetis, the mother of Achilles, dipped him when an infant into the waters of the Styx, which made him invulnerable, except the heel by which she held him, and where he ultimately received his mortal wound from an arrow of Paris in the Temple of Apollo.
Paratively slight would effectually disable him for a time and
cause him to halt for many hours, if not for several days.

In respect to Jacob's declaration, "I have seen God face to
face," we suppose no one will plead for a literal sense of the
phrase, for in that sense no man hath seen God at any time.
We do not question that Jacob did see God "face to face," in
the proper sense of the words, i.e. of an intimate experience
of the Divine presence and favor in a time of need. How do
the pure in heart see God? Not with the natural eye, but
they have spiritual communion with God, they enjoy his special
approval and blessing. So Jacob, brought into a strait, and
subdued and humbled in his temper, finds God a very present
help and acknowledges the divine interposition in his behalf.
He sees God in the deep spiritual sense of the words; nor is
this a strained interpretation nor an isolated example of this
use of the verb to see. We have innumerable instances of this
use in the Scriptures. "He that believeth not on the
Son shall not see life." John iii. 36. We will quote an illustrative
example of this sense of seeing God, precisely parallel
with the passage under notice. It is found in Job xix. 25-27.
"I know that my Redeemer liveth and that he shall stand at
the latter day [i.e. at length, at last] upon the earth, and
though with my skin this body be wasted away, yet in my
flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes
shall behold, and not another." There is an inner-as well as
an outer eye, a spiritual as well as natural vision. What Job
confidently hoped for was a full vindication from the calumnies
and false accusations that had been heaped upon him, when,
at length, God the righteous Judge should appear in his be-
half. What Jacob confidently asserted he had seen, or ex-
perienced, was the divine favor and blessing in granting him
deliverance in a critical emergency.

The place where Jacob had this blessed experience, wher
God had so signally interposed in his behalf, he called by the
expressive name of Peniel, i.e. "The face of God." So on a
previous occasion at Luz, when he had the vision of the ladder
and the angels, he gave the place the new name of Bethel,
"The House of God." When he awaked out of his sleep he said, "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not." Gen. xxviii. 16. This mode of giving to persons and places names compounded in part of the name of Deity was very common in the Old Testament; as El-ijah, "The strong God;" Isra-el, "Prince of God" or "Soldier of God;" in which cases the name El has the force of an adjective, heightening the meaning of the noun with which it is combined.

So "Garden of the Lord," (Gen. xiii. 10; Isa. li. 3,) is simply an exceedingly fertile garden; "the river of God," (Ps. lxv. 9) is an exceedingly great river. Elohim is the simple generic name of God, i. e. "The Mighty One." It does not occur in the singular in the earlier books of Scripture, except in the abbreviated form of El. The plural Elohim is the plural of excellence or majesty, which will account for the expression in Gen. i. 26, "Let us make man." In Prov. ix. 1, wisdom occurs in the plural, chochemoth, to signify wisdom in its fulness, and so Elohim, in the plural is applied to God as comprehending in himself the fulness of power and all those attributes which the heathen ascribe to their severa divinities.

Proper names and titles of honor are often assigned to men or assumed by them on their elevation to office or on some particularly favorable turn of fortune; as Abram was changed to Abraham, and Sarai to Sarah, their names being enlarged in significance to correspond to their new dignity. So Simon was called Peter, i. e. Rock, and Saul was changed to Paul. It is needless to multiply examples of honorary commemorative appellations intended to perpetuate the names and renown of remarkable persons and places, which names, however, are far from carrying with them their primary and literal import but are to be understood in a secondary and figurative sense. The name Peniel or Pennuol, which are different forms of the same word, meaning, "Face of God," and which Jacob gave to the place where he had the nocturnal contest, proves noth

---

ing one way or the other as to the nature of the contest or the person of his antagonist.

Should any one ask, Why so much importance should be given to the wrestling of Jacob with an unknown man at the ford of the Jabbok, we can only answer by referring to various incidents, quite as unimportant yet made quite as prominent, in the lives of the Jewish patriarchs. We are to bear in mind that we are dealing with events that happened "a long antiquity ago"; we are also to remember the distinguished part which Jacob was called to perform in the unfolding of the Divine purposes, and not forget the very natural disposition of his posterity to honor him in every possible way, and to magnify every event in which he was concerned. We are also to remember that this incident of the wrestling marked an epoch in his life, a turning point in his character and career. After this event we read no more of Jacob the Supplanter, no more of his duplicity or overreaching, but only of those traits which do honor to the new name of Israel — "Soldier of God" — by which he is to go down in history to the end of the world.

The explanation of Jacob's wrestling, which, in the absence of positive knowledge, we have suggested as probable, rational and consistent, has at least the merit of taking the story out of the haze of mystery and legend through which it has generally been received, and makes it intelligible, and does not involve the absurdity of representing prayer as a wrestling-match with the Almighty, which to us seems to be a conception as repugnant to piety as it is to reason.

Says the prophet Isaiah: "Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker. Let the potsherds strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What doest thou?" xlv. 9. The phrase "wrestling with God," which in common use, is not we think warranted by the author of Genesis, but is a gloss of commentators, and implies something monstrous; and when, to smooth down its harshness, it is said that Jacob wrestled with an angel, this is another gloss, equally unwarranted, but deemed necessary, no doubt, to avoid the absurdity of the former. Thus one phrase
s adroitly substituted for the other, and then both phrases are explained by some inexplicable process as a metaphor for prayer, and so it passes current, is hallowed by pious associations and all the incongruity and grossness of the imagery is neutralized and forgotten. But what is wrestling? It is a trial of strength, a striving for the mastery by those who sustain toward each other a parity of rank, who are nearly equal, or else how could there be any doubt about the matter or any question to be settled by wrestling?

There is no ground of comparison or analogy, and no propriety, therefore, in representing prayer by a wrestling-match. The metaphor is incongruous and unseemly. Besides, prayer implies perfect trust, absolute submission, entire self-surrender, not self-assertion, not a contest for victory over a foe; and after making all due allowance for freedom of speech, choice of imagery, play of imagination and intensity of emotion, prayer involves humility, prostration of spirit and the feeling of trust expressed by Coleridge:

"I am weak yet not unblest,
Since in me, round me, everywhere,
Eternal strength and wisdom are."

That pious and intelligent people have long been accustomed to speak of prayer as a wrestling with God without any misgiving or suspicion of impropriety, only shows the wonderful power of the imaginative faculty to appropriate and idealize harsh and uncouth forms of speech,—shows how the enthusiasm of faith and piety can use imagery involving grossly erroneous conceptions concerning God and our relations to him without any sense of impropriety.

While questioning then the traditional account of Jacob’s wrestling we do not question the value of prayer as a means of spiritual refreshment, culture and discipline. Prayer is appropriately called in Hebrew, “secret speech.”7 It may, indeed, be called a wrestling, not however with God but with the adversary of God and man, with sinful appetites and passions, with temptation in all its manifold forms; it is a striv-

7 See Isa. xxvi. 16, marginal rendering.
ing for the mastery, not over others but ourselves; it is the perfect trust which one friend reposes in another, the repose of the soul on One who is able and willing to save to the uttermost those who call upon him. The legend as generally held, we think is incredible, not because it involves a miracle but because the evidence of a miracle is wanting. The Scriptures, which give us the history of the several steps and stages in the unfolding of the divine purposes, show us so many and such decisive marks and proofs of their genuineness and truth—are so stamped all over with "the image and pressure" of the times when they were written, of the country of their origin and of the manners of the people to whom they relate, that our faith in them is easy, is inevitable. But we are imperatively called on to take heed how we read, to discriminate the principles of divine truth from the human traditions and corruptions with which truth has often been blended and by which its light has been obscured. Miracles in the founding of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations we admit, and see not how it is possible to believe in the Scriptures or accept their teachings at all and deny the miracles they record; but then those miracles were never wrought on frivolous pretexts, nor to gratify personal pride, ambition or curiosity. An unreasoning credulity and an unreasoning skepticism have practically the same effect—that of bringing the Bible into discredit with the unthinking and ignorant.

The whole account of Jacob's meeting Esau is characteristic of the olden time and of oriental manners; it is fragrant with piety and patriotism; full of glorious memories of the head and founder of the Israelitish race, if understood rationally as an exhibition of Jacob's prowess, and his trials and conflicts without and within as he returned from his long sojourn in Mesopotamia to take possession of the promised land. And it serves also to mark the entrance of the patriarch on a new and nobler course of life, when he seemed to come to a full consciousness of the high destiny he was called to fulfil.
Was Origen a Universalist?

It must seem a little surprising to most of our readers to hear this question seriously asked at this late day,—a question which they naturally suppose answered and settled affirmatively by the general judgment of the learned world through the last fifteen centuries. Yet it is not settled. Every generation or two some one arises to reopen the case and call for a new verdict. A hundred years ago or a little more, Dietelmair, a learned German Professor, undertook the task of vindicating all the ancient Fathers of the Church from the charge of being Universalists, and most of them from even favoring such a heresy. Origen, according to this author, was orthodox and evangelical, as these terms now go, upon the point of endless punishment. And now Dr. Pond, the life-long Professor in the Bangor Theological Seminary, appears to assure us that Origen was no Universalist, but preached eternal punishment, and believed in the endless transitions of all moral creatures from a state of holiness to one of sin, and of course from happiness to misery, and vice versa, from sin to holiness and misery to bliss!

The occasion that calls this subject up at the present time is this: A few months ago Dr. Edward Beecher published, in The Christian Union, a series of learned and very interesting articles upon the history of the doctrine of Retribution, as that doctrine has been held in the Christian Church. The facts elicited in those articles surprised very many of their readers, and none of them, we venture to say, more than Dr. Beecher himself. For fashionable as it is in this country, and necessary as it is to one's orthodoxy, to profess an unswerving faith in the strict eternity of future punishment, nothing is more certain than the fact that during the earlier centuries of the Church, the belief in the final extinction of sin and the consequent restoration of the whole human race to holiness and happiness, was widely received and warmly cherished.
And what makes this fact the more significant, is the circumstance that those who entertained these better views of the divine government, were second to none of their age either in learning or piety, in Christian labors or Christian influence. Another circumstance, which is the most astonishing to our religious neighbors, is that in those early ages of our holy religion, the faith in universal salvation was neither heterodox nor unevangelical! In one of his papers Dr. Beecher said:

"The first system of Christian Theology was composed and issued by Origen, of which a fundamental and essential element was the doctrine of the universal restoration of all fallen beings to their original holiness and union with God."

This statement Dr. Ponds expressly denies. In a series of articles in the same periodical entitled, "Remarks upon Dr. Edward Beecher's articles on Retribution," the learned Professor, having quoted the passage above, says:

"This assertion of the faith of Origen, Dr. B. iterates and reiterates without intimating that the views of this great man had ever been otherwise represented or explained. Now we have studied Origen perhaps as thoroughly as Dr. B. We have read his books with the remarks of his opponents and followers, again and again, and we have no hesitation in saying that he was not a believer in the final and universal restoration of sinful beings to the love and favor of God, in the sense in which the doctrine is now advocated. . . Origen was a learned man, and we hope a good man. His speculations were the result of his philosophy and not his religion. He preached the gospel in much the same manner as those around him. He preached the doctrine of eternal punishment, as might be shown by many quotations. Still his philosophy had corrupted his theology on more points than one, and his corruptions descended to his disciples and followers for many generations."

We have no disposition to interfere in the dispute thus inaugurated between these learned Doctors. They are both of age and are able to speak for themselves. But as the matter in debate touches the history of our faith, and affects directly interests which we hold dear, we may be pardoned for speak-
ing upon it, and especially to an audience which neither of the parties would be so likely to reach.

Dr. Pond, we may observe, seems unwilling to leave Dr. Beecher’s statement with a broad denial, or even a virtual accusation of either ignorance on one side, or unhandsome concealment on the other, but proceeds to give an exposition of Origen’s theory of religion, and to fortify his interpretation of it by various proofs.

“Origen,” he says, “like Plato and Dr. Beecher, believed in the pre-existence of souls. Originally all created, intelligent beings possessed a like nature and powers, and were placed in the same celestial state. But as they were endowed with an absolutely, uncontrollable freedom of will, they did not long remain in the same condition. While some improved more or less, others degenerated; until an infinite diversity of character and condition took place among them. In consequence of this, the Almighty created the material universe, and appointed the spirits to different ranks and conditions according to their respective deserts; elevating some to the order of angels, and consigning others to the abodes of the demons, and sending the intermediate class into human bodies. Origen regarded the sun, moon, and stars as intelligent creatures, being animated by spirits who had attained great moral splendor, dignity and power, and might justly claim those bright abodes as their appropriate bodies. As all these intelligent beings, whatever their character and station, still retained their original freedom of will, they are capable either of returning from their transgressions, or of forfeiting their peculiar honors, or of rising to still higher degrees of excellence and bliss. Nor is it at all certain what their destiny in the coming ages may be. The blessed in heaven may, by degrees, relapse into sin and go down to the regions of woe, while the damned may rise to the mansions of purity and joy; thus contributing, by perpetual revolutions, a ceaseless alternation of happiness and misery. Thus, he says, ‘Angels may become men or demons, and again from the latter they may rise to be men or angels.’ Again he says, ‘It is agreeable to the rule of piety to believe that every rational being according to his purpose and manner of life, is converted sometimes from bad to good, and sometimes falls away from good to bad. Wherefore we are of opinion that, seeing the soul is immortal and eternal, it is possible that, in the many and endless periods
of duration, in the innumerable and different worlds, it may
descend from the highest good to the lowest evil, and be re-
stored from the lowest evil to the highest good. ¹

"Such was the theory of Origen in regard to the subject
before us — a theory which he had gathered chiefly from the
schools; and he needed all his allegorical principles of inter-
pretation surely to bring it into harmony with the Sacred
Word. It is not a system of universal restoration, but rather
of perpetual rotation. Origen did not deny the existence of
eternal sin and suffering somewhere, but rather that there is
any such thing as a settled, confirmed state of character any-
where. Intellectual beings are on something like a continual
probation. They are liable ever to change — the wicked to
ascend, and the righteous to fall; and what the ultimate issue
in respect to individuals may be, or whether there will ever
be any ultimate issue, is more than we can tell.

"That Origen really held the doctrines here imputed to him
is evident, not only from his own words, but, from the state-
ments of those who came after him, and the charges which
were preferred against him. Augustine says, 'The Church,
not without reason, condemned him . . for his theory of
the ceaseless alternations of happiness and misery, and the in-
terminable transitions from the one state to the other, at fixed
periods of ages: for in this theory he allots to the saints only
a false happiness, which brings them no true or secure joy, no
fearless assurance of eternal blessedness.' ² Jerome says also
of Origen, 'He held that, in the future ages, after one universal
restoration, Gabriel might at length become what the Devil
now is, and Paul what Caiaphas, and virgins what prostitutes
are.' He repeats the same charge in another connection:
Origen taught that in the universal restitution the celestial
powers and infernal spirits, together with the souls of all man-
kind, will be reduced to one order or rank of beings; and that
from this uniform state of equality they will again diverge as
formerly, holding various courses until at length some, falling
into sin, shall be born into a mortal world, with human bodies.
So that we who are now men may fear hereafter to be women,
and they who are virgins may then be prostitutes.'

"Among the errors of Origen, which were condemned in
the synods of the fourth and fifth centuries, this was promi-
nent that, 'in the distant ages of eternity the blessed in heaven
will by degrees relapse into sin and descend into the regions
of woe; while on the other hand, the damned will rise to the

¹ De Principiis, pp. 74, 716. Clark's Edition. ² De Civitate Dei. Lib. xxii, Cap. xv
mansions of purity and joy; thus constituting, by perpetual revolutions, a ceaseless alternation of happiness and misery.

"I do not say that Origen did not sometimes use language which implies the universal restoration of the wicked. I know he did. But what does such restoration amount to? Will they stay restored? Or will they not in the endless revolution of the ages fall again, and then be restored, and fall again? Origen himself says, (Contra Celsum, Lib. viii), 'The consummation of all things will be the extinction of evil, but whether it shall be so abolished as not to revive again, it does not belong to this discussion to show.'"

We have thus exhibited at length both the text of Dr. Pond's opinion and the proofs he adduces in its support. And it must be confessed that, prima facie, he has made out a strong, not to say a satisfactory case. Still, with all due deference to his talents and position, we cannot avoid suspecting that there are some facts and considerations to which he has failed to give all the attention they deserve, or perhaps any attention at all, and which if duly weighed would largely modify, if they did not altogether reverse his learned judgment.

In the first place, we must call attention to what seems a singular inconsistency in the foregoing statement of Origen's opinions. In one passage Dr. Pond tells us that "Origen preached in much the same manner as those around him. He preached eternal punishment, as might be shown by many quotations." Now in Dr. Pond's theological vocabulary "eternal punishment" is endless punishment, and we think we do him no injustice in supposing him to purposely represent Origen as a preacher of that eminently evangelical doctrine. Yet he assures us upon various authorities including Origen himself, that he believed nothing of the kind, but taught that there are to be through eternity "ceaseless alternations of happiness and misery, and the interminable transitions from one state to the other at fixed periods of ages."

Now it needs no argument to show that Origen could not have held both of these opinions at the same time, and it is equally impossible that they should have entered as parts into
the same system. If a heretic, Origen was, as Jerome said, "not a fool." If he believed and preached endless punish-
ment, he clearly could not have believed and preached the ceaseless alternations of happiness and misery, which Dr.
Pond represents as the prominent feature of his theory. The
two things mutually exclude each other. Nor does Dr. Pond's
mode of stating the case, at all help the matter. Origen's
system, he says, "was not a system of universal restoration,
but rather of perpetual rotation. Origen did not deny the
existence of eternal sin and suffering somewhere, but rather
that there is any such thing as a settled and confirmed state
of character anywhere." But we beg Dr. Pond to observe
that, upon his own showing, Origen did not believe that any
individual, whether demon, man, or angel, will sin and suffer
forever, but all moral creatures of every rank, will, in their
exercise of "absolute, uncontrollable freedom," be passing
forever from a state of holiness and happiness to one of sin
and suffering, and then from the latter to the former again;
so that, as the Doctor concludes, no one will stay saved or
stay damned! According to this statement, Origen occupied
a kind of middle ground between our prevalent Orthodoxy
and Universalism. He did not deny the existence of eternal
sin and suffering somewhere, and quite as little the existence
of eternal holiness and happiness somewhere; but then they
were to be very equally divided among all God's intelligent
creatures.

That Origen, in common with other Universalist Church
Fathers, applied the word αἰώνιος to punishment; commonly
translated eternal and everlasting, is no doubt true, and it is
just as true, whether we adopt Dr. Beecher's or Dr. Pond's in-
terpretation of his system, that he did not employ it in the
sense of endless. If he believed in universal restoration, he
must have regarded punishment, as finite and temporary. If
on the other hand, he believed in Dr. Pond's ceaseless alterna-
tions of happiness and misery, the result must be the same;
for although sin and suffering might indeed exist somewhere,
they could not be the fate of any single soul, since, like the
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Rich Man and Lazarus one would have his good things while another had his evil things, and then, their characters an conditions being changed, the latter would be comforted while the former was tormented. And is it not a circumstance well worthy of the attention of our religious neighbors, that Origen whose native tongue was Greek, who was one of the finest scholars of his time, familiar alike with the Sacred Scripture and the best writings of the Greek philosophers, should have habitually or frequently used this formidable word \textit{aionios} in connection with punishment, and yet certainly never used it to express a punishment that is really without end? Was he not as well qualified to understand its meaning as any others have been or now are?

That Origen believed fully in the freedom of the human will, we need not take the time to say. This appears every where upon the very face of his writings and is inwrought with his whole system. That he believed it to be \textit{absolutely uncontrollable},’ as Dr. Pond expresses it, is not so clear; and that he maintained it to be such a power and so allied with the intelligence and natural desires of the human soul, as in genuine Bourbon style never to learn anything, even in the bitter school of experience, and hence go on forever and ever repeating its folly as well as its wisdom, is a statement, we confess, that needs more proof than we have yet seen to make it in any degree credible. With his views of the nature of moral freedom, he may perhaps have expressed the hypothetical possibility of such a thing, though even that is not proved from his extant writings, we believe, but that he maintained such a doctrine and inwove it with his Christian system, as Dr. Pond would have us believe, is about the last supposition to be admitted. The whole cast of his thought, the tone of his writings, the prevalent cheerfulness and even joyousness of his spirit, are a constant refutation of the assumption.

It is evident that Origen believed our moral freedom to be an integral part of our being, and as indestructible as our existence. It was in his view no mere mockery as Augustine and Calvin made it, a high sounding term without any mean
Ang, vox præterea nihil, but it was what its name signifies, a real thing, a necessary part of our personality, and the condition precedent of all just reward and punishment. Nor in the conception of Origen was our moral freedom such a short-lived, evanescent thing as our prevalent Methodism and Methodizing Calvinism describe it. They talk bravely of our moral liberty, the freedom of our will, and give it such proportions and dignity as to ground the eternity of torments upon the exercise of it, here in the present life, and so vindicate the severity of the divine justice in our endless undoing by the consideration that we were free to obey or disobey, free to serve God or the Devil, free to win heaven or merit hell! And yet we find this boasted freedom is only a momentary gift, conferred for an hour in the very infancy of our being, and then withdrawn forever. According to this theology, God makes us free here in this present state, and continues our freedom just long enough to involve the great mass of mankind in damnation, and then suddenly snatches it away, as if on purpose to prevent its working its own cure or correcting the least of its errors. So represented, what is it but a snare and a trap, an infinite curse instead of a divine blessing, fitter to be the fatal gift of Satan, than the noblest, the most beneficent gift of God. Origen certainly entertained no such narrow and unworthy notions of our moral nature. He never dreamed that the soul would be less free in heaven than on earth, in eternity than in time. He believed that everything which pertains to character, everything that deserves praise or blame, reward or punishment, has its seat in the will and finds its significance in its freedom. He believed, as Dr. Pond believes to-day, that spirits in heaven once sinned, and he had no reason to doubt that what they had once done they had the power to do again. He believed, too, what Dr. Pond unfortunately does not believe, that spirits which have the power to sin have also the power to cease sinning, and by repentance to return to their original allegiance, and the service of God; and that, like sinning men, they are under solemn and constant obligations to do this,—obligations which no lapse of time can
cancel and no persistence in wickedness can annul. Nay, he went so far as to believe that the Devil himself is free to repent and obtain salvation, and this Dietelmair tells us, several of the Fathers also believed with him.  

In all this, indeed, Origen went little further in his views of moral freedom than is now common among the highest authorities in the evangelical world. Dr. Oosterzee, in his Christian Dogmatics, just published in this country with the highest Orthodox commendation, tells us that our moral freedom “involves in itself the terrible possibility of an endless resistance, which equally endlessly punishes itself”; and he quotes, in confirmation of the doctrine, the statement of Nitzsch that “the thought of everlasting perdition is to such an extent a necessary one, since there can be in eternity no enforced sanctification of the personal being, and in eternity no blessed unholiness.” In other words, our moral freedom is an indestructible element of our nature and must go with us through all our future being. If “it involves in itself the terrible possibility of an endless resistance,” it, in like manner, necessarily carries along with it the possibility of withdrawing this resistance and wholly changing the temper and course of life. If it makes “the thought of everlasting perdition” a necessary one, it likewise makes the thought of universal and everlasting restoration equally necessary, and infinitely more probable. Are we, indeed, to believe that God in his wisdom and goodness conferred moral freedom upon his intelligent creatures, with the clear foresight that in the great majority of cases it would prove the means of their endless ruin? May it not be possible that the purpose of the whole moral government of God over the human race, and eminently that of the gospel, is to bring all men, by the various discipline and training through which they are led, into such a state that they shall see the infinite beauty of holiness; that they shall love God with all their hearts and their neighbor as themselves;  

Sic docet Origenes, Diabolum salvari posse. At complures ecclesiam Doctores idem sentiunt.  

Published in Smith and Schaff’s “Theological and Philosophical Library.”
and find at once their highest pleasure and their highest happiness in a willing and joyous conformity of spirit and life to every divine requirement? If the love of Christ constrains us here, should it be thought singular that it may constrain us more and more hereafter? Is it so difficult to believe, indeed, that every soul may yet learn that perfect obedience is the most perfect liberty? If the time is ever to come when God shall be all in all, as the Apostle declares, must not the divine will be the supreme law of the universe, and the will of every moral creature be brought into sweet and perfect accord with it? Toward this grand result, we believe, the whole force of the gospel is tending, and sure we are that it will never rest, never cease to operate, till this object is fully attained. Christ is not to fail nor be discouraged, and if we may believe his own declaration he will yet draw all men unto himself. And this is precisely what Origen believed and taught.

But what, then, are we to say of his doctrine of ceaseless alternations of happiness and misery, and of those interminable transitions from the one state to another, of which Dr. Pond makes so much, and which he proves by such a formidable array of witnesses? In the first place let us examine those witnesses and see what their testimony amounts to. They consist, it may be observed, of Origen himself, Augustine, Jerome, and some synods or councils which took place upon Origen’s faith.

As to the testimony of Origen himself, we have to remark that it is at best quite insufficient to justify the assertion of Dr. Pond. To avoid repeating it here, we beg our reader to turn back to it as it stands embodied in the Doctor’s statement, and carefully consider its force. It is made up, he will observe, of two quotations. The first merely affirms that angels may become men or demons, and again from the latter they may rise to be men or angels. The second declares it to be agreeable to the rule of piety to believe that every rational creature may from being good become bad, and from bad become good again, and hence, since the soul is immortal it
is possible that in the many and different worlds, and in the many and endless periods of duration, it may descend from the highest good to the lowest evil, and be restored from the lowest evil to the highest good. But we beg it may be observed that this is not proposed as a matter of faith, but merely as a possibility—a possibility that arises from the very nature of moral freedom. Origen does not state it as a fact, but avowedly as a simple hypothesis. Yet Dr. Pond is pleased to treat it as a matter of settled conviction and a part of Origen's system,—a proceeding wholly unwarranted by the facts, and therefore unfair. Then let it be further observed that these quotations, even when taken in this false light, fail entirely to prove the point for which they are introduced. They say nothing of Dr. Pond's "perpetual rotation," and do not even suggest those "ceaseless alternations of happiness and misery," upon which the whole force of his argument rests. In all the writings of Origen could Dr. Pond find nothing more to his purpose? As a faithful student of this ancient Father, he should not only know what he taught, but how and where he taught it.

But this is not the worst of the case. Dr. Pond unfortunately quotes Origen from a Latin translation by Rufinus, which here differs widely from the original Greek, which has happily been preserved, and a literal translation of which was directly under his eye, on the very page from which he copied. How he happened to overlook so important a circumstance we can not well conceive. Origen was, in this chapter, defending the doctrine of moral freedom, and was refuting certain persons who seemed to have called it in question, and while he concludes that it is owing to men's varying dispositions and purposes, "that some advance from a worse to a better condition, and others fall from better to worse; while others again are preserved in a virtuous course, or ascend from good to better; and others, on the contrary, remain in a course of evil, and from bad become worse, as their wickedness flows on," he says not a word about "the many and endless periods of duration," or "the immeasurable and different worlds,"
which Rufinus is good enough to ascribe to him, and which Dr. Pond is pleased to accept as unquestionably his! The translator, Rev. Frederick Crombie, M. A., in a note at the commencement of the chapter, says, "The whole of this chapter has been preserved in the original Greek, which is literally translated in corresponding portions on each page, so that the differences between Origen's own words and the amplifications and alterations of the paraphrase of Rufinus may be at once patent to the reader." We are at a loss to understand why Dr. Pond should, in this case, have chosen to quote Rufinus, when he had Origen himself directly before him.

But passing, for the moment, the consideration of Origen's personal declarations, let us glance at the other authorities adduced. Dr. Pond calls in St. Augustine who testifies without hesitation that Origen maintained the "theory of ceaseless alternations of happiness and misery," and "interminable transitions from one state to the other at fixed periods of ages." But what, let us ask, did Augustine really know of Origen and his opinions. He had certainly never read his works in the original, for eminent as he was in rhetoric and orthodoxy, he could not read Greek, as he himself confessed, and it appears that he was not acquainted with even the translations that had been made into Latin, since he wrote Jerome inquiring what Origen's errors were, and wherein he had departed from the truth. All he knew upon the subject, then, was derived, we may fairly suppose, from Jerome, and possesses no personal value.

And how was it with St. Jerome? That he was able to inform us truly, there can be no doubt. He was a scholar, and familiar with the writings of Origen, of which he had translated a great number. He had been a great admirer of Origen and had spoken of him in terms of the highest praise. He had done more; he had made great use of Origen's works in forming his own opinions and writing his commentaries. Indeed, his partialities for Origen subjected him to the charge of having appropriated to his own purposes somewhat more than was in accordance with strict honor and fair dealing.
But unfortunately there arose at this time a most virulent and abusive attack upon the memory of Origen, now a hundred and fifty years in his grave, and upon his doctrines, and into it Jerome was readily drawn, or more properly, perhaps, gravitated by the very perversity of his nature. It was originated by Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, a vain, self-conceited man, to whom age had brought neither wisdom nor prudence. Jerome became his ready and powerful ally in this unholy warfare, and together they soon enlisted Theophilus, the ambitious, meddlesome, and unscrupulous bishop of Alexandria. Epiphanius though weak, was probably honest, but Jerome and Theophilus were neither. Epiphanius had long been an enemy of Origen, and labored industriously to excite a crusade against him and destroy his influence. Both Jerome and Theophilus had been admirers of Origen, but now conspired to blacken his well earned reputation and place him under the fatal ban of heresy, and if possible destroy all who belonged to his school and adopted his doctrines. Among many other consequences of this unchristian purpose, Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, for the crime of succoring some of the Origenists, whom Theophilus had ruthlessly driven from Egypt, fell under their violent displeasure, and though one of the purest and noblest characters of the age, and perhaps the most eloquent preacher the church has ever produced, was deposed, banished, and after great sufferings in distant lands, perished at last, a victim of their wicked and relentless machinations.

We are glad to say that Jerome, from being a Universalist, became a furious believer in the gentle and peaceful doctrine of endless punishment, and illustrated the spirit of his new faith in a manner which leaves us in no doubt about its temper. However it may have improved his prospects of heaven, we think that Dr. Pond himself will hardly pretend that it multiplied his Christian graces, or increased his usefulness on earth.

But be all this as it may, it is certain that he repeatedly charged Origen with those "endless transitions" from sin to
holiness and from holiness to sin again, which Dr. Pond calls “perpetual rotation,” and he did this in great variety of phrase, and in the most offensive language it was possible for him to employ. He obviously wished to make Origen’s opinions appear not merely monstrous but abhorrent and disgusting. We beg our readers to turn back to the testimony of Jerome, as exhibited by Dr. Pond, and observe how ingeniously our old Saint words his statements in order to subject Origen to odium. Indeed he carries the matter so far as justly to subject himself to the suspicion of malicious exaggeration or constructive falsehood. Simple truth did not answer his purpose. In his epistle to Avitus he pretends to translate a passage from Origen which represents him as believing that the souls of men may sink to such degradation as to be fastened to the gross body of irrational beasts of burden,” which Origen, in his De Principiis, plainly denies, and at considerable length argues against and refutes. He goes so far in his quarrel with Rufinus as to repeat his allegation against Origen of maintaining Dr. Pond’s “perpetual rotation,” but attempts to prove it out of his De Principiis, and boldly challenges Rufinus to prove the contrary! Dr. Pond in like manner appeals to the same work for proof of the same point and we have seen with what success.

We are sorry to say that we do not believe St. Jerome upon his word here. He was too angry to be candid, and felt that he had too much at stake to speak the simple truth; and though a monk, who was to grow into a Saint, Jerome was not a man to stand upon trifles.

And now as to the action of those synods of the fourth and

Dr. Thomas Burnet, Part II. Telluris Theor. Soc. lib. iv. c. 4, says, “The temper of Jerome was imperious, a man of learning, indeed, but violently carried away to whatever side he was borne. He did not fear to load an adversary, or an adversary’s opinions with malign interpretations, or at least with unjust exaggerations, by which he might excite hatred or ill-will.” Dr. Jortin charges Rufinus with adding, ‘leaving out, and altering, as he saw fit, so that his translations are “not versions but perversions of the original. However,” he adds, “Rufinus is so far honest as to own that he uses such liberties. Jerome was guilty of the same fault, and they had nothing to reproach one another with on this score.” Remarks on Eccles. Hist., Vol. II. p. 838. Rufinus, indeed, appeals to the example of Jerome for justification of his own misrepresentation of Origen’s opinions.
fifth centuries to which Dr. Pond appeals: What were they, we beg to inquire, but precisely those ecclesiastical councils which Epiphanius, Jerome, and Theophilus called together and inspired? The charges against Origen, or his books, were no doubt framed by these men and the action of the councils directed by their wishes. The records of their proceedings, we believe, have long since perished, but we are willing to accept the report Dr. Pond gives us of them. But all this adds nothing, we conceive, to the testimony of Jerome, and is only the repetition of it, as it was in the case of Augustine, in another form. It deserves to be noticed, however, that Epiphanius, in a formidable array of heresies which he charged upon Origen, is silent upon this capital one of "perpetual rotation," though he vehemently accuses him of believing that Adam by his sin lost the image of God,—which is today a clearly accepted doctrine of orthodoxy. Dietelmair regarded that accusation against Origen upon which Dr. Pond insists so earnestly and which even Brucker calls his proton speudos, as not merely unproved but as in the highest degree improbable. "I know of nothing more absurd," says he, "that can be said of a man skilled in the Scriptures." And Petersen, distinguished for his extensive reading and familiar with the works of Origen, very justly remarks that "that opinion should be proved out of Origen's own words," and adds, "I have not found it in his writings." Even Mosheim, while he says that "the liberty of the will, which naturally belongs to all souls, prevents their ever arriving at an unchangeable constancy in good," still, when he gives a statement of Origen's system, drawn out in more than twenty propositions, entirely overlooks this proton speudos, of Brucker and Dr. Pond, and neglects all mention of it.

Not only is this charge against Origen incapable of proof from his own works, but what is more those works are full of evidences to the contrary. His faith in the final restoration of all human souls and indeed of all rational creatures to the favor of God and union with him, appears in various parts of his writings, as may easily be shown. This Dr. Pond seems
ready to acknowledge in some manner, only he finds it difficult to allow that they will stay restored. He cannot conceive, it appears, how free beings can ever be kept from sin! Virtue has no charms, one might think, in human eyes, and heaven itself no attractions. Just men made perfect must be deprived of their freedom, before we can be sure of their allegiance to God. They must be fixed — "fixed as in a frost," — by some divine decree so that obedience must be necessary and sin impossible! That would secure the saints in heaven, and satisfy God with praise. Origen, it must be confessed, looked forward to a different kind of service, and a heaven somewhat freer and more joyous. Like Oosterzee and Nitzsch, he believed in "no enforced consecration of the personal being" even in the realms of glory. Poor Augustine and Dr. Pond would have it otherwise. They want something mechanical, and see nothing beautiful, at least nothing "reliable," in any holiness or any praise, that is not really necessitated. That such men should not understand Origen, and find much cause of offense in him, is not singular.

Origen, in common with all Christians of the present day, believed that originally all rational creatures were created good, yet none of them immutably so. They were morally free. "Every rational creature," he says, "is therefore capable of earning praise and censure: of praise, if in conformity to that reason he possesses, he advance to better things; of censure, if he fall away from the plan and course of rectitude, for which reason he is justly liable to pains and penalties. And this is to be held as applicable to the Devil himself, and those who are with him and are called his angels." And thus far Origen was undoubtedly orthodox. But because "there is no rational creature which is not capable of both good and evil, it does not follow," he says, "that we therefore maintain that every nature has admitted evil, i.e. has become wicked." Though the nature of every man admits of his becoming a sailor, or learning grammar, it does not necessarily follow that every man will be a sailor or learn grammar. And so Origen believed that some moral creatures chose the good
and earnestly pursued it, while others, some in one degree and some in another, swerved from the path of duty and fell away into sin.

“But those who have been removed from their primal state of blessedness, have not been removed irrecoverably, but have been placed under the rule of those holy and blessed orders which we have described; and by availing themselves of the aid of these, and being remoulded by salutary principles and discipline, they may recover themselves and be restored to their condition of happiness. From all which I am of opinion, as far as I can see, that this order of the human race, has been appointed in order that in the future world, or in ages to come, when there shall be the new heavens and new earth, spoken of by Isaiah, it may be restored to that unity promised by the Lord Jesus in his prayer to God the Father on behalf of his disciples: ‘I do not pray for these alone, but for all who shall believe on me through their word; that they may all be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.’ And again, when he says: ‘That they may be one, even as we are one; I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one’.”

Thus Origen disposes of the human race; and we think Dr. Pond must confess that it does not greatly favor his theory of Origen’s doctrine. If all souls are to be restored to that union with Christ and God for which our Saviour so earnestly prayed, we see no more prospect of their again falling away than there is that Christ himself will fall away from the Father. Origen then passes to consider the case of the Devil and his angels, whom he describes as having “sunk to such a depth of unworthiness and wickedness as to be deemed altogether undeserving of that training and instruction,” which the human race had received, and moreover as the cause, by their enmity and opposition, of our mortal life being so filled with struggles and trials.

“But whether any of those orders, who act under the government of the Devil, and obey his wicked commands, will in the future world be converted to righteousness because of their possessing the faculty of freedom of will, or whether persistent
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and inveterate wickedness may be changed by the power of
habit into nature, is a result which you yourself, reader, may
approve of, if neither in these present worlds which are seen
and temporal, nor in those which are unseen and are eternal,
that portion is to differ wholly from the final unity and fit-
ness of things. But in the meantime, both in those temporal
worlds which are seen as well in those eternal worlds which
are invisible, all those beings are arranged, according to a
regular plan, in the order and degree of their merits; so that
some of them in the first, others in the second, some even in
the last times, after having undergone heavier and severer
punishments, endured for a lengthened period, and for many
ages, as to speak, improved by this stern method of training,
and restored at first by the instruction of the angels, and sub-
sequently by the powers of higher grade, and thus advancing
through each stage to a better condition, reach even that
which is invisible and eternal, having travelled through, by a
kind of training, every single office of the heavenly powers.
From which, I think, this will appear to follow as an inference,
that every rational nature may, in passing from one order to
another, go through each to all, and advance from all to each,
while made the subject of various degrees of proficiency and
Failure according to its own actions and endeavors put forth in
the enjoyment of its power of freedom of will."

Now however fanciful all this may be about the salvation of
the Devil and his angels, and however doubtful may be the
whole doctrine of such a class of beings, there can be no
doubt with respect to Origen's opinion on the subject.

One passage of Scripture (1 Cor. xv 22-28) had great in-
fuence in forming the system of Origen. It was pivotal in his
theory, and he perpetually recurs to it. It is undoubtedly
the last view which revelation furnishes us of the future,
and is to be regarded as the closing scene of that Mediatorial
administration which constitutes the great theme of the
Bible. All who died in Adam are to be made alive in Christ.
All opposing powers are to be overcome, and Christ having
subjected all things to himself, now that his work is accom-
plished, delivers up the kingdom to the Father, becomes sub-
ject himself, and so God is all in all. Beyond that grand sur-
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render there is no death, and no enemy. Punishment has performed its office and come to an end. The smile of God rests upon his creation, and not only is all restored to its primitive state of goodness, but all is carried immeasurably forward and upward, and surrounded by an unfading glory. Ancient prophecy is fulfilled, the head of the serpent is crushed, and God rests in his Love: God is all in all!

We need not stop to say how our so-called Orthodox commentors and divines treat this magnificent passage, and manage to empty it of all significance and power. It has no place in their theory of the gospel and cannot be harmonized with it. All they can do in this case, as in many others where the inspired thought so far transcends their own, is to slur it over almost as if it did not exist or had no meaning. Origen, however, and many of the Church Fathers, saw its force and grasped something of its grand import. It fixed his attention, and warmed his heart. It was the realization of "that longing after perfected harmony," which Olshausen tells us "is deeply rooted in noble minds." In the following passage Origen unfolds his views of this portion of Apostolic doctrine.

"If we now assert that God is everywhere and in all things, on the ground that nothing can be empty of God, we nevertheless do not say that he is now 'all things' in those in whom he is. And hence we must look more carefully as to what that is which denotes the perfection of blessedness and the end of things, which is not only said to be God in all things, but also 'all in all.' Let us then inquire what all those things are which God is said to become in all.

"I am of opinion that the expression, by which God is said to be 'all in all,' means that he is 'all' in each individual person. Now he will be 'all' in each individual in this way: When all which any rational understanding, cleansed from the dregs of every sort of vice, and with every cloud of wickedness completely swept away, can either feel, or understand, or think, will be wholly God; and when it will no longer behold or retain anything else than God, but when God will be the measure and standard of all its movements; and then God will be 'all,' for there will no longer be any distinction of
good and evil, seeing evil nowhere exists; for God is all things, and to him no evil is near; nor will there be any longer a desire to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, on the part of him who is always in the possession of good, and to whom God is all. So then, when the end has been restored to the beginning, and the termination of things compared with their commencement, that condition of things will be re-established in which rational nature was placed, when it had no need to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; so that when all feeling of wickedness has been removed, and the individual has been purified and cleansed, he who alone is the one good God, becomes to him ‘all,’ and that not in the case of a few individuals, or of a considerable number, but he himself is ‘all in all’. And when death shall no longer anywhere exist, nor the sting of death, nor any evil at all, then verily God will be ‘all in all’."

This language seems to admit of no misunderstanding. It disposes effectually of Dr. Pond’s assertion that “Origen did not deny the existence of eternal sin and suffering somewhere.” If words are capable of expressing thought, Origen very distinctly and emphatically denied that sin or suffering are finally to exist anywhere, and can not exist because God is to be all in all.

Whole pages might easily be filled with similar passages, in which the doctrine of universal restoration is by Origen distinctly, not to say emphatically, taught. And this, let us add, not only in his earlier writings, as the De Principiis, but in his latest as well, his Commentaries and Homilies. Indeed a current of Universalism seems to run through all his works. It was, therefore, no accidental and fugitive thought, no careless expression, with him, as we sometimes see it in the most orthodox writers, but it made, as Dr. Beecher said, an essential part of his system, without which it would have been utterly unbalanced and self-inconsistent. We can not indulge in making quotations, as we could wish, and must content ourselves with a few references. In his seventh Homily on Leviticus may be found an extended passage, in which Christ is represented as waiting for the fulness of his joy in the com-
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plete restoration of the whole human race. They are all members of his body and objects of his love, and he, therefore can not drink of the wine-of joy, until he drinks it with them in his Father's kingdom. He weeps over sinners as he wept over Jerusalem. He is grieved when they sin; he is in sorrow as long as they persist in transgression. He is our Physician, and can he be unmindful of our wounds! He is waiting, therefore, for us to be converted, that we may imitate his example, that we may walk in his steps. "He is expecting joy When does he expect it? When, says he, I shall have finished my work. When will he finish his work? When he shall have perfected me, who am the last and worst of sinners then he will finish his work. For his work is still unfinished, while I remain imperfect. While I am not subjected to the Father, he is not subject to the Father. Not that he himself is wanting in subjection to God, but for my sake, in whom his work is not yet finished, he is said to be not subjected. But when he shall have finished his work and brought his whole creation, (universam creaturam) to the height of perfection, then is he said to be subject to the Father, in those whom he has subjected to the Father, and in whom the work his Father gave him to do is finished, that God may be all in all." His Commentary on the fifth, and also the eleventh chapter of Romans is full of this doctrine. See also his Commentary on John i. 36; xii. 31, 32; Eph. i. 10; Coll. i. 20; Philip ii. 9 10; Hom. 8 and 19 on Jer.

It is worthy of remark that Origen's conception of the divine character, and his views of the object of the divine punishments,—conceptions and views that necessarily give cast and coloring to one's whole system of theology, were thoroughly Universalist. "The goodness of God," says he, "as is worthy of him, incites and attracts all to that blissful end, where all pain, and sadness, and sorrow fall away and disappear." In accordance with this, "all divine punishments," as Mosheim expresses Origen’s opinion, "are salutary and useful." In stead of representing God in our popular orthodox way, as punishing the wicked merely to punish, or rather to tormen-
them, or as Dr. Hodge would have it, "to satisfy justice," Origen contemplated him as "the Physician of souls," who, in his incomprehensible wisdom, knows what methods to pursue and what remedies to adopt to effect the healing of our moral diseases. And as human physicians use unpleasant and painful drugs, apply the knife, and in cases where the virulence of the disease transcends all these means, resort finally to caustic, when the evil has to be burned out by fire, so he thought it is to be believed that "God our physician, desiring to remove the defects of our souls, which they have contracted from their different sins and crimes, should employ penal measures of this sort, and should, in addition, apply even the punishment of fire to those who have lost their soundness of mind." And having quoted certain passages of Scripture, he adds: "By which certainly, it is understood that the fury of the divine vengeance is profitable for the purgation of souls." With many of the best modern theologians, Origen believed in no merely vindictive punishment.*

To all this Dr. Pond would no doubt reply, as he has done already, by saying: We very well know that Origen sometimes used language that implies universal restoration, "but what does such restoration amount to? Will they stay restored? Or will they not, in the endless revolution of the ages, fall away again, and then be restored, and fall again?" and so on for ever and ever! We have already suggested that this pleasant conceit of Jerome has been somewhat overworked both by that Saint and Dr. Pond, and we quite agree with Diekelmair that it is an absurdity which should not be ascribed to any man of common sense or common knowledge. Let it first be proved, if possible, that Origen ever entertained this notion of "perpetual rotation" in the moral universe, before he is made responsible for it, and his whole system declared to be a mere medley, without beginning, middle, or end. On this hypothesis, Origen's theory of the divine government contemplated no final result, and must have recognized God himself as having no plan and operating to no purpose. Yet we
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hazard nothing in saying that no Christian writer, ancient or modern, ever spoke more frequently or more definitely of an end toward which God is directing all things, and which is ultimately to be attained. It is the very end which the Apostle speaks of, when God shall be all in all; when Christ, having brought all souls in subjection to himself, shall deliver up a perfected kingdom to the Father. Even his De Principiis, which is quoted in proof of these ceaseless revolutions of souls, is full of expressions which, were it not required by the very nature of the case, clearly declare the contrary. Thus he speaks of souls being “made altogether spiritual, that they may be forever one spirit with the Lord”; of the soul “possessing in itself incorruptibility, because it has been clothed with Christ, who is the Wisdom and the Word of God”; of their inhabiting bodies to be “no longer overcome by death or wounded by its sting”; of “all things tending to one end”; of “the restitution of all things, when the whole universe will come to a perfect termination”; of “the end of all things and the supreme blessedness”; of Christ’s having brought “the work undertaken by him to a victorious termination”; and as presenting “to the Father the principles of the obedience and subjection of the human race in a corrected and improved condition”; and he repeats again and again the prayer of Christ, “I will that where I am, these may also be with me; and as I and Thou art one, these also may be one in us,” and suggests that these words refer to a time “when all things are no longer in an age, but when God is in all.” If such language as this can be interpreted in accordance with Dr. Pond’s “perpetual rotation,” we must despair of ever understanding an author. In one passage Origen laughs at the conceit of some in his day, who seem to have maintained much the theory with which Augustine charges him, that there was a certain periodical revolution when events would repeat themselves. “For if there is said to be a world similar in all respects to the present, then it will come to pass that Adam and Eve will do the same things they did before; there will be a second time a deluge, and the same Moses will
again lead a nation out of Egypt; Judas will also a second time betray the Lord; Paul will again keep the garments of those who stoned Stephen," etc., all which he regarded as inconsistent with our freedom and mechanical.

But we need not dwell on such circumstances. In his commentary on Romans, he discusses this very point at considerable length, and shows at least what he himself believed, and the grounds on which his faith rested. "We assert," says he, "that the power of the cross of Christ and of his death, suffered once in the end of the world, is sufficient for the cure and health, not only of the present and future, but even of ages past, and not only for our human race, but even for the celestial orders and powers; for according to the opinion of the Apostle Paul, Christ, by the blood of his cross, has reconciled not only the things which are in the earth but also the things which are in heaven." To prove that though free the soul will not again run into sin, he quotes the words of the Apostle, *Love never faileth,* and adds, "If the soul shall rise to that degree of perfection that it will love God with all its heart, and all its powers, and all its mind, and its neighbor as itself, what place will there be for sin?" He also quotes the language of St. John that, *He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God,* and adds, "Therefore that love which alone is greater than all will preserve every creature, or the whole creation, (οσσαν εκτασαλμα) from falling. Then shall God be all in all." He also appeals to the words of St. Paul, *Who shall separate us from the love of God?* etc., and concludes that, if "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus," so neither can human free will, or anything else. He who with Christ, is dead to sin, is alive to God.

Though several writers, as Du Pin, Huetus, and others, adopt, apparently on the authority of Augustine and Jerome, Dr. Pond's theory of Origen's system and faith, we suppose the great majority of the learned agree in regarding him as a
believer, not in "perpetual rotation," but universal restoration, in the very sense in which that doctrine is now taught by Universalists, viz., that all souls shall eventually be brought to exercise "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," and saved, and so made heirs of God and partakers of immortal felicity. Such at least seems to be the opinion of the principal authorities at our hand, Guericke, Reepenning, Ulberweg, Oosterzee, Ritter, J. G. Walch, Muenscher, the late Prof. Emerson, of Andover, etc., etc. We shall close this extended article by quoting a paragraph or two from the pen of the last named authority.¹⁰

"In his more philosophical discourse, Origen abundantly shows that he does not assign a literal eternity of duration to the torments of the wicked. He considered God as punishing the wicked, both men and devils, for the purpose of recovering them from sin, thus doing away all moral evil, and with it also all natural evil. . . God he thinks is able to accomplish all this in its proper time. Writing against Celsus, he says: 'The Word is able to subdue all rational natures to himself, and to transform them into his own perfection; when each one, using his own naked power, will choose what he wills and obtain what he chooses. For though among the wounds and diseases of the body, there are those which no medical art can cure; yet in the vices of the soul, we deny that there is any which cannot be cured by the Supreme Word of God?' When this is done, there will be no more death, nor pains of death, nor devil, nor evil being, nor evil thing. Men and devils, and stars, and other fallen beings, if such there be, will all be brought back to perfect allegiance and perfect bliss and unity of feeling. This view of a perfect restoration, is one in which his mind seemed peculiarly to de-light."

CONTINUING our account of the session of the Philadelphia Convention for 1791, two things belonging to its history are worthy of mention. The first is the protest of the Convention against the doctrine of no future punishment. Rev. Mr. Pollard, of Maryland, had commenced preaching Universalism in that State, and had been assailed with the charge that Universalists deny future punishment. By Rev. Mr. Hawkins, who attended the Convention, Mr. Pollard sent for information as to the theory on that subject, which the Universalists in Convention, endorsed. James Moore was appointed to draft an answer, and the following was approved by the Convention:

"PHILADELPHIA, May 28, 1791.

Dear Brother in Belief of the Truth:—We have had a visit from our Brother Hawkins, who hath been received as a member in our Convention met in this City the 25th instant. He hath given us such a report of you and the Hopeful Evidences of God’s Universal Love and Power prevailing in your parts and under your labors, as rejoices us and for which we desire to be thankful.

Brother Hawkins mentioned your request to the Convention that they would furnish you with such evidences of their faith as might enable you to contradict and put to silence those who either through malice or ignorance assert that we deny future punishment, by holding that all the fallen sons of Adam, the good and the bad, the believer and the unbeliever, go and appear equally alike happy in that state that shall take place after the dissolution of this body. The Convention are well convinced that this unjust slander doth too much prevail among those that are ignorant of our true principles. Notwithstanding all our writings and publick declarations and private conversations do declare to the contrary, they have ordered me to write you a few lines on that subject; and as you will have an opportunity of hearing and receiving from Brother Hawkins our sentiments more fully, I shall be short.
We do disclaim, neither are we in connection with any that hold the above sentiment, (if any such there be). So far from that, we do believe that all that die without the knowledge of their salvation in Christ Jesus, must be called unbelievers, and in the Scripture sense, do die in their sins; that such will not be purged from their sins or unbelief by Death, but necessarily must appear in the next state under all that Darkness, fear and torment, and conscious guilt which is the natural consequence of the unbelief of the truth. What may be the degree or duration of this state of unbelief and misery we know not. But this we know, if it be the just judgment and chastisement of our God, who is the Father of all spirits, that it hath one uniform and invariable end, viz., the good of the creature. For the Father chastiseth every son he loveth, and if we are without chastisement, (whereof all are partakers) we are bastards and not sons. And here we see that chastisement is an undoubted evidence of all that are chastised being sons, and we know there are no bastards, for all are chastised. We do know that by faith Noah believed God and became Heir of the Righteousness which is by Faith, by which he condemned the world. But we do know (at least by the authority of the Apostle Peter) that after our Saviour and theirs was put to death in the flesh and quickened by the spirit, he went and preached to those very identical spirits then in prison, which sometime had been disobedient; and we do know by the same authority that the Gospel was preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit. We do know that Sodom and Gomorrah suffered the vengeance of Eternal Fire, but we do know by the same authority, that they, together with the rebellious House of Israel, shall be restored, as is clearly set forth in the 16th of Ezekiel's prophecy.

But it would be needless to repeat all those Divine records that hold forth the Restitution of all things, spoken of by all the holy prophets since the world began. We would refer you to this matter as mentioned by Dr. Stonehouse, Ramsey, Mr. Relly, Dr. Chauncy, Mr. Winchester, and many more; and to two small pieces now ordered to be printed as an answer to Dr. Samuel Jones' illiberal, unjust, foolish and incompetent letter written by him and adopted by the Baptist Association in New York as their Circular Letter.

Now Dr. friend, however you may be enabled to defend in publick God's universal Love and Power, and in consequence, the restoration of all his creatures, and preach that it is not
to be perfected in time, but in the Dispensation of the fulness of time, yet many that even thus hear your labours will go away and say you hold no future punishment; for such there are yet in the world who are despisers, and will not believe although a man declare it unto them. But be not discouraged, truth will prevail.

I am, Dr. Brother, Your soul's well-wisher in Jesus,

J. M.

The other item of interest refers to an effort to publish a Collection of Hymns that should be acceptable to all the Universalists of the country. "Revs. William Worth, Artis Seagrave, David Evans, Duncan McLean, and Brothers James Moore, Thomas Fitzgerald, William Eugene Inlay, Thomas Francis, and Israel Israel, were appointed to prepare such a book." At once proceeding to their work, the Committee had their selections made, and the book agreed upon with a printer, as early as the following November; but the publication was delayed, by request of the Boston Church, in the hope that differences and preferences which were becoming prominent, might be harmonized. A protracted correspondence, (all preserved,) revealed the fact that the Committee desired a book which should give prominence to Universalist Doctrines, while the Bostonians were as determined that it should be exclusively a book of Praise, and not of Argument. As no agreement seemed possible, the Convention instructed their Committee, the following year, to proceed at once with the publication. The Boston Church issued their book about the same time.1

1 The title of the Convention Hymn Book was: "Evangelical Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs; Selected from various Authors; and published by a Committee of the Convention of the Churches, believing in the Restitution of All Men. Met in Philadelphia, May 26, 1791. O praise the Lord all ye nations; praise him all ye people, For his merciful kindness is great towards us: and the truth of the Lord endures forever. Praise ye the Lord. Psalm cxvii. Philadelphia: Printed by Thomas Dobson, at the Stone House, No. 41 Second Street, M.DCC,XCI." It was a small 12mo and contained 192 Hymns. The title of the Boston book was: "Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, selected and original, designed for the use of the Church Universal, in Public and Private Devotion. Printed at Boston, by Thomas A. Andrews, 1792." It was a 12mo, and contained 415 Hymns. These books had been preceded by three others; the first of which was a reprint of Rolly's Hymns, at Burlington, N. J., 1778; and another edition at Portsmouth, N. H., 1782. The second was a Collection by Rev-
The session of 1792 was the largest of any held during the existence of the Convention. Including the Minutes, twenty-seven papers belonging to this session have been preserved. It commenced on the afternoon of Friday, May 25th, and adjourned at noon of Tuesday, the 29th. Eleven churches were represented by Messengers, viz., Philadelphia, New Britain, Pike Run, Penn.; Wrightstown, Cape May, Pittsgrove, Shiloh, Kingwood, N. J.; Georges Hills, Md.; Drummond Town, Morgantown, Va. The Circular Letter says: "We have the satisfaction to inform you that the number of Churches and Societies joined and united with us, have increased to fifteen, exclusive of twenty-five Societies that have not yet met us in Convention."

The Boston Church sent a long letter, which is so valuable in a historic point, as giving a view of the condition of our cause in the Eastern States, and also in confirming the fact alluded to in a previous Article, that the Convention of 1785 had ceased to exist, that it is here given entire:

"To the Brethren of the Universal Profession, Assembled in Convention at Philadelphia.

Dearly Beloved: — It having pleased the First Universal Church in Boston, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to appoint us, the subscribers, their Committee to affectionately salute you in the name of said Society, we therefore, with all love and good will enter upon the pleasurable office of addressing you as Brethren of the Great Family, who unto us are exceedingly dear as the Offspring of our Heavenly Father, and especially beloved as 'Heirs together of the Grace of Life which is in Christ Jesus, our Common Lord.'

We are fearful lest the non-appointment of a delegate or

Elnathan Winchester, at Philadelphia, in 1784; and the third a book of Original Hymns by Rev. Silas Ballou, the date unknown, but certainly before 1792, as the Convention book contains several Hymns taken from it.

The Messengers were: James Moore, Israel Israel, Wm. Perkins, Anthony Cuthbert, Thomas Moore, Elisha Gorden, Thomas Francis, Philadelphia; Rev. Artis Seagrave, Wrightstown; Rev. David Evans, New Britain; Thomas Yates, Cape May; Rev. William Worth, Pittsgroves; James Randolph, Eliza Swinney, Shiloh; Rev. Nicholas Cox, Kingwood; William McIntire, Drummondstown; Rev. Abel Surjent, Pike Run, Morgantown, George's Hills. The Church at Upper Freehold sent a letter. Rev. Moses Winchester was in attendance.
delegates to attend the yearly meeting may be considered as
an evidence that the 'Love of many in these parts hath waxed
cold,' or that covetousness, which is idolatry, hath devised
this means, to save 'the root of all evil.' Be persuaded, we
entreat you, that neither of these causes have hindered our
sending forward a Messenger. Our Christian regards are un-
diminished towards you. The 'mammon of unrighteousness'
we account not of. The Elders of the Church could not attend
without much inconvenience on their parts, and our young
men, it was more becoming that they should abide at home.

As we have nothing to communicate by order of the Society,
permit us to present such a view of our own state in the gen-
cral, as perhaps you may not obtain through any other medium.

The Church at Boston consists of nearly eighty members, who
have signed the Articles of Faith and uniting Compact, having
fellowship with each other in the Belief of the Truth and the
order of the Gospel. Very many of these, both men and
women, see it consistent with their profession to present the
fruit of their loins in Dedication to the Everlasting Father;
and also to break bread in remembrance of the Lord Jesus,
with singleness of eye, and a thankful heart. There are
others, who having as they judge, passed beyond all shadows
and laid hold of the substance, that look with indifference
upon the things that are seen. A spirit of harmony, however,
prevails between both, and he that regardeth and he that re-
gardeth not, avoid judgment each of the other, remembering
that to their own Master they stand or fall. In addition to
these, we may speak of three or four times the number already
mentioned, who usually worship with us, and lend a patient
and open ear to the glad tidings of great joy. In a few words,
the Society increaseth by the good pleasure of our God; and
we hope and trust that they may show themselves temperate
in all things and be a pattern unto believers.

The Society at Gloucester, Cape Ann, hath been gradually
lessening by deaths; and many young people have intermar-
rried among other churches, and sat down beneath the shadow
of another ministry. The situation of our Brethren in this
town, which is not at present so lovely in prospect as hereto-
fore, may also possibly have arisen in part from their being
destitute of the preached word for one half of the year, conse-
quently on which, some have forsaken the assembling of them-
selves together at these intermediate seasons, and instead of
progressing in knowledge and love, have rather lapsed into a
state of luke-warmness. These remarks it is but candid to
observe, do not apply to the whole of that Society. There are those whose lamps are trimmed, in whose vessels are oil, and whose lights shine before men to the glory of their heavenly Father. Neither do we, Dearly Beloved, mention the above in a spirit of censure. For them, the beginning of our strength in the Gospel,—for them, a kind of first-fruits unto God of his workmanship in this land, we feel sorrow and heaviness of heart, lest any having run well, should now be hindered. And if there are any Consolations in Christ,—comfort of Love, or Fellowship of the Spirit,—fulfill ye, then, we beseech you, our joy,—look on these, the things of others,—and may their hearts receive the brotherly word of exhortation, in due season.

At Attleborough, Massachusetts, there is a small society collected from that and the adjacent towns. As yet we have received no accounts of their walk with each other, or what Confession of Faith they hold to. But by report from Brother Richards, who abode with them one day and a night, they are come out, and come in from real principle.

In Milford, Massachusetts, there are many professors. These have had it in contemplation to build a Meeting House, but we rather think it will be a late date before it is accomplished. The Brethren in this place are averse to system, and generally walk as it seemeth right unto every man.

At Bellingham, Grafton, and some other places, such as Oxford, etc., the word is preached once a month. Numbers attend on these occasions, and declare themselves well pleased, but there is no Society upon a regular basis, if we except Oxford.

Warwick, Egremont, Hardwick and Petersham, contain several warm friends to the cause. They have come into order in several of these towns, and have not only profession, but also possession.

In the State of New Hampshire, the brethren are and have been much scattered. The death of our brother Parker, which we trust was life unto him in the Lord, left the brethren at Portsmouth without any visible help in teaching. Some attempts were made to supply his place. The watchmen watched, the builders laboured, but in vain. Not long since our Elder, Mr. Murray, visited the Society, and they appeared well-disposed to unite together, if it was only once in three months, that they could hear the good report. We hope that the bands of their union may be strengthened, and their hearts knit together.
Rhode Island has but a few who profess the Universal love of God to man. Of these, the brethren in Providence assemble part of the First day in a private house, and the other part of the day they tarry at home, or worship elsewhere. Those that are at Newport, join neither with the world nor with each other. They are afraid of months, of days, and of years, and to avoid being entangled with what they deem a yoke of bondage, they keep from even the appearance of assembling at any time. Brethren! these things ought not to be so!

Vermont. By recent accounts therefrom, the Wilderness blossoms, with the Rose of Sharon. The truth of the Gospel spreads far and wide in those parts, and the oracles of reason are being daily exchanged for the lively Oracles of the living God.

Connecticut, as brother Barnes informs us, is renouncing early imbibed prejudices, for late discovered truths. The Meeting Houses are very generally opened to our speakers, and the spirit of opposition declines apace.

New York, or rather the interior parts of that State, are beholding more and more of the Light that shall increase unto the perfect day; and many rejoice in the healing rays of the Sun of Righteousness.

This faithful portrait, Dearly Beloved, hath its bright and pleasing, its dark and painful Colourings. The 'Cloud and the Pillar of Fire,' were the attendants of Israel until they entered the land of promise. They remain unto this day.

As there appears to be a great improbability that your Annual Conventions will ever be attended by as many delegates from the four New England States, as there are or may be Churches, by reason of the lengthy way to so remote a part, and the great poverty of infant Societies, who will long be without funds, it has therefore been thought advisable that a Convention should be held in some Central part of the Four New England States, and that all the Churches and Societies in these States, and Vermont, [probably New York is meant,] might be invited to attend. This Convention, if held in the Fall, would present an opportunity to you of receiving accounts therefrom in the Spring; and Your Letters in May, might be forwarded to us for Consideration at the September meeting; and our doings of September, transmitted for Your Consideration, at the May Convention. Thus a continual exchange of knowledge, or counsel, would take place; and whilst from You we became acquainted with the State of the Churches beyond Philadelphia, the Brethren at Philadelphia
and to the Southward would be certified by us of the standing of the Churches in these parts. Should it seem meet unto you, Dearly Beloved, that the within be attended to, and that beneficial effects would result therefrom, we should be pleased with receiving a few lines confirming us in the sentiments thus expressed.

We trust that the Brethren of the Convention will excuse our remark that if the Annual Circular Letter to the Churches was printed in future in a sheet by itself, and then directed under Cover, to some one Elder or member of a Church or Society professing with us, that it would be preferable to the mode which was adopted last year. It might also be accompanied with a request that it might be publicly read in the Church, and possibly thus become a means of cementing you and them in closer union.

We also ask indulgence to further observe, that the Proceedings of the First Convention are to this hour a very profound secret to very many, who are anxious to know what was then done. The Philadelphia Impression of these Proceedings never reached this way, save a few that Brother John Murray brought forward. We have had a new edition printed in Boston, but they were not sufficient to answer demands. And should it please you at present, in your Circular Letter of this year, to have brief recurrence to the Proceedings of the First and Second Years, and accompany each Letter with a printed copy of the First proceedings, we are persuaded that it would answer a valuable purpose.

That you may be enabled to accomplish this end, if it appears founded in a Spirit of Uniting Love, we have enclosed to you a list of such Societies, and their localities, as come within the verge of our knowledge; and directed to us in a packet, the Proceedings will be forwarded by the earliest opportunity to the Churches or Societies they are designed for.

That Your Spirits, Dearly Beloved, may be refreshed by the

The appended list of places: "Church at Boston, direct to Mr. John Murray; Gloucester, Mr. John Murray; Society at Portsmouth, N. H., Jeremiah Libby, Esq.; Attleborough, Mass., Mr. Levi Maxey; Milford, Mass., Mr. Noah Wiswell; Warwick, Mass., Mr. Caleb Rich, Minister; Oxford, Mass., Mr. — Barnes, Minister; Grafton, Mass., Mr. — Lath, Minister; Taunton, Mass., Col. John Potter, Esq.; Egremont, Mass., Ephraim Fitch, Esq.; Hardwicke, Mass., Dr. Noah Amsden; — Vermont, Mr. William Farewell, Minister; Sheenabrough, Mr. Michael Coffin, Minister; Providence, R. I., Col. Zephaniah Andrews; Nobletown, N. Y., Mr. Samuel Smith, Minister; Woodstock, Conn., Mr. — Barnes, Minister; Litchfield, Conn., Capt. Noah Guernsey; Bristol, Conn., Seth Roberts; Watertown, Conn., Lieut. Elijah Warren; Newport, R. I., Mr. Nathan Beeby; Bellingham, Mass., Deacon Scott."
dew of Hermon, descending as from the Crown of the Great High Priest, and reaching down to the Skirts of his Garments, where the people are borne; That the Lord Christ may command a blessing among you, even Life Eternal, in the Knowledge of Him who is true, is the fervent wish, dearly beloved in Jesus, of Your Brethren and Companions in the Peace of God.

GEORGE RICHARDS, Oliver W. Lane. Committee.

Boston, May 12, 1792

May 18, 1792. Sabbath afternoon. Read in full meeting of the Church and Congregation, and by them Approved.

Witness,

Jas. Green, Clerk.

Revs. David Evans and James Moore, were instructed to answer this letter; and from their reply, which was approved by the Convention, we copy the following, relating to the request or suggestion for a Convention in the New England States: "Your information of a proposal of forming a Convention in your parts meets our hearty approbation, upon the full assurance of continuing such a mutual connexion as you mention. And perhaps it may be best to have a general meeting of delegates from the several Conventions that may be established in some future period. And we are happy to tell you of a similar request of forming a Convention in the West."

The "similar request" was from the Churches in Morgantown, Va., George's Hills, Md., and Pike Run, Penn., as communicated by Rev. Abel Sargent, the Messenger of those three Churches.

The vexatious question of Divine Sovereignty and Free Will, was thrust upon the Convention, by the Church at George's Hills, in the following portion of their letter:

"We have lately passed an Act in our Church, that any member holding that all things that come to pass were irrevocably decreed so of God, and therefore nothing coming to pass is contrary to, or a transgression of the will of Deity, but everything is consistent with his will that does come to pass, shall not be held in fellowship. And the Church unanimously and cheerfully voted, that no such member ought by any
means to be held in fellowship or his standing be retained in the Church, for we conceive that the harbouring of such sentiment or doctrine in a Church tends in every way to the dishonor of the Church and cause they profess, and is destructive of the order of Christ; for if every transgression is consistent with the Decrees, or Order, or Will of the Deity then of consequence, the Commands must be inconsistent with the Decrees, or Order, or Will of the Deity, and the Commands and Orders of God to us as individuals, are rendered void, and every transgression and disorder justified.

"In consequence of the above, we have thought proper to propose the following Queries to you: A Conformity to the Decrees of God must be conformity to the Order of God, and how can a due subjection and conformity to the Order of God be reprovable? Is not a reproof a manifestation of disapprobation? And will God disapprove of the due execution of His own Order or Decrees? How can this be called transgression or disobedience, when all has been done exactly agreeable or consistent with the Will of the Deity, except God command us to Act Contrary to His Will? We beseech you Brethren, to send us a full answer to this Epistle, especially to the above queries."

Revs. Artis Seagrave and Nicholas Cox were instructed to prepare an answer, which they reported to the Convention on Monday morning. The records show that it was "read by paragraph, and approved," the whole of the morning session being given to the consideration of it. The Copy retained by the Convention is as follows:

**IN CONVENTION,**

**PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 27, 1792.**

*Dear Brethren and Fellow Heirs in the Salvation of Jesus:*—We received your letter by Brother Sarjent, and rejoice to hear that God has inclined your hearts to believe the Gospel and openly profess the Universal Saviour; but lament at the same time to hear that there is any animosity or division like to take place among you or any of the Dear Brethren in your part of the world, respecting speculative points in doctrine; and unfeignedly lament that you have made any decree in your church either to exclude any, or refuse to receive any merely on account of their sentiment respecting their ideas of the Purposes or Decrees of God,—these things being beyond
the full comprehension of you or us while we see through a glass darkly. These same different opinions have made great confusion and disorder in many societies for ages, and we never find that they had any good tendency. And we do not wonder that men should quarrel and anathematize one another for sentiment, while they believed that the love of God depended on the belief of the creature; but for those who believe as you and we do, that the love of God in Christ Jesus is Yea and Amen, and that His love to us does not depend on our belief of any theory, but that our knowledge of his love to us in Jesus, and that antecedent to our belief, is the cause of our happiness; our love to God, and union with one another in one Common Saviour, and that, in proportion to our light or evidence of the truth, is our faith, and consequently our joy in the Lord,—for us to refuse or exclude any of our Fellow Heirs, and Blood bought purchase of the Lamb, while they profess to love God, and do not in works deny him, but differ from us in some ideas of the purposes of God, we humbly conceive is contrary to the principles of universal love we profess, and the examples of our Dear Head and Master, who reproved the disciples for forbidding any merely because they did not exactly follow them.

These things, Dear Brethren, were considered when many of us first met in Convention to consult on some plan of Articles of Faith and Church Government. We met with different ideas; many of us believed and still believe the sentiments for which you condemn your brethren according to the Act of the church, mentioned by you,—though not expressed in the same words, perhaps, as you have used to express your abhorrence of them by; and some of us are in sentiment opposed to these ideas; but we are far from believing that either sentiment ought to exclude any from union in the Church. We agreed to disagree in these things, to think and let think, according to the measure of light given to us, without censuring one another for said sentiment.

You have requested us to decide on the sentiments you spoke of in your letter; but, Dear Brethren, we do not think it our province as a Convention, to decide on any such sentiments, or attempt to establish any rule of Orthodoxy. This prerogative we think belongs only to our Master. All of us are Brethren, and have no right to lord it over God's heritage. We are short-sighted, weak, fallible and partial creatures; and who are we that we should judge another man's servant? We are not the Judge of the quick, nor of the dead; we do
not, therefore, choose to judge lest we be judged, and that
justly, too, for our ignorant and partial judgment; and were
we to contend in Convention about the sentiments you men-
tion in your letter, what would be the consequence? or even
about many other ideas? as perhaps not two can think alike
in all things. Why, the consequence would be, to divide,
differ, and finally destroy our fellowship as a Convention; and
perhaps spread the disorder through the Churches we repre-
sent, and instead of building one another up in the essential
point, to wit, Faith in Jesus, the Saviour of men, we should
go on contending who should be Greatest in the Kingdom of
Heaven!

You, Dear Brethren, have by sending a letter desiring to
join and be received into the Convention, professed union and
a desire of fellowship with the Churches that compose this
Convention, as you have Adopted the Articles of Faith and
Plan of Church Government set forth May 25, 1790. These
Articles do not require a Member of the church to believe or
disbelieve the sentiments you have condemned by the Act of
Your Church, neither does the Form of Church Government
authorize a Church to exclude any member believing in Jesus,
for anything but acting contrary to good moral character, and
departing from our Articles of Faith. Yet by the Act of your
Church, though we joyfully receive you, some of us, and per-
haps the greatest part of us, must be denied communion with
you, on the supposition that our sentiments may sometimes
lead us to vice! Has not this been the pretext for all religious
persecution in the Anti-Christian world? But may the Lord
grant that each of us, Dear Brethren, that have named the
name of the Lord as the Saviour of the World, may depart
from this iniquity, and try to live godly in Christ Jesus,
though those that do not yet know the Truth, may say of us,
as they did of Paul, we Destroy the Law by our Faith.

And, Dearly Beloved and longed for in the Lord, permit us,
as Fellow Heirs with you, not to command you, but entreat
you, to consider that the sentiments you have mentioned with
such abhorrence, ought not to be a bar to Christian Fellow-
ship in the Church of Christ. And we hope you will so con-
sider it and not let your law be like that of the Medos and
Persians. Let him that cannot bear strong meat have the
liberty of eating herbs, and they that are too young to digest
herbs, eat milk. And whether you eat or drink, do all to the
Glory of God, and try to exercise that Charity in Jesus, that
suffereth long and is kind, vaunting not itself, is not puffed
up, rejoice not in iniquity, thinketh no evil, but rejoiceth in the truth, beareth all things, believeth all things, and never faileth. Try in all things to cultivate a spirit of love and union among yourselves,—let the strong bear the infirmities of the weak."

The following letter, written by the Moderator of the Convention, shows that the doctrine of no future punishment was already advocated in some of the Churches, and, with other differences, was creating divisions:

"PHILADELPHIA, MAY 27, 1792.

Dear Brethren in Belief of the Restoration of all Things:—

Unknown to any of you personally, and perhaps unheard of, yet to as many as see this, and who love the Lord Jesus Christ, Greeting.

By our brother Sarjent, who is received by the Convention now met in this place, as the Messenger from three different Churches in your parts, we are informed, and do lament to hear, that there is discord among you who have embraced this great truth. And although an apostle says, 1 Cor. xi. 19, 'for there must be also heresies among you,' etc., yet we would hope better things of you. Do not rend the body of Jesus, for we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.' Eph. v. 30. 'But the body is not one member, but many. Let not the foot say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body.'

As an individual I address you, and, according to information, find you are not divided about the extent of salvation; but with respect to the mode of it. True indeed, within my own knowledge, I find those who have embraced this glorious truth much divided in this matter. But with us we are happy enough to find that these divisions tend more to cement than to separate us; for by this we learn forbearance, brotherly kindness, charity. You need not exercise forbearance or charity towards those who think in all respects with you. I see quite as much difference in the explanation of the mode of salvation with those who have embraced this doctrine, as there appears among other sects of contending Christians who have agreed in this, viz., that but a small part of mankind will be saved. But shall we take them for our example with respect to contention ending in divisions? 'God forbid.' Yea, rather.
let us set them an example of forbearance, and constrain the
us to say. See how Universalists love one another.
Quarrel no more about the decrees and foreknowledge
God, our Common Father. They amount to the same in the
breasts of the different parties that hold them. And never let me fix my conclusions to my brother’s premises. He can doth reconcile them to himself. ‘With his own master, he stands or falls.’ And blessed be his master, we may add, ‘I shall stand: for God is able to hold him up.’ Again, we find those disputes too often engender wrath, and misrepresentations even of our own sentiments; for it is almost the variable consequence of flying from one extreme, to fall in
the other. Hence the different opinions, such as an endless
hell of misery, or no hell at all in a future state; or a hell
punishment considered as a place of atonement; all which
conceive, to be equally wrong. Surely we may safely say
that he who ‘believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and
that believeth not shall not see life; but the wrath of God’
‘abideth on him.’ But as all have been in a state of unbelieving (‘this shall not see life,’ etc.), must only mean, while und.
this state; and as ‘God hath concluded them all in unbelie
that he might have mercy on all.’ And as believing surely gives us a manifestation of this mercy — as many as are with a
such knowledge, must come to it in another state or dispensation, or be deprived of it time without end. You do believe that death itself will give them such a manifestation and as the consequence of this ignorance is pain and misery, we know this must await them till such a manifestation takes place. As for the degree or duration of this blindness and misery, we are not able to say; but know it must end in the
time of the restitution of all things. And therefore we cannot
from divine record, believe in what is called an endless hell; nor can we believe that the chastisement, suffering, or what
ever called, we may endure in a future state or dispensation
can make any atonement or compensation for the offences we have committed. This belongs to our great sacrifice, and this
only.
Again, I beg, do not divide, wrangle, and destroy one another with doubtful words of disputation. But him that is
weak in the faith, receive ye. Do not cast him out, but receive him. What shall I say more? Shall I tell you that I only believe that these jarring sentiments do and will disturb every religious society engaged to know the truth, but as there is a sample of them in every man’s own mind, as an
dividual who is in pursuit of salvation? And if this is so, it 
ought to make us bear with one another. Again, I say, do 
not rend the body of Jesus, nor weaken a single member of 
it. Remember that you are watched on all hands. Be there-
fore, as a city set on a hill, not ashamed to be seen at noon-
day, and let others so see your good works as to be constrained 
to Glorify Your Father who is in Heaven. And the most es-

tential good work you can do is to love and assist one another. 

From your Brother in belief of the truth, 

JAMES MOORE.

To the divided brethren at Pike Run, Washington County, 
Pennsylvania."

The next year the attendance at the Convention was much 
smaller, only six Churches sending delegates. Two new 
Churches were received into fellowship, one "in Hartford Co., 

near Havre de Grace, Md.," and one "lately constituted in 

Burlington Co., N. J., near Jacobstown, and known by the 

name of New Hanover." This latter was the Church which 

Rev. A. C. Thomas has told such an interesting story about in 

his "Century of Universalism." At the time it received the 
fellowship of the Convention, Rev. Abel Sargent was its Minis-
ter and Messenger. He did not remain with it long; and it 

seems never to have had a settled minister again. Empson 
Kirby was an Elder in the Church, and seems to have con-
ducted the meetings, and was their constant Messenger to the 

Convention. At one time the Church writes to the Conven-
tion: "Though we are few, we endeavor to keep up our meet-
ings, mindful of the blessed promise of our Lord, who says, 

that 'Where two or three are met in his name, there he will 

be in the midst;' and we do think that we find the promise 

fulfilled at times; but we wish you to visit us as often as any 
of you can find it convenient. We have not had a Universal-
ist Minister with us for almost a year." Another year: "We 
have had several joined to us since the last Convention, and 
believe we should have more if we were favored with preach-
ing." To this session the Boston Church sent its last letter 
to this Convention. In it they say: "Since the assembling 
of yourselves together at the last annual meeting, we have
been greatly enlarged." To this, the Convention responded: "Our hearts were refreshed by the good news you have brought us of the more general spread of the glorious gospel in your parts. And we have no doubt you will be glad when we tell you it is more so here than has been heretofore. It is certain that truth is spreading in various parts, and there are so many calls for preaching, that it is impossible for the five preachers we have among us to supply them."

[To be continued.]

ARTICLE XIII.

The Kingdom of God.

A phrase of very common use in the New Testament, and of very general misconception by the readers of the New Testament, is that of the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of heaven.

That these are but varieties of phrase, meaning the same thing, is evident from a collation of Mark iv. and Matthew xi. Says Mark, "the mystery of the kingdom of God." Says Matthew, "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven."

Unless the connection in which this phrase occurs be so extrinsically mundane as to compel its location in time, the possessions of many lift its meaning into the heaven of which truly, it is called the kingdom. Yet it is never said to a kingdom in heaven, but a kingdom of heaven. In a few instances, to even a considerate reader but one unconsciously biased by the common misapprehension, its relation of subject, at first blush, may seem to place it more natural in a heavenly, than in an earthly plane. Yet a resumption an independence from the opinions of others, and a closer look, will show its real setting to be not among the things of eternity, but those of time.

Only once, we think, to a discriminating eye has it a plausible appearance of stretching into a future world, and unde
critical test even here the appearance vanishes. And in almost every other instance, it would seem impossible for any one not unusually dull, or exceptionally perverse, to refer it primarily to eternity.

Of one of his acquaintances thus writes Charles Lamb, "he says he could write as well as Shakespeare, if he had but a mind." "You see," adds Lamb, "he but wants the mind." So whether "the kingdom of God" or "heaven" of the New Testament belongs to the future or the present, anybody can decide rightly "if he have but a mind." To turn English into American, let us say, "if he have but a mind to." For it is not the intellect that is lacking, but the will to think for one's self. And on such subjects as this is, this is a much rarer faculty than it is commonly supposed to be. Says Dr. George Campbell of Aberdeen:

"It may be said that the importance of such expressions in Scripture is now so well known that they can hardly be mistaken. But I am far from thinking that this is the case. Were it said only that they are become so familiar to us, that without ever reflecting on the matter we take it for granted that we understand them, there is no sentiment to the justness of which I can more readily subscribe. But then the familiarity instead of answering a good, answers a bad purpose, as it seems to conceal our ignorance even from ourselves. It is not therefore the being accustomed to hear such phrases that will make them to be universally or even generally apprehended by the people." ¹

General opinion places the kingdom of heaven in heaven. And many a reader, in other than Scripture directions discerning enough, accepts the popular impression, and reads, or hears read, the parable of the marriage of the king's son, as if he believed — though he does not — that a man hidden into heaven from the highways is turned out again for want of a wedding garment. He feels that this cannot be the sense of Christ's teaching. Yet if "the kingdom of heaven" represent heaven itself, what else than the expulsion of one of its

¹ Campbell's Dissertations, V.
inmates is intended by the following description in the twenty-
second of Matthew?

"And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw
there a man who had not on a wedding garment. And he
said unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having
on a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then said
the King to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take
him away, and cast him into outer darkness. There shall be
weeping and gnashing of teeth."

A person of ordinary intelligence must feel that here is
confusion, either in Christ's parable or in his own brain. He
can rather suspect the latter as at fault, and that its muddle
is due to its misconception of some of the terms of the parable.
But usually he stumbles on with a persistent notion that the
wedding halls ablaze with splendor must be a picture of
heaven, and that the outer darkness into which the delinquent
is pitched, must be the malk of hell. What else can answer
to the phrase, "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth?"

Still, the puzzle remains unlocked. For even according to
common conceptions, how can an unprepared soul get into
heaven? And how, once in, can it ever be hustled out?
And so, bewildered like a bee behind the window pane, the in-
quirer blunders against the light. Throw up the sash, and
let him into the light of the kingdom of heaven, the light of
the heavenly church of Christ, the light of the knowledge of
the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and without ob-
struction farther, through all such parables he can wing his
way clear now. For he can now understand, when Christ
likened the kingdom of God to a net which gathered of every
kind, the good to be preserved, the worthless to be cast away;
to a field of wheat and tares, the wheat to be garnered in God's
barns, the tares to be burned in His bale fire whose fire was
soon again to be in Zion and his furnace in Jerusalem; to a
marriage whose guests were pressed from the highways; how
it was in perfect keeping with these figures to depict the hasty
but infirm believers, the time serving believers, the ambitious
believers foiled of high seats in the kingdom, by the man with-
out the wedding garment, at the crisis and the judgment thrust out from the light within the church into the outer darkness and doom of the backslider and the perjured.

Throughout the series of figures emblemizing that kingdom in the Gospels, as in that of the leaven, of the mustard seed, or of the seed growing in secret,—let the kingdom of God mean Christ's religion in the individual heart; or, as in this, and others of its type, as the establishment of that religion in the world, and all difficulties otherwise besetting them disappear. Cling to the notion that the phrase means the kingdom of glory, and these difficulties remain inseparably in the way of any other understanding of Christ's language than this,—that, on this subject, he was a man of confused ideas and unintelligible utterances.

The phrase occurs very often in the New Testament. It was doubtless suggested by the old idea of the kingdom of the Messiah.

In Jeremiah xxiii. 5, we read, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth, and this is his name, the Lord our Righteousness." And Daniel vii. 27, "The greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom."

We do not adduce these as express predictions of the coming of Jesus and the introduction of his religion. But they, and many more like them, were the aspirations of the old Jewish heart towards that future golden age, when, in the language of John in the Apocalypse, language in form and spirit caught from the inspiration of the Old Testament, "the kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and he should reign forever and ever."

Had the Old Testament saints lived to look on at the form in which, by a diviner spirit than theirs Jesus realized the kingdom of their hopes, in any but their devoutest gaze upon it they would have been disappointed, and in their devoutest gaze, enraptured, but surprised. For it was not what they
had expected it to be. It was not what they had taught or the Apostles to look for. Only slowly, and after years teaching by his Holy Spirit, did they learn to dismantle earthly glories from the Messianic Kingdom of the Prophets. Well said to them their Master, that it was expedient for that he should go away, for on his departure in the flesh depended the incoming of the Spirit to their souls to guide them into all truth, to glorify Christ by showing him to them, as they knew him in the flesh, but as he really was. So lose as he was in the body, and beside them with supernatural sources at his will, so long would they mar, in themselves in those they taught, the silent power of his kingdom of so by their constantly recurring expectancies of his coming heavenly majesty to an earthly dominion. Just before ascension, sure now that he had risen from the dead, a ready for the crowning manifestation of his Majesty, "Lo wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" is last inquiry they make of him.

Sooner, we think, and perhaps more wholly than the other, did Paul relinquish this view of the Messiah, and his temporal kingdom of heaven. In 2 Corinthians v. 16, he says, "thou I have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth I know him no more after the flesh." Or as Conybeare gives it more clearly, "Once my view of Christ was carnal, yet now it is longer carnal." And surely it is to celebrate his emancipation from the Old Testament mists that had hitherto clouded his view of the kingdom of God, and to rejoice in the changes he has now caught, that he thus snatcheth, and far above its original sense exalts an Old Testament utterance, 1 Corinthians ii. 9: "It is written eye hath not seen, nor ear heard nor have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them to us, yea, the deep things of God."

All the temporal splendors of a Jewish Messiah dispelled all false lights extinguished, he now looked straight upon the deep things of the kingdom of God. God had revealed them to him by the Holy Ghost. And instead of its former ext
nal grandeur, he now saw into its life and spirit. He beheld its majesties of truth, and goodness, its spiritualities of purity, its industries of duty, its activities of brotherly love, its hospitalities of hope for all mankind. He looked upon its Christ seen no longer after the flesh, but in the spirit, no more the King of the Jews, but the Saviour of the World.

And, brooding over it, surrounding and interrufing it, he saw Him who is invisible, its Beginner, and Builder, and Finisher, who, by his good spirit, is daily winning into it from the outside world of sin, the souls that he would save; who is daily enlarging its walls and habitations for them to dwell in, and multiplying its palaces full oft in huts where poor men lie; from whose hands of love, long ago, it came down from heaven as a bride adorned for her husband, and on whose heart of love it yet shall rest, when he shall gather all his kingdoms of the heavens, with their universe of souls, into the final and boundless kingdom of his glory.

Disentangled from the temporal accessories which, to the vulgar Jewish and the early Apostolic mind, had seemed its substantialities, this ideal, and yet, in the soul and life of every sincere Christian man, and in the soul of the best life of the world, this most real and actual power, is what Christ means, when, at the expense of his life founding it in the world, he yet says to Pilate “my kingdom is not of this world.”

It is that kingdom of God of which says St. Paul it “is not in word, but in power”; and again it is, “righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.” Offered first to the Jews, and by them, as a nation rejected, before the generation to whom it was offered had passed away, they were to see Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in it, and themselves the nominal children of the kingdom cast out. Said Christ to them, “know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand?” It could be received only into a heart docile as a little child; it could be cherished there only by a continuance of such a spirit, “for of such is the kingdom of heaven.”

So apart from the common aims of the world was it, that it was hard for those who put trust in riches to enter it. So
strenuous at that time was the resolution needed to consecrate oneself to its service, that once putting hand to its self-renouncing work, a back look on the ease left behind, was token of a spirit unfit for its labors. So unmeet was the highest religious disposition of that time for its requirements, that unless one's righteousness exceeded that of the Scribes and Pharisees, he failed to enter it, while the publicans and harlots, who had repented under the preaching of the Baptist, poured into it.

In our usual worldly states of mind we are outside the walls of this kingdom, as aloof from its inner courts, its sanctuary, its Holy of holies, as were the five foolish virgins knocking uselessly at its stubborn gates. For in our usual states of mind we are carnal, not spiritual; and the carnal mind is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of God, neither can be. While we live after the flesh we mind the things of the flesh, not the Spirit; and it is the spirit that searcheth the deep things of the Kingdom of God. To enter it then, we must be born again, born of water and of the spirit, not of the will of the flesh but of God. And when we are, and see this kingdom of God, is it of our own doing, or of God? Ah, as to Peter, on his first glimpse of it, when by a Divine intuition, he saw and proclaimed his Master, the Christ, the Son of the living God, so to us does Jesus say, “Blessed art thou, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven.”

To an inheritance in this kingdom, from his own experience, so deeply did Paul feel the necessity of this divine quickening, and of such little avail did he know our most strenuous efforts to enter it in our mere flesh and blood condition to be, that he uses our inability, unassisted, to attain it, as a strong analogy of our inability to lift ourselves from death to the life immortal: “Now this I say brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.” 1 Cor. xv. 50.

He does not here lift the kingdom of God into the realm of the immortal, and repeat himself in a feeble tautology. He
does not mean flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of glory, neither doth corruption inherit the kingdom of glory. Corruption is the natural state of a corpse; flesh and blood, the condition of an unregenerate soul. And the analogy is, as flesh and blood cannot of itself quicken us into the spiritual kingdom of everlasting life, so cannot a corpse quicken itself into the immortal life.

There are other considerations connected with its so frequent mention both in the Gospels and the Epistles. It is to bring blessing to its applicants at its coming, wrath and destruction upon its rejectors. The Beatitudes breathe its words of assurance and comfort to the one class who hungered and thirsted after righteousness waiting for the kingdom of God. Those unwilling to receive it are warned, how, by frantic opposition to it they provoke it to grind them to powder. Matt. xxi. And in view of its near approach, and of the hostility of its opponents to it and its recipients, St. Paul comforts the persecuted, and fulminates against their persecutors in such words as these: “To you who are troubled rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” 2 Thess. i. 7.

At present we are less concerned with these signs of its first coming than with what in itself it was, and still is. In the parables it is a power from Christ stirring the heart of a miscellaneous world, and out of it quickening a community of professed believers in Him.

As the body sometimes stands for the man, so sometimes this community is called the Kingdom of God or of heaven. And there are tares among the wheat, among thrifty stewards lazy ones who fold their talent in a napkin, foolish virgins among the wise, and the man at the marriage without the wedding garment.

But interspersed through these, other parables recognize that, as not the body but the soul is the real man, so not the community but the power it encloses, and sometimes disguises,
is the real kingdom of God. And the mustard seed, and the
leaven, and the seed growing secretly, imply its vital begin-
nings and its expansive growth; and the hid treasure, and
the pearl of price, its preciousness in the believing soul.

Drafted from the old Messianic idea, for some time after the
Lord the phrase, kingdom of God, retained some of the old
Messianic associations. But in the minds of all the apostles at
last, stripped of these tawdrinesses, it shines out clearly as
the ideal church, sanctified and cleansed with the washing of
water by the word, a glorious church, not having spot or
wrinkle, or any such thing, holy and without blemish. Eph.
v. 27. And again:

"I John saw the Holy City, new Jerusalem, coming down
from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her
husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying,
Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and they shall be
his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their
God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and
there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying,
neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things
are passed away." Rev. xxi. 2-5.

Does any one say that such a kingdom, such a Church of
God as this, never had an existence in this world? Oh yes it
has. Not in body, but in spirit. As it was in the days of the
foolish virgins and the tares, its body has always been un-
worthy of it. But its spirit, its essence, its sublime reality,
has been seized, and held, and gazed upon, not only by apo-
stles, but by many a soul since, and now, born not of blood,
nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

And to these on their Mount of Transfiguration, it is the
world at their feet which shimmers dim and uncertain through
lower mists; while that which has come down to them out of
heaven, in which their souls mingle in the Communion of
Saints, and make tabernacles, and abide, and see the Father-
hood in the face of God, and gather all their cares, and broken
hopes, and memories of anguish, and their f elles t so e into their
rms, and hold a them up in the light of that countenance, till
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bane turns to blessing, and the turmoil of the lower life is quieted in unutterable peace,—ah, that to them is the real world then, and this earthly one, a troubled planet in eclipse. This is a structure whose best delights are crumbling daily under the tread of Time. That, a realm aloof from Time, the dominion of the life spiritual, the life eternal, the life divine, the life of God in the souls of his children, the life hidden with Christ in God. And so long as blessed souls shall shed their thanks at the feet of God, and wretched souls seek refuge in the pardon of God, so long through all ages shall this kingdom cherish the redeemed among men, till it be lifted up, whence it came, into the kingdom of the Universal Redemption that is in Christ Jesus where God shall be all in all.

GENERAL REVIEW.

"Lost Forever."¹

This is the title of a work by the Dr. Townsend, of Boston University, the object of which is to prove that a portion of mankind, the children of God, whom Christ died to save, will nevertheless be damned, "lost forever." To establish this proposition the author labors through nine chapters filling more than four hundred and thirty pages, followed with an Appendix which opens with a list of Universalist books, introduced with the following sage remark: "We feel perfectly safe in giving a list of the principal Universalist literature bearing upon the subject under discussion, since the reading of it, we are confident, will refute the strongest positions assumed therein."

Sage, consistent Mr. Townsend! Why then, if Universalism is such a shallow, stupid, self-destructive heresy, did you spend so much precious time and labor in attempting to write it down? Why did you prepare this elaborate and learned volume to refute the arguments

of so unanswerable, when you are so prone to reading their own books will refute the strongest positions assumed therein? Why did you not spend your money in purchasing these books, instead of printing your own and mutilating them?—even among your evangelical friends! In the way of your machinery be well grounded, you soon would have affected Universalism as much as Julius Caesar is reported to be. Possibly, however, you may have conscientious scruples against aiding the poor enemy by being nominally suicide in this unnatural way.

But there is another question we would like to have answered—If your profoundly critical judgment of our “principal literature” is somewhat new, what happens in that say Universalists are found in the land? If our own books “refute” the doctrine they are intended to prove, they ought long ago to have convinced all Universalists to Orthodoxy, to a point in endless punishments. And yet, according as it may seem, Dr. Townsend feels it necessary to write a book of 400 pages to refute what we have already refuted! According to Dr. Townsend, to set off in hot pursuit to kill a mosquito and a dead one at that; for he names in his Appendix at least twelve descendants of Goliath, each of whom killed the same small bird years ago! Naught Universalist that will not stay killed; for it was never so much as we never so strong as now; while at the same time a well known orthodox minister, shows in an orthodox paper that endless punishment is a “lying belief.”

But to return. In the first chapter the author shows that there is a general aversion to the doctrine of endless punishment, that people do not like to hear it, that ministers hesitate to preach it, and makes the following confession, honorable alike to his heart and head:

“The plain truth is, that this subject has relation to certain emotions of the human heart, the deepest and tenderest of which is capable. The constitutional antipathies, the increased disturbance to our repose, the multiplication of personal anxieties, objectionable methods of presentation, are nothing in comparison, or are each a hundred-fold intensified by the thought that a father, a mother, a brother, or a sister, or a darling child may be suffering endless punishment. How can I be happy in heaven if my child is in hell? is the blunt and awful question which the preacher is frequently called upon to answer. Various answers are attempted, and many of them are very good for other folks but not for us.

“Judging from our present human nature and relations, we do not know exactly how a mother can be perfectly happy in heaven, whose son is in hell; nay, worse, we are willing to confess that at times, while facing this question, perplexity has settled down upon us like night.”
In the next chapter we have an argument designed to show that the Bible is the sole authority in the discussion of the question, and if this teach the doctrine, our hearts, our reason, have nothing to do with the matter. Yes, but are we not to use our reason to find out what the Bible does teach on this subject, and on all subjects? And the heart, this very love of the parent, does not the Saviour himself appeal to it in a comparison with God's love? "What father, if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Is not then the appeal to parental love against the dogma of endless torment a legitimate one? And is it not so far to aid us in our interpretation of Scripture as to make it highly probable that the word of God will not contradict the Fatherhood of God? And if Dr. Townsend, as he so frankly confesses, "does not exactly know how a mother can be perfectly happy in heaven, whose son is in hell," does he exactly know how his Heavenly Father can be perfectly happy while his son, L. T. Townsend, is in hell—if it should happen to turn out so?

And a word at this point. On page 73 he charges us with saying, "One of two things is certain,—if God is the Father of all men, endless misery is false; or, if endless misery is true, God is not the Father of all men, and the Bible is false." On this he remarks, "Mr. Thayer is bound, therefore, to find Universal Salvation in the Bible, or else bound to pronounce the Bible false." Dr. Townsend conceals the real point of the argument, which is this: The Bible declares that God is the Father of all men—if endless punishment be true God is not the Father of all men—therefore, in that case, the Bible is false in saying that God is the Father of all men. In other words, if the Bible teaches that God is both infinitely merciful and infinitely cruel, the teaching must be false on one side or the other. Did Mr. Townsend ever hear of Dr. Albert Barnes, who says on 1 Cor. xv. 22, "it must be held as a great principle not to interpret this passage so as to teach universal salvation!"

And in elaborately showing what requires no showing, since no one disputes it, that the Scriptures make a distinction between the righteous and the wicked, was it quite honorable and fair to stop in the middle of a quotation? "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine. Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through
their word." John xvii. 9, 20. The quotation ends in the middle of a sentence, leaving the impression that Christ prayed only for the twelve and believers. The next words are—"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Here are three classes for whom Jesus prays, not two as our author by his half-quotation would have the reader suppose—1. The twelve Disciples. 2. Believers. 3. The World. In the 9th verse, as he says, he did not pray for the world; he had not reached that part of his petition; but in the 21st verse he did pray for the world; and this verse and this prayer Dr. Townsend leaves out, breaking off the Saviour's continuous utterance in order to do it!

We suppose our author is very learned,—all professors are—and of course familiar with Greek, at least with the alphabet; and yet one might suppose, after reading page 117, that he did not know the difference between omicron and omega. In his criticism of ἰων and ῥων he puts one for the other eight times out of twelve! For example he writes the phrase εἰς τοὺς ἰωνας τῶν ἰωνων as follows—εἰς τοιούτων τον ἱωνον. Here are six blunders in four consecutive words—ε for ω four times, σ for the final letter in τοις, and running two words into one. Then he uniformly writes "Ἀθηναίοι, instead of Ἀθηναίοι, with a smooth breathing instead of an aspirate. It is only fair to say, however, that like errors do not appear elsewhere when Greek is used; though whether this is owing to the fact that the proof-reading in these cases was by the author or by some one else, we are not able to say. If the first named are errors of the printer, and Dr. Townsend reads his own proofs; then, while two or three such errors might be excused, that ten should get into a single page and escape the critical eye of the scholar! Well—

In regard to αἰωνίος we are gravely informed that "its natural meaning is unlimited duration; any other meaning is secondary." It is something to be thankful for that at last we have this matter authoritatively and finally settled by one whose scholarship will render all future discussion simply impertinent. The natural and radical meaning of the term has been so long in debate among the learned, that it is a relief to have it henceforth ruled out of the discussion. Prof. Taylor Lewis, somewhat known in the world of classical and biblical criticism, says, that "the preacher in contending with the Universalist, or Restorationist, would commit an error, and it may be suffer a failure in his argument, should he lay the whole stress of it on
the etymological or historical significance of the words, αἰών, αἰωνίως, and attempt to prove that, of themselves, they necessarily carry the meaning of endless duration." Whether, after reading Dr. Townsend's book, he will withdraw from Lange's Commentary his Excursus on the "Olamic and Αἰονίων words of Scripture," remains to be seen.

We are farther informed by our author that "Plato and other classic writers always used αἰωνίως to express perpetual duration. All Jewish writers who used the Greek tongue likewise employed it to express endless duration, or eternity." For example, when Plato speaks of methe αἰωνίως, he means the man will be drunk to all eternity; and when Herodotus, Sophocles and Εἰσχύλυς say τελευταίοι τον αἰώνα, they do not mean, "to come to the end of life," but to come to the end of "perpetual duration!" Josephus was "a Jewish writer who used the Greek tongue", and who therefore, according to our critic, employed αἰωνίως to mean "eternity." For example, he calls the temple an everlasting (αἰωνίως) memorial to Herod, though it was already destroyed when he was writing. And he speaks of the everlasting (αἰωνίως) worship of the temple, though he says in the next verse that it had then come to an end! And Philo too was a Jew who wrote in Greek; and he employs the very phrase in Matt. xxv. 46, μικρὸς αἰωνίως, everlasting punishment, to describe the punishment which one man inflicts on another who has injured him, and which of course cannot extend beyond this life! Does Dr. Townsend say these are examples of the secondary meaning? But, having rejected the Pope's infallibility, we are not encouraged by page 117 to accept his as a substitute.

As regards this language in Matt. xxv. 46, our author asserts with great confidence that if the punishment of the wicked is not endless, then the life of the righteous is not endless, for both are expressed by αἰωνίως. But that orthodox scholar and critic, Taylor Lewis, says with honorable frankness, "These shall go away into the punishment (the restraint or imprisonment) of the world to come, and these into the life of the world to come. This is all we can etymologically or exegetically make of the word in this passage." And Macknight, the Scotch Presbyterian, in the same manly spirit says, "I must be so candid as to acknowledge that the use of these terms forever, eternal and everlasting in other passages of Scripture, show that they who use them in a limited sense when applied to punishment, put no forced interpretation upon them."
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And this brings us to the quotations of Dr. Townsend from the early Christian Fathers. "How strongly," he says, "the doctrine of endless punishment is fortified by the faith of the church through the ages! The apostolic and patristic periods present a comparatively clean record." And then he quotes the phrases "eternal fire," "eternal punishment in hell," "eternal torments," "everlasting fire," from Polycarp, Tatian, Irenæus, &c., and assumes that because they use aionios in these expressions they must have believed in endless punishment. And yet, if he is the scholar he would have us believe, he knows, what he conceals from his readers, that others of the Fathers acknowledged on all hands to be Universalists, used the same phrases and talked of everlasting punishment and eternal fire as freely as their contemporaries. The Sibyline Oracles, Clemens Alexandrinus Origen, Gregory Nyssen and others, to whom Greek was native called the punishment of the wicked eternal, everlasting, and yet believed the wicked would be finally saved; showing conclusively that they, who were Greeks, do not agree with our critic and his friends that aionios punishment is endless punishment. Let us give a single example from Gregory of Nyssa: "Whoever considers the divine power will plainly perceive that it is able at length to restore, &c., in means of the everlasting purgation and expiatory sufferings, those who have gone even to this extremity of wickedness." Here Gregory says not only that the everlasting punishment shall come to an end but that it is the very means by which the wicked shall be purified from their sins and restored to God! Now if Dr. Townsend were as fair and just as the solemnity of his subject demands, he would have allowed his readers to know these facts, and so to judge for themselves of the soundness of his criticism and argument on this word aionios.

Space will not allow us to follow the author through his book, in detail. Nor is there need of it, for a few general principles cover all its facts and all its arguments. He is profuse in his quotations of Scripture threatenings having no bearing on the subject; and he seems to think that Universalists will now, for the first time, read these texts in his book. We can assure him that we are as familiar with them as he is, having pondered, weighed and measured, and, we think, reached their meaning; and yet we believe still in universal redemption.

And here let us say to Dr. Townsend, that it is a waste of time fo
him to gather up in formidable array all the passages in the Bible containing the words judgment, day of wrath, damnation, hell, destruction; and then laboriously argue that the Bible teaches that there is a judgment, that the wicked will be damned, destroyed, cast into hell, sent into everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, &c. Universalists believe all this, because they believe the Bible which teaches these things. The question is not, are these terms found in the Bible? but what is the meaning of these terms? Suppose he proves a general judgment after death, does this prove endless punishment? Suppose he proves that sinners are damned, or are cast into hell, then what? We believe this; and therefore that is not the matter at issue. The real question, the only question is this: Will God suffer the being which he has forced upon us—yes, forced upon us, for we had no choice in the matter; we were compelled to take life with all its temptations, risks, and tremendous perils—will God suffer this being under any circumstances, in any contingency, to become an endless curse to us?

And so the two or three hundred pages of passages from the Bible and quotations from orthodox authors, to prove that God makes a marked distinction between the righteous and the wicked, that there is a judgment after death, and a hell beyond this life, are only so much waste paper, as far as the single question at issue is concerned.

Dr. Townsend argues that God suffers this life as long as it lasts to be a curse to millions of his creatures, and that therefore it is not unreasonable to believe that he will suffer the future life to be an endless curse. After filling some forty pages with a detail of the barbarities and dreadful sufferings arising from War, Intemperance, Slavery; the thousands of murders, suicides and brutalities of London, New York, &c.; the "fifteen millions massacred since the rise of Popery"; the countless victims of the Inquisition, and of Tyranny; the terrors and desolations of earthquakes, volcanoes, conflagrations, famines, plagues, floods, wrecks, sicknesses, and other agencies of destruction, we come to this conclusion:

"If God cannot prevent evil and woe in this stage of human existence, what evidence is there that he can prevent them in a future stage of existence; or if he can prevent them in our present existence, and for wise and good reasons does not, then what satisfactory evidence have we that he may not also, for wise and good reasons, allow them in a future existence?"
of its advocates, when you are confident that reading their own books "will refute the strongest positions assumed therein"? Why did you not spend your money in purchasing these books (instead of printing your own), and scattering them broad-cast among your evangelical friends? In this way, if your confidence be well grounded, you soon would have killed Universalism as dead as Julius Caesar is reported to be. Possibly, however, you may have conscientious scruples against aiding the poor sickly thing to commit suicide in this unnatural way.

But there is another question we would like to have answered — If your profoundly critical judgment of our "principal literature" is correct, how happens it that any Universalists are found in the land? If our own books "refute" the doctrine they are intended to prove, they ought long ago to have converted all Universalists to Orthodoxy, to a belief in endless punishment. And yet, curious as it may seem, Dr. Townsend finds it necessary to write a book of 450 pages to refute what we have already refuted! Astonishing Dr. Townsend, to let off his 450 pounder to kill a mosquito! and a dead one at that; for he names in his Appendix at least twelve descendants of Goliath, each one of whom killed this same small bird years ago! Naughty Universalism! that will not stay killed; for it was never so much alive, never so strong as now; while at the same time a well known orthodox minister, shows in an orthodox paper that endless punishment is a "Dying Belief."

But to return. In the first chapter the author shows that, there is a general aversion to the doctrine of endless punishment, that people do not like to hear it, that ministers hesitate to preach it, and makes the following confession, honorable alike to his heart and head:

"The plain truth is, that this subject has relation to certain emotions of the human heart, the deepest and tenderest of which it is capable. The constitutional antipathies, the increased disturbance to our repose, the multiplication of personal anxieties, objectionable methods of presentation, are nothing in comparison, or are each a hundred-fold intensified by the thought that a father, a mother, a brother, or a sister, or a darling child may be suffering endless punishment! How can I be happy in heaven if my child is in hell? is the blunt and awful question which the preacher is frequently called upon to answer. Various answers are attempted, and many of them are very good for other folks but not for us.

"Judging from our present human nature and relations, we do not know exactly how a mother can be perfectly happy in heaven, whose son is in hell; nay, worse, we are willing to confess that at times, while facing this question, perplexity has settled down upon us like night."
In the next chapter we have an argument designed to show that the Bible is the sole authority in the discussion of the question, and if this teach the doctrine, our hearts, our reason, have nothing to do with the matter. Yes, but are we not to use our reason to find out what the Bible does teach on this subject, and on all subjects? And the heart, this very love of the parent, does not the Saviour himself appeal to it in a comparison with God's love? "What father, if his son ask bread, will give him a stone? If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Is not then the appeal to parental love against the dogma of endless torment a legitimate one? And is it not so far to aid us in our interpretation of Scripture as to make it highly probable that the word of God will not contradict the Fatherhood of God? And if Dr. Townsend, as he so frankly confesses, "does not exactly know how a mother can be perfectly happy in heaven, whose son is in hell," does he exactly know how his Heavenly Father can be perfectly happy while his son, L. T. Townsend, is in hell—if it should happen to turn out so?

And a word at this point. On page 73 he charges us with saying, "One of two things is certain,—if God is the Father of all men, endless misery is false; or, if endless misery is true, God is not the Father of all men, and the Bible is false." On this he remarks, "Mr. Thayer is bound, therefore, to find Universal Salvation in the Bible, or else bound to pronounce the Bible false." Dr. Townsend conceals the real point of the argument, which is this: The Bible declares that God is the Father of all men—if endless punishment be true God is not the Father of all men—therefore, in that case, the Bible is false in saying that God is the Father of all men. In other words, if the Bible teaches that God is both infinitely merciful and infinitely cruel, the teaching must be false on one side or the other. Did Mr. Townsend ever hear of Dr. Albert Barnes, who says on 1 Cor. xv. 22, "it must be held as a great principle not to interpret this passage so as to teach universal salvation!"

And in elaborately showing what requires no showing, since no one disputes it, that the Scriptures make a distinction between the righteous and the wicked, was it quite honorable and fair to stop in the middle of a quotation? "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine. Neither pray I for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through
their word." John xvii. 9, 20. The quotation ends in the middle of a sentence, leaving the impression that Christ prayed only for the twelve and believers. The next words are—"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Here are three classes for whom Jesus prays, not two as our author by his half-quotation would have the reader suppose—1. The twelve Disciples. 2. Believers. 3. The World. In the 9th verse, as he says, he did not pray for the world; he had not reached that part of his petition; but in the 21st verse he did pray for the world; and this verse and this prayer Dr. Townsend leaves out, breaking off the Saviour's continuous utterance in order to do it!

We suppose our author is very learned,—all professors are—and of course familiar with Greek, at least with the alphabet; and yet one might suppose, after reading page 117, that he did not know the difference between omicron and omega. In his criticism of διώκω and διώνως he puts one for the other eight times out of twelve! For example he writes the phrase εἰς τοῖς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων as follows—εἰς τούσαιων τῶν αἰώνων. Here are six blunders in four consecutive words—ο for a four times, σ for the final letter in τοῖς, and running two words into one. Then he uniformly writes "Αδησ, instead of "Αδησ, with a smooth breathing instead of an aspirate. It is only fair to say, however, that like errors do not appear elsewhere when Greek is used; though whether this is owing to the fact that the proof-reading in these cases was by the author or by some one else, we are not able to say. If the first named are errors of the printer, and Dr. Townsend reads his own proofs; then, while two or three such errors might be excused, that ten should get into a single page and escape the critical eye of the scholar! Well—

In regard to aionios we are gravely informed that "its natural meaning is unlimited duration; any other meaning is secondary." It is something to be thankful for that at last we have this matter authoritatively and finally settled by one whose scholarship will render all future discussion simply impertinent. The natural and radical meaning of the term has been so long in debate among the learned, that it is a relief to have it henceforth ruled out of the discussion. Prof. Taylor Lewis, somewhat known in the world of classical and biblical criticism, says, that "the preacher in contending with the Universalist, or Restorationist, would commit an error, and it may be suffer a failure in his argument, should he lay the whole stress of it on
he etymological or historical significance of the words, $\alpha i\omicron$ or $\alpha i\omicron$ios, and attempt to prove that, of themselves, they necessarily carry the meaning of endless duration." Whether, after reading Dr. Townsend's book, he will withdraw from Lange's Commentary his Excursus on the "Olamic and $\alpha E$onian words of Scripture," remains to be seen.

We are rather informed by our author that "Plato and other Hellenic writers always used $\alpha i\omicron$ios to express perpetual duration. All Jewish writers who used the Greek tongue likewise employed it to express endless duration, or eternity." For example, when Plato speaks of methe $\alpha i\omicron$ios, he means the man will be drunk to all eternity; and when Herodotus, Sophocles and $\alpha E$schylus say telutesai ton $\alpha i\omicron$os, they do not mean, "to come to the end of life," but to come to the end of "perpetual duration!" Josephus was "a Jewish writer who used the Greek tongue," and who therefore, according to our critic, employed $\alpha i\omicron$ios to mean "eternity." For example, he calls the temple an everlasting (ai$\omicron$ios) memorial to Herod, though it was already destroyed when he was writing. And he speaks of the everlasting (ai$\omicron$ios) worship of the temple, though he says in the next speech that it had then come to an end! And Philo too was a Jew who wrote in Greek; and he employs the very phrase in Matt. xxv. 6, xai$\omicron$ov, everlasting punishment, to describe the punishment which one man inflicts on another who has injured him, and which of course cannot extend beyond this life! Does Dr. Townsend say these are examples of the secondary meaning? But, having rejected the Pope's infallibility, we are not encouraged by page 117 to accept his as a substitute.

As regards this language in Matt. xxv. 46, our author asserts with real confidence that if the punishment of the wicked is not endless, then the life of the righteous is not endless, for both are expressed by $\alpha i\omicron$ios. But that orthodox scholar and critic, Taylor Lewis, says with honourable frankness, "These shall go away into the punishment (the restraint or imprisonment) of the world to come, and these into the life of the world to come. This is all we can etymologically or exegetically make of the word in this passage." And Macknight, the Scotch Presbyterian, in the same manly spirit says, "I must be so candid as to acknowledge that the use of these terms forever, eternal and everlasting in other passages of Scripture, show that they who use them in a limited sense when applied to punishment, put no forced interpretation upon them."
And this brings us to the quotations of Dr. Townsend from the early Christian Fathers. "How strongly," he says, "the doctrine of endless punishment is fortified by the faith of the church through the ages! The apostolic and patristic periods present a comparatively clean record." And then he quotes the phrases "eternal fire," "eternal punishment in hell," "eternal torments," "everlasting fire," from Polycarp, Tatian, Ireneus, &c., and assumes that because they use aionios in these expressions they must have believed in endless punishment. And yet, if he is the scholar he would have us believe, he does not know, what he conceals from his readers, that others of the Fathers acknowledged on all hands to be Universalists, used the same phrases and talked of everlasting punishment and eternal fire as freely as their contemporaries. The Sibylline Oracles, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Gregory Nyssen and others, to whom Greek was native, called the punishment of the wicked eternal, everlasting, and yet believed the wicked would be finally saved; showing conclusively that they, who were Greeks, do not agree with our critic and his friends that aionion punishment is endless punishment. Let us give a single example from Gregory of Nyssa: "Whoever considers the divine power will plainly perceive that it is able at length to restore, by means of the everlasting purification and expiatory sufferings, those who have gone even to this extremity of wickedness." Here Gregory says not only that the everlasting punishment shall come to an end but that it is the very means by which the wicked shall be purified from their sins and restored to God! Now if Dr. Townsend were fair and just as the solemnity of his subject demands, he would have allowed his readers to know these facts, and so to judge for themselves of the soundness of his criticism and argument on this word aionios.

Space will not allow us to follow the author through his book, detail. Nor is there need of it, for a few general principles cover its facts and all its arguments. He is profuse in his quotations Scripture threatenings having no bearing on the subject; and he seems to think that Universalists will now, for the first time, read these texts in his book. We can assure him that we are as familiar with them as he is, having pondered, weighed and measured, and, we think, reached their meaning; and yet we believe still in universal redemption.

And here let us say to Dr. Townsend, that it is a waste of time for
him to gather up in formidable array all the passages in the Bible containing the words judgment, day of wrath, damnation, hell, destruction; and then laboriously argue that the Bible teaches that there is a judgment, that the wicked will be damned, destroyed, cast into hell, sent into everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, &c. Universalists believe all this, because they believe the Bible which teaches these things. The question is not, are these terms found in the Bible? but what is the meaning of these terms? Suppose he proves a general judgment after death, does this prove endless punishment? Suppose he proves that sinners are damned, or are cast into hell, then what? We believe this; and therefore that is not the matter at issue. The real question, the only question is this: Will God suffer the being which he has forced upon us—yes, forced upon us, for we had no choice in the matter; we were compelled to take life with all its temptations, risks, and tremendous perils—will God suffer this being under any circumstances, in any contingency, to become an endless curse to us?

And so the two or three hundred pages of passages from the Bible and quotations from orthodox authors, to prove that God makes a marked distinction between the righteous and the wicked, that there is a judgment after death, and a hell beyond this life, are only so much waste paper, as far as the single question at issue is concerned.

Dr. Townsend argues that God suffers this life as long as it lasts to be a curse to millions of his creatures, and that therefore it is not unreasonable to believe that he will suffer the future life to be an endless curse. After filling some forty pages with a detail of the barbarities and dreadful sufferings arising from War, Intemperance, Slavery; the thousands of murders, suicides and brutalities of London, New York, &c.; the "fifteen millions massacred since the rise of Popery"; the countless victims of the Inquisition, and of Tyranny; the terrors and desolations of earthquakes, volcanoes, conflagrations, famines, plagues, floods, wrecks, sicknesses, and other agencies of destruction, we come to this conclusion:

"If God cannot prevent evil and woe in this stage of human existence, what evidence is there that he can prevent them in a future stage of existence; or if he can prevent them in our present existence, and for wise and good reasons does not, then what satisfactory evidence have we that he may not also, for wise and good reasons, allow them in a future existence?"
This is a serious and solemn question, and the facts on which rests are confessedly painful problems which sometimes press on the mind and heart of the sincere Christian. It seems to us that Universalism, which teaches that all evil is temporary, and has within it a germ of good that will in the fulness of God's time bud, and blossom and bear fruit, is the only possible solution of the mystery consistent with the Divine Perfection. On the other hand, if the darkness and anguish and sin of this life are to be perpetuated in the future life without end; if evil be eternal without any purpose, intention or wish on the part of God to bring good out of it, then the question goes deeper than the differences of creeds and sects; it strikes at the foundation on which all religion rests; and asks whether there be a God, in any just definition of the word. And if this be Dr. Townsend's position, his controversy is no longer with the Universalist, but with the Atheist, and we are curious to know how he would meet the question, and vindicate the divine character. But passing this let us come to the argument, which is not new, and so in our examination of it we may cover some ground which we have gone over before. If the reasoning of our author is good, it will admit of universal application, where the same principles are involved. Let us see then the result.

Dr. Townsend describes in very graphic terms the cruelties inflicted by Pagan and Popish persecutors on saints and martyrs in the past. The horrible tortures to which they were subjected, burned alive, tormented in pieces by dogs, devoured by wild beasts, starved in dungeons, crucified, and buried alive. Now God either willingly permits these cruelties and outrages against the saints and the righteous, or he cannot prevent them. If he cannot prevent them in this stage of human existence, what evidence is there that he can prevent them in a future stage of existence? Or if he can prevent them in the present existence, and for wise and good reasons does not, then what evidence have we that he may not also, for wise and good reasons, allow them in a future existence? If here he lets loose upon the faithful the devils of earth, how does Dr. Townsend know that he will not hereafter let loose upon them the devils of hell?

He quotes Dr. Edwards as saying, "If God may, without injury to his government, permit a creature to fall into sin-to-day, and punish

1 It is urged by Dr. Dexter in his "Verdict of Reason," who cites the Andersonville prison pen as an example; and by Prof. Bartlett in his recent articles on "Future Punishment" in the Congregationalist; and by scores of others.
him for it, why may he not do the same to-morrow, and so on through every day or period of existence?" And if God may, without injury to his government, permit his saints to fall into the hands of tormenting fiends to-day, why may he not do the same to-morrow, and so on to all eternity? Our author speaks of some Universalist arguments as proving too much; is this kindred to them?

Again—he argues at great length that the wicked do not suffer in this life the just punishment of their sins, that they are often indeed prosperous and happy; and hence the necessity for endless punishment. Let us apply his analogical rule here: If God's justice permits the wicked to escape the punishment of their sins in this world, what reason have we to suppose it will not permit them to escape punishment in the next world? Justice is the same always and everywhere; and God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. If then he suffers them to revel in sin and enjoy it now, why not eternally? If he cannot punish them in this life, what argument is there for supposing he can in the future life? Or if he can punish them here, but for wise and good reasons does not; what satisfactory evidence have we that there will not be equally wise and good reasons why he should not punish them hereafter?

And now for the conclusion: God allows the righteous to suffer in this world, and the wicked to escape just punishment in this world—if there are wise and good reasons for this to-day, there will be to-morrow, next day and forever—therefore the righteous will be miserable forever, and the wicked will be happy forever! If Dr. Townsend's analogy is good for a part, it is good for the whole, and the same condition of things existing to-day, will always exist; for what is consistent with divine goodness and justice now, will be to-morrow, and forever. And so Heaven will be no better than Earth, and Hell no worse!

But at this point, perhaps, Dr. Townsend will say that this is only a temporary state of things, that the righteous suffer only for a season, and will finally be delivered from all evil, and received into everlasting rest. Exactly: that is what we believe; and we believe the same in regard to all. The present conditions of life are only for a time, a means to an end. We cannot, therefore, reason from what is for a day to what shall be for eternity. What is perfectly consistent with divine goodness and wisdom as a means, may be directly opposed to them as an end. To argue therefore that because sin and misery
exist in this life for a season, they may therefore exist in the next life forever, is confounding means with ends, the process with the result.

It would be idle to judge of the architecture of a temple or a palace by inspecting the rubbish gathered about the foundation walls. We must wait until the structure is completed, before we undertake to criticise the purpose and design of the builder. So we must not hastily decide that evil will enter into the finished work of God, because we see sin and suffering present in the progress of the work.

There are some other things in this volume to which we may give attention hereafter.

Decrease of Crime in Ireland.

We are heartily glad of an opportunity to say a good word of Ireland; and this opportunity is furnished by a statistical statement in Old and New on the Prison Question, and its claims upon the attention of the people of our country. In this statement mention is made of the prison system inaugurated in Ireland about twenty years ago by Sir Walter Crofton, and still in practical operation. The writer represents it as combining the best features of the old and new theories of convict treatment, and as having wrought a marvellous change for the better among the criminals under its influence, and brought about a remarkable diminution of crime. There is reason for believing that Sir Walter may be induced to visit us during the present year, and the writer expresses the hope that “his presence may bring to a focus the scattered rays of good sense and philanthropy which now illuminate the dismal record of crime in the United States,” and lead to the establishment among us “of a convict system approaching in excellence to that of Ireland.” But let us come to the facts as presented in the paper mentioned, which, as they relate to Massachusetts, do not certainly shed much glory on the model State, as compared with Ireland.

“As tested by its results in diminishing crime in that country, the Irish or Crofton system is truly remarkable. In January, 1854, when the whole population of Ireland was a little more than 6,000,000, the convict population sentenced for the higher grades of crime was about 4,000, or one in every 1,500 of the inhabitants. Twenty years later, in January, 1874, when the whole population of the country was between 5,500,000 and 5,500,000, the convict population had fallen to less than a third part of what it was in 1854, that is, to 1,136, or little more than one in 5,000. The convictions for high crime, which in 1854–55 averaged 610 a year, are now less than 225 a year, or fewer than in Massachusetts, which, with a population of about 1,600,000, will this year receive nearly 250 convicts into its Charlestown prison.
As almost half these Massachusetts convicts are sentenced for the same length of time, and the same offenses, as those in Ireland, it is fair to take 100 of them as representing the same degree of criminality as was represented by the 228 Irish convicts. Now, the population of Massachusetts being to that of Ireland about as 1 to 3 1/2, we have the comparative criminality of Massachusetts to that of Ireland, in proportion to the population, as 350 is to 228, or more than sixty per cent. greater. In New York it is probably double that of Ireland.

"Of course, other causes have co-operated with Sir Walter Crofton's system to reduce crime in Ireland to its present minimum; while other causes than our own wretched prison system have combined to swell the flood of crime here in America. The commitments to the Massachusetts State prison the present year will be just about double what they were in the year 1864; and the number now imprisoned there is almost double what it was on the 1st of October, ten years ago. Then it was but 351, of whom about 35 were under sentence for life; now the number at Charlestown is more than 670, of whom about 68 are sentenced for life, and about 100 are second-comers to this same prison. During these ten years, while crime has doubled, the population of the State has increased about thirty per cent. This is surely progress the wrong way."

The Egyptian Book of the Dead.

An article in a recent number of the "London Quarterly," reprinted in No. 1593 of Littell's "Living Age," contains an abstract of the labors of Bunsen, Birch, Lepsius and Brugsch in regard to the religious views of the early Egyptians on certain important points, as disclosed in the celebrated Book of the Dead which has so long engaged the attention of the learned. Dr. Lepsius many years ago published the Egyptian text, and Dr. Birch of the British Museum has given the world a complete translation of it into English.

It seems now to be an established fact that we possess written monuments of older date than the oldest of the Hebrew Scriptures, which are said to contain truths that as yet no inspired writer had announced. Whence came these truths? The writer in the "Quarterly" thinks they are remains of a primeval revelation. There are in this Book of the Dead ancient vestiges of a faith in one Supreme God, the immortality of the soul, a final judgment, and a future state of rewards and punishments. Strip off the mass of myth and legend and fable, and get back to the earliest text and there we find these primeval truths imbedded. Our readers will doubtless welcome some quotations bearing on these statements.

Dr. Lepsius has published what he believes to be a fragment of the
oldest text, copied from a sarcophagus of the first Theban dynasty; and, set side by side with a copy of the same taken from another sarcophagus of a later period, we are able to see how the brief utterances of the first were expanded, mystified and confused by the additions and corruptions of later centuries. But for these comparisons we must refer the reader to the authorities named. 1

1. The Divine Unity. "I am Tum, one Being. I am one. I am Ra, First in his dominion. I am the great God, existing of myself, the creator of his name, the Lord of all gods, whom no one among the gods resists. I am that which is ever, even that which is eternal."

This brief extract would seem to show that beyond all the gods and idolatries of Egypt, far back toward the morning of the world, the fathers of the nations believed in, and worshipped, one Supreme God. As the ages went by he was called by various names, and worshipped in various forms, but, traced through all these back to the first conception, he was One only, the Creator and Ruler of all.

Iamblicus says, the Egyptians "affirm that all things which exist were created, that he who gave them being is their first Father and Creator, and acknowledge the existence of a vital power before heaven was. They say that Mercury, the Egyptian Thoth, taught, and that Bitys the prophet found it written in hieroglyphics, that the way to heaven was the name of God which penetrates through all the world. Divine good they consider to be God, and human good to be union with Him, or, if we translate more exactly, identification with Him." 2

2. The deathless character of the Soul, and its consequent future life after the death of the body.

1 The Book of the Dead, according to the Turin Papyrus, consists of 168 chapters.

2 There are some curious correspondences with the account of the Creation as given in Genesis. In chapter 115 we have this: "I (meaning the supreme god Re) appeared before the sun." "When the circumference of darkness was opened, I was one among you (gods)." "I know how the woman was made from the male." In chapter 100, For Giving Peace to the Soul, to be pronounced as a charm over the body of the deceased, we have this remarkable passage: "I am made the second after Isis, the third after Nephys, I have grown strong by their prayers, I have twined the cord, I have stopped the Apophis (the evil serpent), I have turned back his feet." A serpent with many feet — feet growing by pairs out of the annular ribs of his skeleton — is a prominent figure on some of the old mummy-chests, that of Ramses II., for example, the Pharaoh of the Exoduses; while other serpents have none, but go on their bellies. What relation has this to Genesis iii. 14: "Upon thy belly shalt thou go?" Did he go on feet before this? Voltaire, sneering at the literal interpretation of the allegory, says that if the serpent had to go on his tail before, he ought to have been much obliged for the privilege of going on his belly, as altogether more convenient.
This appears everywhere in the Book of the Dead; and is in fact the warp and woof of the web. It comes to the surface in every variety of form, and, in its later enlarged and corrupted editions, confused, absurd, and contradictory. But from the beginning the doctrine of man's immortality is beyond question. "Birth into earthly life was death. This world was darkness. Death itself was manifestation into light. From age to age it was persistently believed that the eminently pure and upright man would become at once a renovated human person after death," associate with the gods, and finally perhaps become himself a god of subordinate rank — much as Christians say now that good men become angels after death.

As we have only fragments of the early text of this remarkable document, it is difficult to say what was the primitive teaching respecting the wicked after death. How far the doctrine of metempsychosis runs back toward the beginning cannot be ascertained, but at its earliest appearance it seems to lean toward the great truth of universal purification and restoration. The Quarterly writer says that "amidst incessantly tantalizing contradictions there is constant assertion of the immortality of man, his manifestation to light, or his doom to ineradicable transmigrations for purgation from sin, and the eventual reunion of the purified soul with the deserted human body."

At what period embalming began to be practised cannot be determined, or whether originally it grew out of the doctrine of transmigration; though it is commonly believed that the one is dependant on the other, and that the body is mumified in order that the soul may recocupy it when it has completed its circle of transmigrations. This matter of the body is a confused affair, the result probably of the successive additions of the passing ages.

Five principles were held necessary to complete a man, namely:

- Ba, the soul, represented in hieroglyphic by the figure of a hawk with human head and arms, Akh or Khu, intelligence; Ka, existence, breath of life; Khaib, or shade; Kha, or body; and lastly, the ka, or mummy. The soul is not described as created, but the Ka, breath of life, is the especial gift of Tum. The book opens with an address of Thoth himself, followed by addresses of the soul, immediate.

And here comes in one of the contradictions, for nine of the 183 chapters are prepared for the living to recite in order "to save the departed from the defilement of the destruction in hell, and eternal overthrow." This, however, is undoubtedly one of the later expansions of the primitive text. At the same time the 125th chapter makes of Going to the Hall of the Two Truths, and separating a Person from his Sins when he has been made to see the Faces of the Gods. From this it would seem that the old Egyptians did not believe the modern doctrine of no change and no salvation after death.
diately after the separation from the body, to the infernal gods. The defunct enumerates his titles to the favor of Osiris, and demands admission into his empire. The choir of glorified souls intervenes, supporting the prayer. The priest on earth speaks in his turn and implores divine clemency. Then Osiris encourages the defunct to speak to his father and enter freely into Amenti, the Hades of Egypt."

Here a distinction is set up between Kha, the body; and Sah, the mummy! and on the other hand, between the soul, the intellect or intelligence, and the shade (ghost?). Following we have metamorphoses of the vile into the glorious ("sown in disonor, but raised in glory"), of men into gods, of mortals clothed in heavenly forms; and then a chapter of the soul visiting the body in Karneter, the grave or tomb. The deceased "sees his body, he is at peace with his mummy, he is not troubled." Here the soul seems to be without a body; and also the body and the mummy are regarded as one. At the same time there is a chapter on "The Reconstruction of the Deceased," in which we have an elaborate description of all the parts of a new body which is made for the soul's use in Amenti, the Egyptian Hades or under-world.

It would be natural to suppose that the embalmed body was only for the use of the soul on its return to earth, after completing its round of transmigrations; and that the new body given after death would be the immortal one.

But in opposition to this we find twelve chapters which describe "the manifestation to light" of "the reconstructed human body, invested with undying powers," and surrounded with manifold defences against mortality. The departed one is assured that he shall come forth as the day, prevail against all enemies, break through the barriers of sepulchral night, and that as the sun after entering the gate of the west at evening, emerges in the east with returning day, and mounts up into the meridian glory, so shall body and soul, the material and the divine again united, quit the earth, and ascend towards Aahenu, or Heaven.

Now the body given in Amenti was not a human body; and so it would seem after all that the embalmed earthly body is the one that is finally to be reconstructed and endowed with "undying powers," or made immortal.4

4 Some of these mummies have lain uninjured for three or four thousand years, and even more. Yet the process of mummification has not destroyed the flesh, and "Mr. Pettigrew relates that after patiently macerating a piece of mummy in warm water, it

We have elsewhere (Hist. of Endless Punishment) described the great judgment of the dead, as conducted by the forty-two judges before the burial, and as repeated in Amenti or Hades. We will simply put on record here a part of the plea which the deceased is supposed to address to Anubis, the Judge of the Dead, as contained in the 125th chapter. It is curious as an exhibit of the grounds on which the Egyptians expected to be justified in the judgment; and also as a probably correct picture of the kind of sins which prevailed among the people:

"Oh ye lords of truth! oh thou great god, lord of truth. I have come to thee. I have brought myself to see thy blessings. Rub ye away my faults. I have not privily done evil against mankind. I have not afflicated persons or men. I have not told falsehood in the Tribunal of Truth. I have had no acquaintance with evil. I have not done any wicked thing. I have not made the labouring man do more than his task daily. I have not been idle. I have not failed. I have not been weak. I have not done what is hateful to the gods. I have not calumniated the slave to his master. I have not sacrificed. I have not made to weep. I have not murdered. I have not given orders to smite a person privily. I have not committed fraud to men. I have not injured the images of the gods. I have not taken scraps of the bandages of the dead. I have not committed adultery. I have not spat against the priest of the god of my country. I have not thrown down. I have not falsified measures. I have not thrown the weight out of the scale. I have not cheated in the weight of the balance. I have not withheld milk from the mouths of sucklings. I have not hunted wild animals in their pasturages. I have not netted sacred birds. I have not caught the fish which typify them. I have not stopped running water. I have not put out a light at its proper hour. I have not robbed the gods of their proper haunches. I have not stopped a god from his manifestation. I am pure! I am pure!"

The following passage from the justification plea appears on a burial monument in Ben Hassan, and was copied by Dr. Brugsch, who dates it 2500 years before Christ. After narrating the services which he heard rendered to the neighborhood in which he lived, he proceeds as below. It may be well to compare this and the above with the judgment scene in Matt. xxv.: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat," &c.

"Covered the softness and natural appearance of flesh. Freed from the mummifying rubbish, and exposed to the action of the air, it was smitten with putridity, and after the amazing pause of at least three thousand years between vital activity and utter dissolution, there came visibly the material fulfilment of the sentence, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.' "
"I have not troubled the son of the poor man, I have not oppressed any widow, I have not disturbed any fisherman, I have not driven away any shepherd; there was no householder whose servant I took for labour; no prisoner languished in my days, no one died of hunger in my time. When there were years of hunger, I had all the fields of my nomos ploughed. I gave nourishment to its inhabitants and fed them. There was no hungry person in it. I gave the widow equal measure with the married woman. I did not prefer the rich to the poor."

And now a few words respecting the argument of the writer in the London Quarterly. He regards these several doctrines as fragments of a revelation made in the beginning to the fathers of the race. This revelation in the course of ages was mostly buried under a mass of mythological rubbish and corruption, and so obscured by fable and falsehood as to render it necessary that it should be "renewed" again, "divested of every disguise and disentangled from every perversion."

The fact of a primeval revelation we are not disposed to dispute, but that all the doctrines named above were included in that revelation is quite another question; and that Moses was "plenarily inspired" to reassert them is still another question. Where in the writings of Moses do we find the doctrines of a Judgment after Death and Future Rewards and Punishments, to say nothing of Endless Punishments?

"A judgment after death was known to the Egyptians when the chapters of this Book of the Dead were written, and therefore could not have been unknown to Moses during his early education in Egypt, which continued until he was forty years of age."

Exactly; and this is the very point where your difficulty lies—Moses did know all about the doctrine of a judgment after death. For years he had been face to face with it in the belief and practice of the people among whom he was born and educated. And yet when he comes, as the servant of God, to proclaim His law to the Hebrews, he is entirely silent on the subject! If this doctrine were a part of the primeval revelation of God to man, and, being lost, Moses was "plenarily inspired" to re-reveal it, how is this astonishing fact of his total silence on the subject to be explained?

The writer referred to does not seem to see this point, and so repeats the assertion in regard to Future Retribution. He calls special attention to the fact that Moses must have known this and kindred doctrines; a fact which we are not in the least inclined to deny:

"Therefore when it is said that the doctrine of Future Retribution
was not known to Moses and the Hebrews, and that the thought of
awards and punishments in a future state did not influence the legis-
lator, nor affect the nation, we can now meet the allegation with a
confident reply. We can show that the contrary appears in all the
monuments of Egypt, contemporaneous with Moses, many ages before
is time, and many ages after him. Incidentally, too, we know that
his allegation of ignorance is equally discordant with all that bears
ny relation to the subject in ancient monuments of Chaldea and
Syria."

It is not pretended that Moses was ignorant of the doctrine of
future rewards and punishments. On the contrary we contend that
was perfectly familiar with it, and had been all his life; and yet
then he speaks to his people in the name of God he entirely ignores
his doctrine also, makes no allusion to it whatever; but announces,
a motives to righteousness and obedience, an elaborate system of
awards and punishments which are wholly confined to this life!

Is it possible to believe that Moses held this doctrine as of divine
origin? Is it possible to believe that he thought himself “plenarily
inspired” to re-assert it as part of God’s first revelation to his chil-
ren? If this was his belief, if God did commission him to announce
new, and incorporate into his Law, the doctrines of a judgment after
death, a future retribution, and endless punishment, then never before
was prophet or messenger of heaven so recreant to duty; and it may
re confidently said that, whoever else may escape, Moses must be set
town as sure of the damnation against which he wickedly and cruelly
ailed to warn the Hebrews and the world!4

A Chapter of Antiquities.

We have gathered up the following facts from various sources, and
make record of them here for the use of those curious in such matters.
They are corrective of some archaeological speculations, showing how
often the learned in such things have to modify their decisions, and ad-
just their theories to the newly discovered facts; and they lead to
many questions which coming ages only may be able to answer.

Something more than a year ago, a surveying party in Southern
Arizona, on the south of the Gila River, very unexpectedly came

4 Of course we have not attempted to prove what is now so generally admitted by
biblical scholars of all creeds, that the doctrines above mentioned are nowhere to be
found in the books of Moses. See the testimonies of orthodox critics and commenta-
tors given, in part only, in the writer’s work on the Origin of Endless Punishment, pp.
44-52; 260-270.
upon "a chain of cities in ruins." An examination of the countless tumuli in the vicinity revealed large quantities of pottery, household utensils, and human bones, but no weapons of war. Some of the hammers or axes were of a quality of stone harder than any now in use, while of the clay vessels many showed the clearest evidences of the Roman style of decoration.

The famous Hayden expedition in southern Colorado and Arizona has also found some remarkable pre-historic relics. The report says that the San Juan region abounds everywhere with evidences of civilization ante-dating anything at present known in North America.

"We first found in the canyon of the Rio Mancos mounds of earth concealing piles of earthen ware, masonry, and straw with fragments of pottery ornamented by imprinted designs on the outside and glazed and painted within. Then the mounds became more numerous, and clustered into villages. Vestiges of ancient wall of regularly cut stone and ancient towers in an excellent state of preservation, together with the remains of underground workshops, appeared. These were in the villages, and recorded the prosperous condition at that time of these ancient people.

"They were evidently a peaceable people, and, attacked by hordes from the north, they fled to the cliffs of these wonderful canyons near by, and there erected houses upon ledges and benches in the very face of the bluffs, where nothing but a bird could reach them except by a single dizzy trail capable of being defended by one against a thousand. There they were secure from attack, but were ill able to stand long sieges; and gradually left even these swallows' nests to move south into Arizona, and there, broken in spirit, they hid away from their pursuers. Even now we find their remnants in the Moquis villages, and their houses, built of carefully cut stone, faced smoothly without two and three stories high, plastered and painted within, two hundred feet sheer up to the top of the bluff, eight hundred feet sheer down to the bottom."

About six miles from Rockford City, on a high table land on Rock River, excavations in a mound brought to light at a depth of nine feet a tablet of Niagara spar, with traced and bevelled edges, and a series of eccentric carvings that probably were designed to perpetuate some event. Six of the figures correspond perfectly with Libyan characters, letters of the oldest African nations. Fourteen distinct figures may be traced on the tablet, including those of a well-formed fish, a lizard, and two serpents. As in Arizona, a quantity of bone and small pieces of rock exhibiting perfect fin-marks were found near the tablet.
The Two Republics of Mexico mentions the recent discovery of an artificially excavated grotto, fifteen miles from Tancitaro, in the State of Michoacan, which is represented to be of immense depth and vast extent; the remains of walls and arched corridors are still to be seen, and many curious specimens of the handiwork of an unknown race have been brought from this subterranean palace.

A Manila paper announces the discovery of some pre-historic remains on the little islands of Rota and Tinian, which form part of the Ladrone or Marians Islands. They appear to consist in each case of two series of eight stone pyramids, standing in two rows, at intervals of twelve feet, the base being twelve feet square, and the height thirty-six feet. The summit is crowned by a kind of large cup equal in diameter to the diagonal of the base. They cannot possibly be ascribed to a race at all similar to the vindictive and degraded aborigines of the Archipelago. They would seem to have much in common with the pre-historic remains found in Mexico and some of the United States.

We turn now to Rome, where recently some very interesting antiquities have been recovered by excavation on the Esquiline Hill, especially in the way of statues and coins; seven statues having been found in fine preservation, including a bust of Commodus, and a statue of Venus which is said to surpass in beauty even the celebrated Medicean Venus. According to the statement of a correspondent of the London Telegraph, not less than eighty-two statues, more or less perfect, have been found, since the commencement of the recent explorations. He also says that coins have been discovered in large quantities. "On the Esquiline so many have been found that they fill chests. Only during the past week the workmen came upon a mass of some three thousand lying loose in the ground. These coins are principally bronze, but there is also a large amount of gold and silver money. A collection of small Etruscan vases in colored terra cotta has been the means of proving the existence and site of an ancient Etruscan cemetery on the Esquiline. From the tomb of a priest has been extracted the gold thread woven into his robes, which has remained long after he and the robes he wore have crumbled into dust."

Amongst other things, a war car or chariot of Syrian workmanship was discovered, which was found so deep down in the earth that the leading archaeologists begin to think that it belongs to a period of history utterly lost, and anterior even to the Etruscan civilization.
If other objects of this class are found, it will tend to verify the remark made by an Italian historian that Syria once ruled Europe. Near Santa Maria Maggiore they dug up 1300 pieces of carved ivory, evidently forming part of some piece of furniture.

"It has generally been supposed that the Etruscans were the first nations of Italy who could boast of any high degree of civilization, but the study of the walls called Pelasgic or Cyclopean and a comparison of the jewelry found in the old tombs has established the fact that before the Etruscan there was another nation, the Tirrenian, superior in taste and skill and instruments of workmanship. Indeed, the Etruscan jewelry seemed quite coarse and rude beside that of the more ancient period. These Tirrenian ornaments are not found in the ruins of the cities which historians assert to have been powerful in the Etruscan confederation, and besides are found all along the shores of the Mediterranean and of the Black Sea and in Phoenicia and Egypt, showing the people of these countries to have had a common origin with this early nation of Italy, while the Etruscan jewelry bears a character distinctive of itself, and is found nowhere else than in Italy."

In France, department of Aisne, at the little village of Amifontaine, a workman struck with his pickaxe a hard object, which turned out to be an earthen jar filled with Roman medals to the number of six hundred. They were in a good state of preservation, in not very pure silver, and all struck with the effigies of emperors of the Antonine period.

M. Guerin, engaged by the French Government in scientific researches in Palestine, some time since read a paper in a Geographical Congress at Lyons, in which he claims to have discovered the tomb of Joshua, within the territory belonging to the heritage of Joshua:

"In the hill at this place are many tombs, and this one has a vestibule, into which the light of day penetrates, supported by two columns, while the place is furnished with nearly three hundred niches for lamps, and is soiled evidently from their use. This argues that some periodical celebrations were held there. This vestibule gives entrance to two chambers, one containing fifteen receptacles for coffins, and the other but one. In this latter one M. Guerin supposes the body of Joshua to have been deposited, and he thinks he has discovered strong evidence of this in the statement that the sharp flint knives with which Joshua used to circumcise the children of Israel at Gilgal were buried in his tomb. On removing the débris which covered the floor of the tomb, a large number of flint knives were found, and on making excavations at Gilgal, the passage of the Jordan, a number of similar knives were also discovered. The pillars in the vestibule of the tomb
are surrounded by a fillet in the style of Egyptian monuments, and this would argue a period of about the time of Joshua."

Two or three years ago we mentioned the discovery of a papyrus which was believed to contain the oldest "fairy tale" in the world. Since then the report has taken on a more decided historical form, and a translation of the tale is given in a late number of Macmillan's Magazine, published in London. It appears that in 1852 an English lady acquired a roll of papyrus inscribed with hieroglyphic characters, which she submitted to the Vicomte de Rouge, then director of the Museum of Oriental MSS. in Paris. That distinguished scholar declared the composition to be nothing less than a story written by a Pharaonic scribe for the edification of the young crown prince, Seti Maniphta, son of Pharaoh Rameses Misamum, founder of the cities of Pithom and Rameses, who ruled in Thebes B.C. 1400, and at whose court Moses was educated. The opinion of the learned Frenchman was subsequently confirmed by the authorities of the British Museum, and in 1863 an equally learned German unfolded the papyrus and read to a Berlin audience a literal translation of the fairy tale told to the son of Rameses the Second, thirty-two centuries ago! In language and manner it resembles the style and structure of Scriptural writings and other productions of the period.

Religious World.

The interesting historical papers of Rev. Mr. Eddy, which are in course of publication in our pages, are alone sufficient evidence of the need of such a magazine as the QUARTERLY. They show the importance of some repository where such valuable documents, as from time they are brought to light, can be put into compact form, with some hope of being preserved; instead of being committed to the columns of a weekly paper which generally perishes with the using.

It is fashionable in certain quarters, and even among some of our own communion, to say of the early Universalists, the men who laid the foundations of the Universalist Church in this country, that they were merely anti-orthodox controversialists, men who were destitute of piety, and thought more of argument than of the necessity of a Christian life and culture; that they never would have made a profession of faith even, if they had not been driven to it by the law, and
then made it as short as possible, and mere dogma at that. But the
"Articles of Faith," the "Form of Church Government," the "Rec-
ommendations" of the Convention in 1790, as given in our January
number, and the Letter of the Boston Church in the present number,
all tell a very different story; and discover to us that the Universalists
of eighty and ninety years ago were men of genuine piety, humble and
reverent Christians, seeking to build up that kingdom of God which is
righteousness peace and joy in the Holy S, irit, and to bring up their
children in the love of God and the practice of virtue.

We are glad of this vindication of their Christian character and
work, and we cordially thank our correspondent, in behalf of our
whole people, for rescuing from oblivion and destruction these valuable
papers, so indispensable to the authentic History, yet to be written, of
the Universalist Church in America. And in closing, we feel it only
just to include in these commendations, Rev. A. C. Thomas's "Cen-
tury of Universalism," a book which should be better known among
us, furnishing, as it does, like testimony to the Christian spirit, action
and life of the early Universalists of Pennsylvania and New York.

— The following is from the 3d volume of the Journal of John
Quincy Adams, recently published. Having read Bishop Horsley's
Sermons on the 45th Psalm, he says, "When the Bishop tells me
that it is the mere cant of puritanism to allege the precept of mutual
forgiveness, the prohibition of returning evil for evil, and of resisting
persecution, as reproving religious wars, and at the same time con-
tends 'that the peacable submission of the subject to the very worst
of kings is one of the most peremptory precepts of Christianity,' I
hold him to be preaching doctrines false, pernicious and damnable, for
which if eternal punishment be compatible with a merciful and benevo-
 lent dispenser of it, the Bishop would be a promising candidate for it.
For, if there be one species of perverseness more detestable than any
other, it is that which inculcates vicious principle under the sanctified
garb of religious instruction. But so it is, and so it always will be,
with priests who are at the same time Lords. Horsley was not worse
than Masillon. In merely human enmities there is nothing so re-
morseless as in the rancors of a Bishop."

— In a recent lecture at Andover Theological Seminary on "The
Doctrine of Rationalism in Germany," the following statements were
made regarding the Universities, confirmed, according to the lecturer,
by the testimony of Heidelberg professors, of Dorner, Julius Muller,
and especially Tholuck:

"1. That in the German universities the rationalistic lecture-rooms
are now empty and the Evangelical crowded, while fifty or eighty years ago the rationalistic were crowded, and the Evangelical empty.

"2. That histories of the rise, progress and decline of German Rationalism have been appearing for the last fifteen years in the most learned portions of the literature of Germany.

"3. That such teachers as Tholuck, Julius Muller, Dorner, Ullmann, Lange, Rothe and Tischendorf, most of whom began their professorships with great unpopularity in their universities, on account of their opposition to rationalistic views, are now particularly honored on that very account.

"4. That every prominent German University, except Heidelberg, is now under predominant Evangelical influences, and that Heidelberg is nearly empty of theological students.

"5. That in the field of exegetical research, while rationalism has caused the discovery of many new facts, and the adoption of a new method, the naturalistic theory by Paulus, the mythical theory by Bauer, and the legendary by Renan, have been so antagonistic to each other as to be successively outgrown both by Christian and by rationalistic scholarship."

—It is evident that our excellent friend, Dr. Whedon, editor of the "Methodist Quarterly," is occasionally moved to righteous indignation against Calvinism, even to the point of wrath, such wrath as is allowable to the sanctified. Sometimes since we gave an example of his mild way of stating his views of the god of the Genevan Reformer, whom he described as "The Infinite Gorilla!" Lately he has discovered another equally emphatic term, borrowed from the famous Cyclops who devoured several of the companions of Ulysses, and whose one huge eye, in the middle of his forehead, the Grecian chief destroyed by driving into it a burning stake, while the monster was in a drunken sleep. The subject and occasion which called out the following reprimand, so sweet tempered, so classic in expression, will appear in the extract itself:

"1. All infants do deserve to go to hell. All infants are damned, if not in hell, yet in the womb or in the cradle. Stick a pin there. Infant damnation is just and righteous. We submit, then, for any one to say upon mere sentimental feeling that this righteous thing never finally takes effect, is an effeminate dodge, entitled to no place in a manly theology.

"2. This assumption that every infant, that is, every human being, comes into a damned existence, is the very center, heart, back-bone, and base of Calvinistic election. Inasmuch as all are anteriorly damned alike, so THE INFINITE BLIND POLYPHEMUS may dab his hand into the whole crowd and snatch one here and one there,
for no reason or motive in the chance object, but from his own 'mere good pleasure.' And this is Calvinistic 'election.' And this is 'glorious grace!' It is of no use for the 'Intelligencer' to say that we misrepresent this matter. We state it truly; and we state it in the terms in which it ought to be stated; and we hold it up to execration. If these doctors cannot give us a better theology than that, they had better step out."

— A remarkable sermon was preached last January at St. George's Episcopal Church in St. Louis, by Rev. R. A. Holland, D. D., Rector of the church. If we had space we should give lengthy extracts for, as the "Liberal Christian" truly says, "it is the bravest, boldest, strongest, most passionately-earnest and morally-inspired protest against the doctrine of everlasting punishment that we have ever met with." It is not, however, so "flatly contradictory of the articles and creeds" of the Episcopal Church as that journal represents, for the doctrine of endless punishment is not asserted in the xxxix Articles. In reply to Bishop Robertson's courteous letter (in which there is no word about heresy or ecclesiastical prosecution), Dr. Holland claims that his views have a legitimate place in the Episcopal Church, which he loves and honors for its freedom. And in a letter to the St. Louis Republican he cites the decision in the Church of England on a case similar to his own. Mr. Wilson, one of the authors of the famous Essays and Reviews, was tried before the Privy Council for avowing Restorationist opinions. The court consisted of the late lord chancellor Westbury, the two Archbishops, the Bishop of London, and two temporal peers; and they unanimously decided that the formalities of the Church did not warrant the condemnation of a clergyman for expressing the hope of universal restoration.

In the meantime the sermon is making a stir in the newspapers and pulpits of St. Louis, and the people crowd to hear a man who is not afraid to preach what he believes. So goes the "irrepressible conflict," and every day new witnesses rise up to testify to the Truth.

— An English Ecclesiastical Court has lately made a significant decision. Rev. Flavel S. Cook refused the communion to one Henry Jenkins, for which he was brought before the court by said Jenkins, as guilty of an illegal act. It leaked out in the course of the preliminary arguments in the case, that Mr. Cook, the pastor, had refused the communion to his parishioner because he did not believe in endless punishment, nor in the orthodox hell, nor in the personality of
the Devil! The Court decided against the legality of his action; practically, therefore, establishing the fact that a man may reject these dogmas, and still be a good churchman, entitled to the fellowship and all the privileges of the Church.

— The following on the religious condition of the upper and lower strata of French society is from the English Spectator. It is without doubt approximately correct in its estimate, though we think it does not give sufficient weight to the power of the women in the rich middle classes, who under the direction of the priesthood exert a constant home influence over the men — husbands, sons, brothers, and lovers:

"Most of the men in France hate the Catholic Church with a fury which is scarcely comprehensible even to those Englishmen who are smitten with the fever of 'No Popery.' The real leaders of French thought either formally adhere to the Catholic Church and smile at her teaching, or they hold scornfully aloof from all churches whatever. The uneducated artisans regard her with a ferocity which in a time of disturbance, ever leads them to the brink of violence (to actual violence, as witness the late terrible savagery of the Commune. Editor.); while the cultivated classes, when they do not find it convenient to put on the robes of devotees, treat the priesthood with mingled anger and disdain. It is the rich, trading middle class that gives the Church her new strength. At the same time, the supreme need of France, for temporal as well as for eternal reasons, is a religious faith which she can really respect and believe.

"But there is no sign of a great religious transformation on all the dark horizon of France. In vain do we look alike to Catholicism and Protestantism for a creed that can soften the hard, atheistic secularism of her life; and meanwhile, the earnestness which other peoples throw into religion, France flings into politics. She debates the practical problems of daily life with a theological fury; the rival parties pursue each other with exterminating passion; and thus is she tossed from revolution to revolution."


The chief value of this volume, lies in the special contributions of Prof. Taylor Lewis and the general editor, Dr. Schaff. The intro-
duction to the poetical books of the latter, occupies thirty pages, and has much pleasing and informing matter in regard to the character, spirit and uses of Hebrew poetry, and should have a careful reading. "Theism of the Book of Job" and the twelve excurses, filling a hundred pages, by Prof. Lewis are, of course, full of learning and original suggestions. Our readers will be particularly interested in what he has to say of the "veil thrown over the Doctrine of a Future Life in the Old Testament," though they may not accept all his reasons for it; as well as in his comparisons of the Hebrew belief on this point with those of the surrounding nations.

We are inclined to think that Excursus VI. is intended as a sort of antidote to his Excursus on the "Olamic Words" in the volume on Genesis, and what he has elsewhere said of Sheol. At any rate the Professor thinks he has found in the Hebrew word Abaddon, chapter xxvi. 6, a hell that will afford some ease to the troubled evangelical mind, compelled to give up Sheol as a place of torment. So Abaddon, it is thought, will save the reputation of the Old Testament, and furnish a reasonably orthodox hell. At any rate we must take it "as something beyond Sheol, deeper, darker, more hidden and mysterious. It is the Locus Perditionis, the world of the perished, of the lost. It is ... utter destruction." Unfortunately Prof. Lewis does not tell us how he came to find out so much about a realm deeper and darker, and more mysterious even than Sheol.

The Introduction to the Book of Job by the translator, occupying sixty pages, abounds in valuable matter, and contains much that is fresh and original. The writer gives us a very elaborate and ingenious argument in proof of his theory that Hezekiah was the author of Job, which as a consequence fixes the date somewhere about B. C. 710, during the prophetic career of Isaiah.


Professor Gillett knows more about John Huss than he does about the Moral System, or the philosophy of the divine government. It is seldom that we have met with so much bad logic, and inconsequential reasoning, and absolute contradiction, as are to be found in chapters xii-xiv, on Probation and Retribution. Whole pages could be cited, large portions of which might easily be taken for extracts from Ballou or Williamson; while perhaps, in alternate paragraphs, we find the most absurd and untenable inferences drawn from the admitted facts. His arguments in evidence that this is a life of probation in the orthodox sense need no better answer than he has himself furnished in the next two chapters on Retribution. If the reader has any doubts on this point, let him read for himself, and, having read, we are quite sure he will not send his sons to "Academies and Colleges," where this treatise is the "text-book."

The "Historical Introduction" is a condensed and very satisfactory
sketch of the beginning (as far back as the Greek sages and moralists) and the growth of thought and discussion on the questions involved, up to the time of Butler’s Analogy. Students will find this summary very convenient.


Nine of the sixteen lectures making this volume are devoted to Wordsworth, three to Burns, one to Coleridge, and one to Cowper. Wordsworth is regarded by Mr. Brooke as the greatest of the English poets of the last century; “greatest not only as a poet, but as a philosopher.” By an able critical analysis and dissection he shows the subtle relations of his poetry to Nature and to Man, the influence exerted upon it by the French Revolution and contemporary events, and the inspiration drawn from his ardent love of Humanity, his sympathy with the oppressed, his enthusiasm for liberty, and his faith in Human Brotherhood.

The chapter on Cowper is full of painful interest. It discovers to us the terrible burden of his Calvinistic belief, its effect on much of his poetry, and the anguish, insanity, and wretched death to which it led. Let this record be read by all those who would know what is the damnation of unbelief; by all those who ask, If Universalism is true what is the use of preaching it? If they cannot see how faith in Universalism would have saved Cowper from that fear which hath torment, from the death and hell of despair; all we can say is, they must have as little brains as they have heart.


If the reader will change the title of this book by substituting Church, or the Roman Church, for Religion, he will have a more correct impression of what Dr. Draper really writes about. Religion is a very different thing from the church, or hierarchy, or priesthood pretending to represent it; and is no more responsible for their ignorance, blunders and crimes than Temperance is responsible for the drunkenness of those who may have signed the pledge, or Science for the false theories, and bigotry, and assumed infallibility of some of her disciples. The story of Galileo and Bruno is well told, but what had Religion to do with their persecution, imprisonment, suffering and cruel death? If Dr. Draper must curse somebody for all this, let it be the real authors; the Pope, the Inquisition, the Priests.

As regards the statements of the book, some of them seem to be exaggerated, and the rose-colored eulogy on the intellectual, literary, scientific and philosophical culture of the Arabs, occasionally approaches the borders of myth and legend. We know they wrought marvels, and that Europe was largely indebted to their schools and learned men, but there is such an air of romance in much of their so-
called history that we always hesitate; and Dr. Draper's evident wish to write up Mohammedanism in order to write down Christianity does not tend to increase our faith.

Then again our author wholly ignores the services of the Church of the Middle Ages in conquering, restraining, civilizing, and christianizing the barbarians who over-ran the empire; in transforming her monasteries into schools and seats of learning; in encouraging painting, sculpture, architecture and the arts; to say nothing of her universities, charities, &c. Keeping all this out of sight, he pushes into the foreground her opposition to a true cosmogony and the study of astronomy, and thus takes the role of the special pleader rather than that of the impartial historian.

But with all this, and much more that might be said in the way of criticism, Dr. Draper's book is a remarkable one, and will surely be read by all intelligent people interested in the question which is now agitating the world of thought. Its style invites the reader, its spirit seems so fair, and its facts are arrayed in such a striking and attractive manner, that the reader keeps on to the end.

The argument opens with a masterly sketch of the Macedonian campaign in the East, and the new world, new Nature, it opened to the Greek mind; the contact of European and Asiatic thought, and the results following; the Alexandrian Museum and School in connection with the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies, in which it is said that the Museum was the birthplace of science, where Nature was "practically interrogated." Then we have an able statement of the religious condition of Rome, the spread of Christianity, its partial compromise with paganism, how it was corrupted and debased by Constantine for political purposes, the origin of Arianism, and the antagonism between dogma and science inaugurated by Augustine, whom he mercilessly criticises.

Next comes a chapter on the conflict respecting the Divine Unity, in which we have Mohammedanism introduced as "the first or southern Reformation," and its relations to Nestorianism set forth; which, with the following chapter on the restoration of science by the Arabs, constitutes one of the most brilliant portions of the work.

In reviewing the discussions regarding the criterion of truth, whether the Bible, the Church, an infallible Pope, or the individual Reason, Dr. Draper gives us his opinions frankly, kindly informing us that the books of Moses are "spurious," and the contents borrowed from Assyrian mythology, as shown in the recently discovered tablets containing the story of the flood! Is Dr. Draper's knowledge of the past ages so encyclopaedic that he can positively affirm that the Hebrew and the Assyrian accounts, and the various readings of the story among all nations and tribes, are not all from one original source, viz.: the fact itself of a flood, far back in the past, covering the inhabited portions of the earth?

Chapter ix gives the controversy concerning the government of the world, whether by Providence or Law; and of course our author de-
cides for Law; all things, plants and animals, being the outcome of evolution, and not a creation. Providential government has no meaning; a Father's care is not needed; Almighty Force, revealing itself in the invariable sequence of cause and effect, orders, shapes and controls all things.

"Science in relation to Modern Civilization" is rich in facts, and shows the generous work which the former has done by its discoveries and inventions in promoting the welfare of mankind. The last chapter on "The Impending Crisis" sets forth the present relations of the Papal Church to Science, Education and the existing governments of Europe; repeats the story of the Vatican Council, the Papal Syllabus, the declaration of war against modern civilization, the conflict with the German Government, the Evangelical Alliance, &c.


What pleasant memories of the olden time, when the "Lowell Offering" was in its glory, come to us with the name of Lucy Larcom. Then and there we saw the promise of that reputation which now has grown into such fair proportion; and thought travels back with light step to those first timid efforts at story and song, of which this beautiful volume is in part the ripened fruit. And how "The Roadside Preacher," too, brushes the dust from one of Memory's pictures, in which we once more hear poor, half-crazed "old Larkin Moore" uttering his warnings to the idle and unbelieving crowd in the streets of Lowell.

Welcome to these Songs of Childhood, fragrant with the sweet breath of woods and fields and gardens, for they are sure to cultivate a love of nature, and to instruct while they charm. Love of the wonderful "little peoples" glows through them all, and will win their love in turn.

If your child is unhappy, possessed with a spirit of fretfulness or teasing, take down this volume and read "Peepay," "The Baby's Thoughts," "Gowns of Gossamer," or "At Night-Fall," and you will be sure to exorcise the evil spirit.

Nothing can be more suitable and acceptable for a birth-day gift, or token of remembrance to a beloved child. The beautiful illustrations, of which there are nearly forty, and the ornamental covers, will add largely to its attractions in the eyes of childhood.


"Will you promise to give five minutes to this book?" said the friend who placed it in our hand. "Yes." He inferred, with good reason, that beginning with five minutes we should continue to the end, which we did; and so will all intelligent readers. It is the most sensible book we have had in hand for many a day. Though Mr. Savage is now a Unitarian, when this book was written he was in
the Orthodox communion; and hence the wonder that such independ-ent thought and criticism should not only have passed unchallenged, but been received with cordial praise, by his brethren.

"Common Proofs Inadequate," is one of the fairest and most appre-ciable statements of the objections urged by modern unbelief, which has lately come from a Christian pen; and the following sec-tion on "The Independence of Christianity," is certainly as admirable in the way of reply, as far as it goes. The illustration of the Sewing Machine is as ingenious and perfect in its way as any thing to be found in literature. Still it is possible to ask some questions in re-gard to the argument.

The discussion of Christianity as the highest ideal of manhood; the deficiencies in this respect of other religions, of philosophic and scientific theories; the Suggestions to new Theorizers, to the Churches, and the Doubters, are fresh, earnest, and judicious. The reader will find this little volume full of meat for the hungry questioner. We can readily understand that it "has been born of doubt and conflict," and that the author has "fought over the whole ground of modern scepticism in a hand to hand contest with its shadows and its facts."


This little volume discusses, in a candid and devotional spirit, the Nature, Forms, Objects, Fruits, Power and Time of Prayer. It is a treatise which will be welcome to very many whose creeds differ widely from that of the author. The objects or things for which we should pray, the fruits of prayer, the answer to prayer, the question of divine knowledge and pre-arrangement, are all handled in a rational and reverent manner; as in the following:

"It is certain that all forms of error, wrong and sin shall come to an end in the world; God has purposed and foretold the universal triumph of good over evil; yet the devout soul is not thereby kept from praying for the blessed reign of love. We pray for what we know is sure to come, and our prayers animate us to struggle against the many evils about us, and so we become a part of the means by which God gradually works out his own holy counsels." . . . "If we ought not to pray for events which are sure to take place, we ought not to pray for the conversion of the world to Christ. The kingdom of our Lord is destined to fill the earth; all other kingdoms shall be absorbed into it. It shall spread like leaven in human society, till the whole is leavened. Christ shall have the heaven for his inheritance; his banner shall float over all lands; every knee shall bow to him; the glory of the thousand years is on its way to us. We know that this promise of God is sure. Yet we do not pray felter-ingly, but more freely and earnestly, on account of our knowledge." pp. 66-68.

It may be as well, after these extracts, to state that the "Old South" is not a Universalist Church.


The author has read largely and industriously, and has made up from his reading a concise statement of the mechanical inventions, scientific achievements, historical and religious changes, and political and military revolutions, which have marked the progress of mankind from the savage state, regarded as primitive, to the present level of
physical comfort and intellectual culture. As such we can heartily commend the volume to our readers. We know of nothing better, as a book of reference when one is in a hurry.

We observe however that the author settles certain speculative and questionable matters in an ex cathedra way, as if his positions were beyond challenge. There are five ages of past world history. The Stone Age lasted "ninety thousand years;" the Bronze Age, "eight thousand;" the Iron Age, "two thousand;" the Printing Age, "three hundred and twenty;" and the Steam Age, thus "one hundred years."

Exactness is the one thing needful in these times of speculation, controversy and uncertainty, and it is refreshing to have these Ages "placed," and fixed as to character and length. It is a relief to be able to say positively, when writing or speaking on the subject, that the Stone Age Age lasted ninety thousand years, and then came to an end. Suppose there are tribes of savages who still use stone hatchets and arrow heads; of course they are a fraud, they have no business here in this Printing and Steam Age; their right to exist ended ten or eleven thousand years ago, as Mr. Hittell has clearly shown.


A general history of our country which, while it shall be reasonably brief, shall yet embrace all the leading events of its discovery, settlement and progress, its political, civil and social changes and characteristics, up to the present time, including as far as may be its antiquities, and pre-historic races; a history which we can put into the hands of an intelligent young person with the assurance that its style will attract and please, and the narrative inform and educate the active and inquiring mind — for such a work we have waited long, and we have found it now in this book of Mr. Higginson's.

The narrative is plain and direct, embodying all that it is essential "young folks" should know, without being encumbered with important dates, names and trivial incidents, which so try the memory and the patience of the youthful student of history. At the same time he obtains a sufficient view of the life of the people, and of the character of those persons who have helped to shape or give color to the history. The book should receive the special attention of teachers, and find place in every family library.


After reading, till weary, arguments in proof that we are only developed oysters, arguments plentifully interlarded with small sneers at the superstition of those who believe that man has a spirit and is immortal, we took up this volume of Holmes as a relief, and read the "Memorial Poems," those written for Harvard "Class Meetings," and those written "In the Quiet Days"; and, comforted, strength-
ened in hope and faith by the beauty and tenderness of the sentiment and the sweet music of the verse, we thanked the poet, and felt how much nobler the work of him who helps us to build better and stronger, than his who labors only to destroy what is already built. The inspiration of the poet is a far greater blessing to Humanity with all its woes and sorrows, than the cold, hard logic of the materialist. These Songs of Christian hope and trust and reunion in the glad Hereafter, are better than the soulless science of Tyndall, Huxley, Spencer and their kindred. “But the first are dreams,” says the Scientist, “and the last is fact.” Well, if Christianity with all its hopes and promises and consolations, its triumphant faith, and victory over death, and visions of the Beloved beyond — if all this be a dream, a deception, a lie, then we can only say it is the most magnificent lie ever uttered, and the only one in all the universe that is infinitely better than the truth!

We welcome the book; and to what we have said add one word for the poems of Patriotism, the ringing songs “In War Time.” They have all the stir of a bugle call, and remind us of Whittier and “The Battle Hymn of the Republic.”


We have all heard of Baker’s Expedition into Central Africa under the auspices of the Khedive of Egypt, and of its partial failure owing to the hostility of the Egyptian officials, and all those interested in the slave-trade. This book contains the story of it. The firm of the Khedive invested Sir Samuel with absolute power for four years in the regions embraced in the expedition, the objects of which it set forth as follows: 1, to subdue to the Khedive’s authority the countries south of Gondokoro; 2, to suppress the slave-trade; 3, to introduce a system of regular commerce; 4, to open to navigation the great lakes of the equator; and 5, to establish a chain of military stations and commercial depots, at intervals of three days’ march, through Central Africa, assuming Gondokoro as the base of operations.

The Expedition was fitted out by the Egyptian government with ample means to command success — a fleet of steamers and sailing vessels loaded with all needed stores for the army of 1800 soldiers, besides sailors; abundant supplies of merchandise for trade, and presents to the negro kings and chiefs; steel vessels, to be transported across the desert in sections, on camels, and set up on the shores of Lake Albert N’yanza &c., &c. Everything was done that could be done to secure success, and justify the expectation of large and beneficent results. But the secret and persistent opposition from the start of those whose business it was to aid the expedition, defeated the main objects which the government and Mr. Baker had in view. And, let it be confessed, Sir Samuel helped the unfor-
The delay of more than two months in starting from Cairo, and of weeks at Khartoum, was the loss of a year to the great object of the expedition; for the reason that the waters of the Nile had fallen so low that it was impossible to ascend the river till the following year, which was the thing intended by the government officials, and the agents of the slave traders. His hopeless struggle against the insurmountable difficulties of his position, shows the dogged and persistent temper of the John Bull. Not one in a thousand would have continued to cut through the miles of matted vegetation which absolutely closed the Nile to navigation; as witness this record in his journal of March 21, 1870—"We have now been hard at work for thirteen days with a thousand men, during which time we have travelled only twelve miles!" The effect was discouragement and increasing sickness and death among the men, ending in a return down the river to a camp below the junction of the Sobat.

Starting again in December following, he reached Gondokoro after heroic efforts; and deprived by the intriguing slave traders (always secretly aided by the government officials and agents who shared their profits) of camels and carriers and all means of transport for his steamers across the desert, he still pushed on to within twenty miles of the Albert Nyanzza; at which point his forces reduced by desertion, treachery and assaults of hostile tribes, and warned by the approaching end of his four years of power, April 1, 1873, he was compelled to turn back, and abandon the enterprise.

A more exciting and instructive narrative it has not been our fortune to read for a long time. It has all the fascination of the most daring exploration and adventure, and is full of perils by land and water, perils among the heathens, perils in swamps and deserts, from wild beasts and treacherous savages. And it would be difficult to describe the dangers and sufferings and conflicts of that long march of retreat through a hostile country, where every tree and bush and tuft of grass concealed an enemy; the little army weary and hungry, loaded down with their baggage; and fighting desperately at every step of the way—repeating the experiences, the courage, the steadiness, and the success of the famous retreat of the Ten Thousand. All honor to "The Forty Thieves," that band of convicts—transformed into splendid soldiers—whose courage and discipline so often saved the expedition from disaster and ruin!

The book establishes several things important for the world to know:

1. The fact that it is impossible to overstate the horrors of the African slave traffic; its brutalizing influence on all engaged in it, its utter destruction of all human sympathies and all sense of moral
obligation; its constant resort to lying, treachery, cruelty and murder—of all which Abou Saood was the incarnation, a fair specimen of the class, hundreds of whom swarm through Central Africa, stealing, burning, plundering, killing and kidnapping negroes; leaving behind them wherever they go a desolate waste.

2. That the only possible method of breaking up this diabolical traffic is the establishment of trade and commerce which, under the protection of military stations, shall exchange the manufactures of civilized nations for the ivory, oil, hemp, tobacco, cotton, grain, and other products of African fields and forests. But this will never succeed without European agents and officers. Sir Samuel Baker accomplished a great work, considering the opposition and obstacles which he had to overcome; and gave a severe check to slave hunting, as is proved not only by his own words, but by the disinterested testimony of the great German traveller, Schweinfurth. That the Khedive intends holding the country annexed, is proved by his appointment of Col. Gordon of the British Royal Engineers as Baker's successor, and Lieut. Col. Charles Long, Major Campbell, and several other American officers, as his assistants. A letter recently received in New York from Col. Long mentions his arrival, in spite of the hostile natives, at Lake Victoria N'yanza; and also his reception by a friendly native king who testified his pleasure by beheading one hundred and seven of his subjects!

3. That the negroes are incorrigible liars, treacherous and indolent, and wherever they have come in contact with slave hunters thoroughly brutalized; yet having natural traits of character which, under the influences of a firm and just government, would gradually lift them up to the level of civilization, and make Central Africa a centre of industry, commerce, education, political power, and social order and happiness.

4. That the Egyptian Mohammedans, as a rule, are as great liars as the Negroes, as great thieves and cowards; and, with exceptions, thoroughly given over to slavery and the slave traffic. Hence what we call public opinion is wholly against the efforts of the Khedive to abolish the traffic and establish law and order in Equatorial Africa. It is the old story of Paul against Demetrius and the silver smiths of Ephesus.

12. Assyrian Discoveries; an Account of Explorations and Discoveries on the Site of Nineveh, during 1878 and 1874, by George Smith, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum. With Illustrations. Scribner, Armstrong and Co. $4.00.

We have not space in an ordinary book notice to bring out these interesting and important discoveries of Mr. Smith, as they bear upon the Bible History; and so in our next we shall make them the subject of an article in the General Review. In the meantime let us say that no book has appeared, since Layard's Nineveh, so attractive and valuable to the Biblical student.
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A very excellent "collection," containing some of the choicest things in English literature, all aglow with the hopeful and cheerful spirit of our faith. We find among them many of our special favorites, whose beauty and sweetness will commend them to all who are in affliction, to all who find it so difficult sometimes to answer the question, Why? in a spirit of trust and resignation. We think the book will prove a welcome and comforting visitor in the sick room; and it must be useful anywhere in strengthening the weak in faith, cheer ing the desolate in heart, and lifting up them that are bowed down. Pastors will find it a very helpful assistant in their labors among the poor, the afflicted and discouraged.

But this is not all. Let any one who is going out into the woods, on the hills, or by the sea-shore, or wherever God may be seen in his works, take this volume with him, and he will find sweetest fellowship in the poems on "Nature," "Morning and Evening." "Rest," on page 141, ought to have a foot-note, stating that it was found under the pillow of a soldier who had died in the hospital during the late rebellion. It is this fact which gives it to its pathetic interest.


The sight of this volume makes us regret more than ever our need of a denominational Publishing Fund. Here are the complete works of the world-admired Channing—a volume of 980 pages, double columns, clear, readable type, reasonably good paper, neatly and thoroughly bound—all for one dollar! Nothing but a publishing fund, furnished by the wise and generous contributions of the people, could make this possible. O that we had the means of doing a like work with some of our books, sending them broad-cast through the nation at less than cost, so that all who wished could procure and read them. Channing's entire works, sent by mail, postage paid, for one dollar! Henceforth no one can plead poverty as an excuse for not owning the works of this gifted preacher.


As a general statement of obligations resting on believers, and of their duty to be faithful to them, the book of Mr. Faunce is well conceived, and it will be helpful to hundreds who are seeking by godly lives to increase the efficiency of Christianity in Christian lands, and to commend it to the faith and practice of heathen countries. But it needs to be more specific in its counsels to be of much service to those who are daily asking themselves the questions which are given on page 18; who cannot quite satisfy themselves that the Bible rules in these cases "were evidently given to meet a condition of things long since passed away," though they may be reluctant to apply them literally
to the present and to themselves; and who are unable to decide to what extent they must deny themselves, and bear the burdens of the poor, the ignorant, the criminal and wretched, in order to fulfil the law of Christ. Here is a "beautiful extract":

"And where is our compassion, where our fellow-feeling for our fellow-men, to say nothing of our sympathy with God and Jesus Christ, if we do not offer up earnest and uncasing prayers for a whole race of human beings, the greater part of whom are bond-slaves of Satan, and are falling, one every second, into the region of unending despair?"

And pray, Mr. Faunce, will you tell us where God's compassion is, and Christ's sympathy, when they see sixty souls falling every minute into endless damnation, and having all spiritual power to save them, yet do not save them? And what heed would such beings be likely to give to our "earnest and uncasing prayers?"

---

**BOOK NOTES.**

*Biographia Diabolica; Being a choice Collection of the most Valuable Books relating to The Devil; his Origin, Greatness and Influence, comprising the most important works on The Devil, Satan, Demons, Hell, Hell-Torments, Magic, Witchcraft, Sorcery, Divinations, Superstitions, Angels, Ghosts, &c., &c.; with some curious volumes on Dreams and Astrology. In Two Parts. Pro and Con. Serious and humorous. Chronologically arranged with Notes, Quotations and Proverbs, and a copious Index. Illustrated with Twelve Curious Designs. On sale by Scribner, Welford & Armstrong. New York. 60 cts. [A friend has sent us a copy of this work, and we put the title on record here for the benefit of those who are curious in such matters. It shows diligent search and reading, and perfect familiarity with the literature of the subject; beginning with the trial of Dame Alice for Sorcery, in 1364, and coming down to the London edition of St. Gregory's Dialogues on the Devil, the whole making nearly 560 titles! There is a large number on the subject of Future Punishment and Endless Torments, which may be of service to the Librarian of our Historical Society. Copies of this Catalogue should be secured for all our college libraries. It will prove very serviceable to the future historian of church dogmatics.]

Oriental and Linguistic Studies. Second Series. The East and West; Religion and Mythology; Orthography and Phonology; Hindu Astronomy. By William D. Whitney. Yale Professor of Sanscrit. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. $2.60. [A collection of twelve previously printed papers, every one of which is a valuable contribution to the historical or the critical literature of our country. In Oriental studies Prof. Whitney is without a rival in America, and with few if any equals in Europe. His criticisms of Muller, Cox and Alfred, and "How shall we Spell?", "The Elements of Pronunciation," and "Bell's Visible Speech," discover his accurate linguistic knowledge; while in "The Lunar Zodiac" he soars out into depths where trying to follow we feared, as did the mariners with Columbus, that we should never get back to land again.]

The Houses of Lancaster and York, with the Conquest and the Loss of France. By James Gairdner. With Five Maps. Scribner Armstrong & Co. $1.00. [Another volume of that neat, convenient and excellent series, "Epochs of History," received with such favor by the public. This issue is fully up to the standard, and we have obtained from it a clearer view of the "War of the Roses," and of the questions in controversy, than from any other work on the subject. And we may say the same in regard to the extent of the English possessions and conquests in France, which gave rise to the inscription on English coins — "By grace of God, King of England, France, and Ireland" — which, we believe, was not discontinued till 1801. The maps are a happy conception, and of themselves histories.]
Our former paper gave the the story of Walter Balfour's outward life. But how much of labor and of varied influence and experience those few dates and statements included! Mr. Balfour's accession to our ranks was, in an important sense, an epoch in the history of Universalism. 'Our young and struggling Church had not been wholly lacking in scholarly men. Samuel C. Loveland—whose biography ought to be worthily given us, showing us the man, by Dr. Sawyer, or some one who knew him well— is deserving of honorable mention in this regard; and other names might, perhaps, be added. But, with very few exceptions, up to this time, our preachers had been self-made men—strong-minded, practical, well-informed, for the most part, but men with none of the learning and culture of the schools; coming directly from the people; stepping from the shop and the farm into the pulpit; better able to discuss principles than to dig among the roots of philology; more skilful in forging chains of logic and in wielding the weapons of common sense than in handling Greek or Hebrew dialectics; and better prepared to vanquish an adversary with the good old Saxon of the English Bible, faulty in some respects as the translation is, than to confound them by learned treatises on the meaning of the original. It was no small thing, therefore, when a man of the acquirements of Mr. Balfour, able to meet the learned on their own ground and dig among philological roots to their heart's content, and able, therefore, to furnish his brethren with materials for a juster verbal criticism, joined his fortunes with us. His Letters to Stuart and his two Inquiries, together with some of his miscellaneous expositions, are doubtless to be reckoned among the most effective of all the instrumentalities that wrought in
behalf of Universalism from 1823 to 1840; nor have the Inquiries ceased their good work yet.

His influence, it has to be confessed, has, from the first, been greatly qualified by the nature of some of his opinions. For this reason, he has never been as wide, and cannot be as permanent, or as useful, a power in the life of our Church, as his labors deserved, or as he would otherwise have been. Not only was he a most dogmatic advocate, in its baldest and extremest form, of the doctrine of salvation by grace,—which meant to him happiness in the future world,—pertinaciously insisting that an instantaneous resurrection, at the last trump, is to put us all at once into glory, utterly irrespective of faith, or antecedent life or character,¹ but he was a most inveterate railer against the doctrine of the native immortality of the soul.

I much doubt, after some study of his utterances on this latter point, whether his ideas were very exact, or altogether clear to himself concerning it. For though the doctrine of the non-immortality of the soul was the under-current of all his thought, and formed the chief burden of at least two of his largest books, and though he never lost an opportunity to shoot his arrows at "the heathen doctrine of an immortal soul," as he called it,—sometimes in very harsh and even coarse terms, he yet talks much of death as a sleep, and tells us "that the spirit, or life, of every man returns unto God who gave it," and "is laid up with Christ in God, to be restored to man in the resurrection at the last day."² He appears not to have perceived the confusion in his terms as he thus theorized about "restoring to man" what, if man has any distinct entity, is the man himself. As little does it seem to have occurred to him that if death is, in any actual sense a sleep, there must be in us some living principle to sleep, and that if there is anything in us that "returns to God" at death, to be "laid up with Christ in God," there must be something in us which survives death, and that in either case there is an undying element in our being, necessitating at the last, in some

¹See, as examples, Letters to Hudson, pp. 33, 36, 47, 120. Also, Essays, p. 192.
²Essays, p. 205.
form, his hated doctrine of an immortal essence. But however he may have failed in exactitude of thought, and therefore in entire consistency on this point, it is clear that his philosophy was thoroughly materialistic; that he recognized nothing in man except as the result of organization; that, whatever terms he occasionally employed implying the contrary, death, in his conception, is the perishing of the whole man, "body, soul and spirit," so that he utterly ceases to be; and that there is any future life to be anticipated only as the result of another organization—the new and spiritual body which is to be the outcome of the resurrection: though what it is that is to be clothed with this spiritual body if there is nothing in us which survives death, or how this resurrection, according to his thought, can be anything but a new act of creation under the name of a resurrection, he never, that I am aware, undertook to explain.

Did it fall within the design of these Sketches, it might be interesting to pause here, for some analysis and discussion of the theory thus brought to our notice. But our sole aim is to picture men, not to discuss opinions. This glance at what were, in substance, Mr. Balfour's views on this subject, gives us, therefore, all that here concerns us. At first, these views obtained some acceptance among us. Tyros and hasty and superficial thinkers there were, ready to adopt any new opinions that more sharply antagonized the prevalent "orthodoxy," especially if put forth by one having any claim to a hearing, who at once laid hold of them,—to put them forth, ten, in a shape even more offensive than Father Balfour's, because unaccompanied by the earnest religiousness which in his best moods always characterized him. I heard them so forth once in 1845, in an inland town of eastern Maine, a ministerial fledgling, fresh from Balfour's pages. Preaching in a schoolhouse to a score or two of people who needed a very different message, he proclaimed our non-immortality,


* On neither of these points are special references necessary. Consult Letters and Essays, ad libitum.
and the certainty of our felicity through the resurrection however we might live, or fail to live here, in a form so grossly materialistic that, young as I was, I went home grieved and disgusted, feeling that if that was Universalism, the less we had of it the better. It was preaching that no one could hear, at all agreeing with it, without having self-respect lowered, and all religious sensibility and concern proportionally undermined. And that young man was but the type of others, including some who were older; and the moral tendency of that day's preaching only sampled more preaching of this sort in the name of Universalism than was good for it, from 1828 to 1835, perhaps on to 1840. Fortunately, however—and in saying this, I do not forget that something like Father Balfour's opinions touching the non-immortality of the soul has been held, before him and since, by Christian men of no mean standing, and by some among us who were neither tyros, nor hasty thinkers—fortunately, as most of us feel, the leading minds of our Church alike lay and ministerial, while holding Mr. Balfour personally in great respect, have never had the slightest sympathy with his opinions in this particular. Nowhere were these opinions more repugnant than among us to the prevailing Christian consciousness of the people; and nowhere, therefore, despite any temporary eddies of favor for them, was the whole current of sentiment more hostile, or decided, against them: a fact which those who have manufactured misrepresentations of Universalism have always found it convenient to overlook, rendering still more flagrant the criminality which, notwithstanding repeated denials and explanations, has gone on persistently citing Mr. Balfour's extremest statements as if, instead of speaking solely for himself on this point, he had uttered the convictions of the entire Church.

Those to whom Universalism is chiefly precious as a minis-try of spiritual power, will never cease profoundly to regret that any man should have held such opinions and called them by its name, and especially that so good a man as Mr. Balfour should have given so much time and labor to promulgate and defend them. But, much as this may have been regretted
no one probably who really knew him was ever surprised that
his opinions were thus what they were. They were the natural
result, first, of the structure of his mind, and secondly, of his
training and habits of thought.

In the first place, a Scotchman, he had a peculiarly Scotch
mind, without the slightest scintillation of Scotch genius—
cold, plodding, literal, unimaginative. Something of the
spiritual faculty he had, as every man has; but it was dormant.
He lacked insight. He had little or no spiritual vision; ex-
cept in certain directions, was very little in sympathy with
purely spiritual views of things. He believed in God, in
Christ, in the Bible—no man ever believed in them more de-
voutly; and so believing, he recognized the spirituality of God
and of the religion of Christ. But as to every thing else, his
thinking was upon the most literal, not to say material, plane.
The consequence was natural. Paul said in his day, "The
letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life"; and this is true uni-
versally. Language is at best but a kind of straight-jacket
for all large and subtle thought. Especially is it inadequate
for the full expression of such facts and truths as the Bible
announces. The soul of any communication, and above all of
any Bible communication, escapes us if its mere letter be alone
regarded. Father Balfour seems, to no small extent, to have
forgotten this, as, constituted as he was mentally, he could
hardly have failed, without special counter effort, to forget it;
and forgetting, he signally illustrated it. He dealt with lan-
guage, for the most part, as a thing of forms and roots, seldom
as a thing of spiritual suggestiveness; much as if, looking
through a window, one should assume that he takes in all
that the scene includes and means, when his eye seizes only
the bare outlines of house and field and tree, making no allow-
ance for the thousand hidden and innermost things which
these can only remotely hint. Belonging to the class con-
cerning one of whom it is said

"A primrose on the river's brim
A yellow primrose was to him,
And it was nothing more,"
a word to him was a kind of philological fixed quantity, standing for just so much as its root indicates, as 2 stands for two, and that only. On this account, while his faith in the Bible was absolute, and his deference to it unquestioning, his interpretation of it, as the rule, was purely formal and realistic. Dr. Whittemore, I remember, as several of us were talking of this peculiarity, once said, "If Father Balfour had a five dollar bill about which he was in doubt, he would take it to the Bible to see if it were genuine." Such a regard for the Bible, *in spirit*, is worthy of all imitation; but so almost exclusively literal as it was in him, allowing to any word only its most technical import, and insisting on a "Thus saith the Lord" for even the minutest particulars of faith, it could hardly have resulted otherwise than in just the opinions it did.

Then, in the second place, Father Balfour was by training a Calvinist of Calvinists, and by nature extremely "set" and tenacious in his opinions. He had, indeed, an intense love of truth. He despised all obsequiousness to mere human authority, and thought his own thought, and reached his own conclusions, in a very individual and independent way. No man was ever less disposed to follow prescription, or to think with the multitude, or to pin his faith on the sleeve of any Church, or creed. Hence, no matter what Dr. Morse, or the *elite* of Charlestown "orthodoxy" might think, or how it might break his relations with them, if he saw reason to hold to a weekly administration of the Lord's Supper, he so declared himself; and coming to believe in immersion, he was straightway immersed, taking his position accordingly; and set to thinking by Prof. Stuart in the direction of Universalism, he honestly kept on thinking, though it did lead him towards conclusions which he had hitherto regarded with disfavor, and though consequences quite undesirable personally to himself might ensue. But his mind had little or no elasticity. It did not easily react. Once bent, it usually retained that inflexion, so that whatever changes his opinions might, in some respects, undergo, the bent was the same. In other words, once settled into a given kind of thinking, he kept on doing that same kind
of general thinking, however he might at some points be "switched off" on to another track, or travel here and there to different conclusions. The underlying method and principle remained the same, however scope might be extended, or results vary. Ingrained, therefore, as Calvinism had become in his very being, he did not cease,—it is scarcely too much to say he could not cease, to be a Calvinist though he did become a Universalist—except as to incidental details and largeness of issue. The cast of his thought, and therefore his essential philosophy of the Divine Government was just as Calvinistic as before.

All his conceptions, especially as to our attainment of felicity in the future world, were thus pre-determined. As he saw things, there could be no salvation except by the unconditional grace of God; and whatever else might, or might not be true, heaven, he was fixed in believing, was to be thought of only as an absolutely free gift to all, without regard to faith or character. But this of necessity excluded any continuance of character beyond death, and therefore any continuance of moral agencies for the change of character; and this again naturally suggested the non-continuance of the soul itself. For if the soul continue, how can character but continue, and with it the necessity of means to change it? And what, then, becomes of felicity in heaven as absolutely a free gift, without regard to character? So, apparently, he reasoned. Hence the significance of a remark of Dr. Whittier, to the effect that "in Mr. Balfour's mind, the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul and that of future retribution stood or fell together." That is to say, conceding the immortality of the soul, and the moral nature of Christ's saving work in the future life as here, there seemed to him no way to escape the conclusion that salvation must cease to be thought of as a free gift in any absolute sense, and be regarded as something to be wrought in us hereafter just as purity is wrought in us through Christ here. But led by his investigations to see that neither of the words translated hell in the Bible has any reference to a place of future punishment,
unable to conceive of any discipline beyond death except in some such place, and finding it impossible to yield his Calvinistic conception of free grace, or to think of salvation in the sense of heavenly happiness except as an unconditional gift, it was a short step for him to the deduction that there could be no such discipline, and by consequence, no surviving soul to be disciplined,—only death as "the end of all," and then, at the final trump, a resurrection, taking all alike by free grace, in some mystical sense in Christ, at once into heaven.

This, or something like it, seems to have been the path through which he travelled to his doctrine of the non-immortality of the soul. The two elements thus brought into view, his mental structure and his invincible Calvinistic training, lay at the bottom of it all.

Is it asked now, whether Father Balfour was, in any sense, intellectually a great man? It is doing him no injustice to say that he was not. He was, conspicuously, an industrious man; but his mind was neither large nor deep. I have said he lacked insight. He lacked breadth also; lacked intuitiveness and spontaneity; lacked compass, sweep, originality. He was a specialist, always following some cue, and running, alike in thought and taste, in narrow ruts, rather than moving in any amplitude or comprehensiveness of range. His eminence in his particular line—for there was a time when he was eminent, and his name deserves honorable mention always among those most prominent in our history—came of an unconquerable application, of steady, patient, persevering work, and not of any brilliance, capaciousness, or peculiar vigor of intellect. He was distinctively a plodder. Stick-to-it-ateness (if such a word may be pardoned on these pages) was his only genius—This he had in a remarkable degree.

How accurate he was in the scholarship he thus attained, or how extensive were his acquirements, I am not competent to say. His accuracy was sometimes challenged, but I am not aware that, lynx-eyed and eager as his antagonists were, he was ever convicted of serious mistake; nor, plodder as he
was, can I easily conceive of him as otherwise than tolerably accurate in the substance of his scholarship. Taking his writings as a fair reflex of his mental habits and attainments, indeed, it has to be conceded that he was not very painstaking in the expression of what he had to say. As a writer, he was about as far from being scholarly as he well could be, writing for publication at all. His composition is in no sense rhetoric. It has neither grace, nor polish, and is not always even grammatically correct. It is plain, off-hand, homely talk of the commonest sort, frequently in the rudest and roughest vernacular, especially in his controversial writings.

But this was the man — for as he thus wrote, so he preached. An instance or two will show this better than any description. Preaching from the text, "And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good," after having read the words, he immediately began, "It says nothing about his making a hell. If he had, it would have been a good hell, for everything he had made is declared 'very good.'" On another occasion, having heard a sermon from one of our ministers, touching the idea that one must be "willing to be damned" in order to be saved, he arose and said, "I should like to spâck a wor-rd. I was thûinking while Bro. Grûnwood was prâching, that if any body must be dômned, it better be them that's willing to be dômned. For myself I'm not wûlling to be dômned. I've no more to say." Imagine these things spoken in the broadest of Scotch brogues, in the hitching way described in our opening, and one can very well conceive how he always preached as to manner, and also as to language and method of treatment, and how, therefore, he always wrote, and did whatever he had to do. Addressing himself to anything, he went directly at it; and the particularism, above noted, in which he was fairly open to literary criticism, came, we can hardly think from lack of information, but from the engrossing earnestness with which he surrendered himself to his purpose. So intent was he on this purpose, that he never stopped to cull phrases, and became careless of

---

*Given on the authority of Dr. Thayer.
everything but to hit the object he aimed at, and to hit it
every time, it scarcely mattered to him with what, as hard as
possible.

Herein was exhibited the characteristic quality of his intel-
lect—at once its literalness and its lack of scope and range.
Doing anything, he was, for the time, a man of a single idea.
Given a thought or a text, that was all he saw or knew, and
he went into its treatment, pursuing it to what to him was
the end, much as a good pointer, with nose to the ground,
goes on a trail, oblivious to everything else. What to the
pointer are all the glories of the heavens and all the beauty of
the earth, the songs of birds, or the fragrance of flowers? He
is after his game. Discursive, Father Balfour was, and
sometimes diffuse, as a pointer not unfrequently doubles and
winds about in a very circuitous way; but he never lost his
trail, and pursuing that, however discursively, indulged in no
circumlocutions, and gave himself no care even for the smallest
euphemisms in his terms. A specialist and a plodder, he
"went for" what was before him, heedless though his gram-
matical constructions were faulty, and indifferent though his
vocabulary was of the commonest and baldest, content if he
but struck where he intended.

Out of the same peculiarity of mind which made him what
he was in this respect, came, too, a doughty Scotch obstinacy,
and an immovable doggedness of will, on account of which he
did not always find it easy to adjust himself to others' methods
and opinions, and which, sometimes ludicrous as they showed
themselves, at other times led him into acts rendering him
liable to be seriously misunderstood. An example will illus-
trate this, and at the same time indicate the state of feeling
growing out of the "no-future punishment" feud. Invited to
attend the installation of Rev. Lemuel Willis, a believer in
"future punishment," at Salem, Mass., in March, 1829, he
peremptorily declined, and wrote letters to various brethren
who were to be present, designed to keep them away. This
seemed hardly Christian; and done by most men, it would
have meant only malice, or personal spite. But of such feel-
ings, if through years of intercourse I rightly interpreted him, he was incapable. It meant in his case, simply, on the surface, that he so felt that our good Bro. Willis had failed of his duty in not making an effort to arrange certain difficulties between himself (Father B.) and Rev. Paul Dean, and, underneath, that he was so fixed in the conviction that the settlement over that old parish of a believer in "future punishment," in the condition of affairs then existing, would be a serious mistake, mischievous to what he thought the interests of truth, that, whatever others might decide, he could not consent to participate in the service, nor fail to do what he deemed proper to hinder its consummation. And this shows what, as one of the most pronounced traits of his character, marked him all his life. Not only did he do his own thinking, but, pleasant, always kindly as he was, he was bound, so far as his action was concerned, to travel his own road, and to have his own way. His mind once made up, argument was closed, and all the bulls of Bashan could not move him.

So constituted, does it need to be said that he was, most stiffly and sturdily, a man of great independence of character? For scarcely anything else was he so marked. As Dr. Whittemore well says, "he could not brook dictation, or pride, or superciliousness in any one;" and next to an evasion, or a lie, perhaps nothing more strongly moved his indignation than to have somebody assume airs of superiority, or undertake to play the pope, or to snap a whip over him. That he should fawn upon anybody, or curry favor in any quarter, or calmly submit to arrogance, or be any man's echo, or tool, was in his very nature impossible. Standing squarely upon his own feet, supported by his own vigorous backbone, he expected for himself what he conceded to others, viz., a recognition of manly equality, and of his right, unchallenged, to think his own thought and to be a man after his own fashion.

And yet, while so dogged in his Scotch will, and so pro-

*It is due to Mr. Willis to say that, in his published Reminiscences of his Salem Pastorate; he says, respecting this matter, "I knew them both so well, and their disaffection so fully, that I was certain that no effort of mine would avail anything towards a reconciliation."
nounced in his independence, he was, withal, one of the most thoroughly artless, simple-minded, guileless, unsuspecting men I ever knew. It is difficult, in this respect, to convey a just idea of him to those who never saw him. Perhaps naïveté, with a little streak of "oddity" running through it, will best describe him. He had no sharpness, and was very little a man of the world. Hence, though not unmindful of money, or of thrift, his confidence was often abused, and his guilelessness imposed upon. I never recall him, as I remember him in this particular without wondering at the wariness which kept him from the Post Office, and so saved him from the net which the new editor of the Magazine — doubtless Mr. Whittemore — devised to discover him as An Inquirer after Truth. So artless and ingenious as he was, most of us would have said, it would have been just like him to go for the letter.

This naïveté was, at times, all the more striking because of the utter absence of humor in him, and because, therefore, of his slowness to perceive its point, or to appreciate it in others. One of the stories current in his time in Cornhill, and which Abel Tompkins — of pleasant memory — for years delighted to tell, concerned something "very funny" which was told to Father Balfour; but just "where the laugh came in," failing to catch the joke, he excitedly turned away, exclaiming, "It's a ho-ax, it's a ho-ax!" illustrating alike his lack of humor and his inveterate disinclination to adopt our English pronunciation. This same thing, his artless slowness to perceive points, appears in another story told of him. He had a bad habit, in announcing his hymns, of speaking quite low. For this reason, he was accosted by the choir-leader, one afternoon, as he was going into church where he was spending a Sunday, with the remark, "We didn't quite catch the hymn this morning, Father Balfour, and had hard work, guessing and hunting after it. Please give it louder this afternoon, will you?" "Louder? what louder?" "The hymn, Father Balfour, the hymn." "The hymn?" a little testily. "Yes, I will." When the time for the hymn came, forgetting his promise, he said in his usual low tone, "Let us sing to the

*Given me by Rev. A. G. Laurie, on the authority of Dr. Whittemore.*
praise and glory of God in the use of the three hundred and forty-fifth hymn.” Then, suddenly recollecting his promise, he shouted with all his might, “HYMN!” The choir, with the people, looked up amazed, but they were no whit wiser as to the number of the hymn.

This last story represents him as speaking a little testily. He had a way of so speaking sometimes — sharp, brusque, impatient, the result, in part, of a slightly irascible temperament, and, in part, of his artlessness and naïveté. But his testiness detracted nothing from his general amiability. On the contrary, it served only to give a spice of piquancy to his intercourse with us, which, like mustard in food, we rather enjoyed than otherwise. It seldom showed itself except as, in his innocence, he was moved to serious displeasure. He had a high sense of honor, and a quick sense of injury; and, honest himself, he took it for granted that everybody else was so, until he found himself deceived, or disappointed, or thought himself misused and imposed upon. Then, or when anything had been said or done specially offending against his notions of propriety or truth, we were sure of a gust, and a stranger, witnessing, might have supposed that instead of being one of the kindest and most delightful of men, with an artless and unbounded faith in everybody, he was fuming and petulant, out of all patience with the world, and with no faith in anybody. But we knew what it all meant, and that instead of a thunder storm it was only a little “heat lightning” out of a passing summer evening cloud, behind which lay the pleasantest blue sky. So understanding him, though never failing to regret and condemn whatever real wrong he complained of, we were for the most part only amused at such times, as he sat on the edge of his chair, leaning a little forward (his usual sitting posture at our Cornhill gatherings), grasping his cane, and now and then bringing it decidedly to the floor as he talked, or as he stumbled, in his tripping and irate way, about “Tompkins’ stove,” carrying his cane, with flexed elbow, a little in front of him, held just below the top, and occasionally pounding out his emphasis as he naively and unreservedly “freed his mind.”
I should not have deemed it important to speak of this particular phase of Father Balfour's character, had it not seemed necessary, in justice to him, in order that some things he wrote might be better understood. It is hardly possible that he should not be seriously misjudged without some such explanation. His books— or rather the manner in which some of his debtors treated him, or in which those who attacked his writings referred to them, or in which his labors were, as he felt, "pirated" by some of our own book-makers, gave him great and almost incessant annoyance; and it was, more frequently than by any other cause, by one or another of these reasons for complaint, that he was nettled into these little gusts of protest and free-speaking. It was doubtless in one of the testy moods thus occasioned that he wrote the letter:

6 The letter was sent as a communication to the Universalist Union, published in New York, and appeared in the octavo issue of Aug. 5, 1839. Unable to obtain access to it myself, I am under obligation to Rev. A. C. Thomas for the following account of it, with the extracts he has kindly copied for me:

"The article by Balfour is a long one, treating of the ill pay of clergymen, the lack of punctuality in subscribers to periodicals and its evils, the misfortunes of publishers, &c. I transcribe what he says respecting the latter:

Will those who have written books in defence of Universalism continue to write, or will others succeed them in writing, if their time and labor spent involve them in pecuniary loss? Few, if any, among Universalists have published more books of this kind than myself, and here I could write a long and a sad chapter from my own personal experience. But a few words must suffice. So far from my publications being a profit to me, they have only been a bill of expense and much perplexity, in addition to all my labor in writing them, so much so that I have been tempted to curse the day that I ever published a book. But I began to publish, and defence of what I deemed truth led me farther into it, hoping that Universalists would feel interest enough to prevent my losing by it. Some of them did, and I most gratefully thank them for their kindness. But many Universalists seem to feel little interest in reading and informing themselves as to their professed faith. What is still more painful some, not a few, have got my books, and either from want of honesty, or carelessness, have forgotten to pay for them. Should this article meet their eye, may it have the blessed effect upon them, to perform a long neglected duty to me, the neglect of which has caused me many a sleepless hour, and anxious thought, that I might maintain the character of an honest man. Who will be such a fool as I have been, to publish books on Universal Salvation, if this is the way their labors are to be rewarded? I am heart sick of it; and to be told my books have contributed much to the rapid spread of Universalism, has no tendency to remove this kind of sickness. I have listened with a heavy heart to persons telling me my books were the means of converting them to Universalism, when they had converted me into pecuniary embarrassments by their publication. Few Universalists who publish books can afford to lose by them; and still fewer are willing to do it. But let books cease to be circulated on the subject, and no reply made to our opponents, and who will venture to predict Universalism will go on and flourish as in past years? We have no reason to expect this, unless these means have in time past been useless in promoting its prosperity."

The above is the paragraph entire. Later in the article is the following:

1 Were I to commence my writing life with my present experience, I would send my books to no man, except booksellers on commission. Nor would I sell them on credit, except to persons whom I knew to be trustworthy."
which M. H. Smith so garblingly quotes in his Universalism not of God, to show the demoralizing effects of Universalism, hypocritically adding, "A dreadful experience!" He knew Father Balfour well, and had therefore the easy explanation of the extravagant statements he quoted; but it served his base purpose to cite them and put the worst construction upon them, and he did so. Father Balfour utterly repudiated any such construction, insisting that the communication explained itself. This is true; but the letter was none the less extravagant. It well illustrates, however, how, because of the constitutional impatience and testiness to which I have referred, conjoined with his artlessness and his utter openness and sincerity, he often spoke and wrote without any brake upon the wheels of his impulse, or any hold-back in the flow of whatever came to lip or pen for utterance. His controversial pages furnish numerous examples of the same thing—conveying the impression to a stranger reading them, that he was a very different man as to temper and spirit, from what he actually was. Following the injunction of our Lord in one respect, he had the harmlessness of the dove, but the wisdom of the serpent was wanting. With his frankness and impatience, he knew nothing of concealment or reserve, and never learned the lesson that sometimes "discretion is the better part of valor," or that, thinking or feeling, it is not always best to give vent to everything that is thought or felt, just as it comes to mind.

But whatever the peculiarities of Father Balfour, in these or other respects, requiring to be noted in any attempt justly to portray him, they in no way touched him at the core, and subtracted nothing from the purity of his life, or the Christian excellence of his character. He was eminently a good man. Intellectually, as has been intimated, he had no special distinction except for his industry; and as an author, he is even now, to a considerable extent, obsolete. In the progress of learning and criticism, not a few of his interpretations have been outgrown, and at many points his conceptions of Biblical meanings, once current among us, have been superseded by
those broader and more spiritual; while, speaking of his books as a whole, it has to be confessed that only to a limited degree do they represent, either as to doctrine or method, the present thought of our Church. This is the penalty to which all are subject who write in transitional periods, in any department of thought; and so opposed as some of his opinions were from the very first to those prevalent among us, this penalty has in an especial manner fallen upon Father Balfour's labors. His books— all of some of them, and considerable portions of others—are of a kind which few if any of us would care to put into the hands of one ignorant of Universalism, and wishing to learn what it now is. Only ideas the farthest possible from the facts could be gathered from them by such a reader; nor, turning over some of his pages, is there room for much surprise that, despite all our disclaimers, such impressions concerning Universalism as constitute the basis of most of the prejudice against it have come to prevail, when so much in one of our most fruitful writers can be found to warrant them. Whatever difference of opinion there may be among us as to the extent to which the doctrine of "no-future punishment" has ceased to be the faith of our Church, it will probably be agreed by all that in the bald and materialistic form in which Father Balfour held it, it is scarcely now to be found; and as to methods, it is certain that a stranger who should accept some of his books as at all an index of the feeling and practice now existing in our Church, would be utterly misled. He opposes "prayer-meetings," "inquiry-meetings," and all special means for awakening a religious concern; and, if possible, he opposes even more virulently all means designed "to procure money to print tracts, educate ministers, and send out missionaries." He bases his opposition, it is true, on the ground that these things are got up "to save immortal souls," —a work, as he believed, in which only God has anything to do; but a stranger reading him, would not only conclude, if any attention were given to this ground of opposition, that all Universalists are in like manner averse to "saving souls," but—

would take it for granted that the opposition, as the substantive fact in the case, is shared by us all, and would be amazed to learn that the things opposed were long since adopted as parts of our general system of Church-work. For these reasons, though some of his productions have a permanent value, the most of them are already passé, and are certain every year to become more so.

While, however, these things being so no, claim can be set up for Father Balfour as in any sense a great man, or a great preacher, and he is to hold no such place among our writers as, considering his sincerity and assiduity, we could desire, as a good man his position is unchallenged and secure. It was for what he thus was that those of us who knew him loved and honored him most while he was bodily with us; and it is because of what he was in this particular that his name most deserves to be embalmed in our history. Though not without his weaknesses, and perhaps his faults, his integrity was ingrained and without a flaw. He had a loathing for anything mean. With all the force of his nature he shrank from anything wrong. He was good in the very staple of his character. Perhaps honesty, better than any other single word, indicates his distinguishing trait. What is right? there is reason to believe, was the regnant question with him; and if, in anything, what he did, or failed to do, seemed not quite right to others, it was always safe to be assured that it was entirely right to him. Tenacious and somewhat pugnacious in his opinions, he was nevertheless one of the most genial, humble and unassuming of men, ready always to speak a kind word, or to do a kind act, whenever he could. Consequently, though gifted with neither wit nor humor, he was a most agreeable companion socially; and those accustomed, in the years ago, to mingle in our Cornhill Monday-gatherings, have numerous

It is due to Father Balfour to say that he was by no means alone in his position concerning these things. It was the position, on various grounds, of nearly all our preachers in those early days: a fact which goes far to explain many things, and which, especially, should lessen our surprise that our people do not learn the lesson of Church-giving as rapidly as could be desired. The effects of a bad education are not easily, or quickly, outgrown.
pleasant recollections of him, and of happy hours with him, as one of the chief figures there, as his peculiar speech still lingers in our ears, and his face and form still keep their place in our hearts.

And then, underneath all that he otherwise was, and giving charm and fragrance to all, he was a thoroughly religious man. At times, indeed, as in his blunt, rough way he dealt his iconoclastic blows, and spoke his mind, off hand, concerning what he called "heatfen" errors, strangers were not unfrequently shocked, and found it difficult to credit him with reverence, or to believe that he had much religious sensibility or feeling. But he was never consciously irreverent. Nothing grieved him more than to be suspected of being so. If he ever so seemed, it was in word, not in thought, or spirit. I think I never knew a man more reverent or devout; and occasions there were, when, deeply moved religiously himself, he would pour out his soul in his unstudied talk with a pathos and a power that moved us all. I remember one such occasion particularly. It was at a Conference Meeting in Cambridgeport. The thought of the meeting was the divine efficacy of Religion to bring God near, and to cheer and support in the midst of the severest experiences. Father Balfour accepted the theme, and yielding himself to its inspiration, took us up into the very presence of the Father, giving special impressiveness to his words by describing the case of an old Scotch woman whom he had known—bed-ridden for years, helpless, dependent upon charity, and suffering constant pain, but filled with such a sense of God and His nearness and love, and living so in the companionship of the Saviour, that, he said, she was the happiest person he ever saw, and to enter her room was to walk, as it were, in the atmosphere of heaven. That address will never fade out of my memory, and its effect, I trust, will never cease from my life. It was an address that only a profoundly religious man, himself dwelling near to God, could have made; and in it we had a revelation of what was deepest in Father Balfour's heart. He was an earnest, pious, Christian man, believing in prayer; believing in
the Bible; loving the Saviour; and taking hold of God with a child-like faith that saturated his whole being with its influence. Whatever we may think as to the tendency of some of his opinions, it was apparent to all who were much with him, that he "had been with Jesus," and that, like Enoch, he "walked with God."

That one so full of faith in God and religion should hold the Bible in great regard, was what might have been expected. As we have seen, Father Balfour did so hold it. He built everything upon it. Regret as we may that he could not have read it, if not with less reference to the letter, at least with more reference to the spirit, it has to be said of him that no man, perhaps, ever folded it to his heart in a reverence more nearly approaching idolatry. If he had any conspicuous thought above all others, any one idea possessing him, this was it,—the inestimable worth of the Bible, the importance of its study, and the evil certain to result from its neglect. This was the key-note of the larger portion of his public utterances, especially during his later years. Because he thought their effect would be to induce parents to neglect the Bible-instruction and religious training of their children at home, he was at first opposed to Sunday Schools; and though he subsequently favored their establishment in self-defence, as a means of keeping our children out of the schools of other sects, he never very heartily endorsed them. Nor is it a fact unworthy of mention here,—is it not, rather, a fact of special interest, deserving to be emphasized upon our remembrance, as indicating vital conditions of our welfare?—that the importance of the Bible and the importance of prayer were, in substance, the topics of the last contribution to the press which his hand ever penned,—in a sense his last words of love to us as a people. And could he speak to us from the immortal shore, indicating which of all his counsels he would have us ponder most seriously, I doubt not they would be these: "The controversies now at rest will be brought up again in the next generation, if parents and teachers are not careful to get youth well instructed in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and [to]
examine for themselves, What is truth? If Universalists sleep, and allow their children to sleep with them, while men are sowing their tares, it is easily seen what work is preparing for the next generation. They ought to see to it that Universalists in name be also Christians, and able and willing to defend what they believe from the Scriptures. There can be no safety from controversy until Christians are correctly and generally instructed in the Scriptures, for so long as general ignorance of them prevails, there will always be some who will impose on the ignorant for selfish and sectarian purposes."

"Until the Bible is universally read and attended to, how can we ever expect the pure and undefiled religion of Christ to prevail? We may multiply sects, books and meeting-houses, until they are past numbering, but the Word of God, and men taught to read it, would do more good than all our modern means put together to convert mankind."

What wiser words ever dropped from human pen? Or how can we better honor him who wrote them than by heeding the admonitions which thus, "being dead, he yet speaketh."

But we must not further linger. Gratefully and lovingly, despite his errors and limitations, should the name of Walter Balfour be cherished in our Church. He did what he could. No man ever wrought more seriously or sincerely; and though his errors and limitations greatly restricted and qualified what he did, they could not make it otherwise than, in large measure, a work of help towards the truth. So far as it was so, he still survives, and will survive, leading souls into light.

By a singular coincidence, Prof. Stuart, through whose unwitting labors he was led into Universalism, died the day after his departure. Is it an unauthorized, or altogether fanciful thought, that, in the orderings of Providence, our venerable and excellent father was so first called among the immortals, that he might welcome there his equally venerable and excellent compeer, with whom he had been so much in debate, to


 reciprocate his offices of help by introducing him into the arger and clearer displays of grace and truth, which were to settle all their controversies and demonstrate the glory of God as the Father, and the efficiency of Christ as the Redeemer of all souls? If it be allowed us so to think, the work thus given him on the other side of the veil does but symbolize the work appointed to him and to every teacher of truth, wherever his influence may reach, or he may personally be, so long as any need to be taught, or to be helped towards God. Death may consign their bodies to the dust, but it cannot stop their work. And so it is for us to rejoice that, though he long ago went out from the company of those living in the flesh, and while his mistakes and misconceptions are sure to pass away, our quaint but beloved Father Balfour, by the power of whatever truth he taught and of the good life he lived, is to be a perpetual force for the instruction and redemption of the world.

Article XV.

Our New Departure.1

It is not proposed, in preparing this paper, to undertake an elaborate review of the work above noted. A few words, however, in relation to one or two points may not be inappropriate. Written as a sort of paternal admonition to the Universalist Church, it cannot be expected to be of much interest to parties outside. Among Universalists it has already passed the ordeal of popular judgment, and its matter, spirit and suggestions have been differently estimated by different minds. It is not to be presumed that the book will accomplish all the good expected on the one hand, or inflict any serious damage that may be apprehended on the other. Severe criticism and
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gushing commendation are, therefore, alike inappropriate. It will doubtless soon drop from public thought, and its mission, if accomplished at all, will be accomplished in the quiet, imperceptible and perhaps unconscious changes that may occur in the Church and its members.

It is much to be regretted that the author did not bestow greater care and attention in the preparation of his book, and give it a higher place in the ranks of modern classic literature. Aside from its exaggerated views and searching dissections of the past methods of the Universalist Church, its literary blemishes are too apparent and too intrusive to secure for it a very pleasant perusal. Its sentences are often thrown together without order, and with little regard to elegance of diction; they are so wordy and so crowded with adjuncts and explanatory clauses as to render them tedious and obscure, and to require a second, and perhaps a third reading before their meaning can be apprehended. The fault may indeed lie in a lack of attention on the part of the reader. But the book fails to compel attention, like the fresh, terse, vivacious utterances of a master in English literature. Some books are very readable, though the opinions enunciated may be deemed erroneous; others are scarcely bearable even when, in relation to facts and opinions, the reader and writer are in full accord.

Mr. Brooks justly occupies a very high position, and perhaps aspires to be a leader, in the Universalist Church. He has certainly been a severe and indefatigable student; and, in this respect, whatever may be his aspirations, and whatever may have been his advantages or disadvantages, he stands preëminent and worthy of all praise. Perhaps, too, he may have achieved the grace and fitness requisite to a successful leadership in a new religious denomination. When John Wesley cast away the effete processes of his ancestral Church, and wrought for himself a name and a leadership in an enterprise which resulted in a new Christian denomination, he brought to the work great natural abilities, thorough literary and theological attainments, invincible force of character, attractive oratory, rigid self-denial, method and enthusiasm.
Such qualifications are no less important or essential to success in our own times than at any period of Christian history. In the conduct and management of our own Church they become especially necessary, since the cases are entirely different and dissimilar.

Between Universalists and other branches of the great Christian Church, there are points of difference of the most grave and momentous concernment. They are points, too, which in Our New Departure seem to have been entirely overlooked. Most of the great Christian reformers of recent centuries commenced and carried on their work within the compass or reach of a common and established creed. It was not an effort, on their part, to overthrow an old massive religious structure which had stood and frowned for ages, and required ages of persevering labor with the sharpest intellectual conflict and the aid of civil authority to erect and establish. The very touch with a view of assault upon its fundamental principles was as severely rebuked and as keenly resisted by the early reformers as by the mother Church. Their effort was a mere work of correction, a very earnest endeavor for the extirpation of what they deemed pernicious errors, that had slowly and silently worked their way into the Church. At the same time the fundamental principles of the old formula remained intact. Yet these reformers worked well in their sphere and were successful in their work. They were anathematized by their mother, and suffered both persecution and ecclesiastical excision as heretics and schismatics; but in their "new departure" they carried with them the old formula of Christian doctrine, cherished too, as dearly and tenderly as the borrowed jewels borne away by the Hebrews in their exodus from Egypt. Their work, therefore, was a matter of comparative ease—a mere labor of expurgation and reinvestment. They fought only against offensive excrescences—wild, rank, fetid scions engrafted upon the goodly stock.

Even the later sects which sprang up in the great Protestant Church, had each their one idea, their one overcoming thought deemed indispensable to the purification and perfec-
tion of the old creed; but the creed itself, drawn from the earlier ages, was still retained. These sects too may have suffered persecution for the enunciation of very small differences of opinion, but if their points were of any real value to humanity and were taken in adaptation to popular necessities or the hidden springs of human action, success was inevitable and progress rapid. The Methodists, for example, have run a very rapid course. They bore away the old theory of a triune God, eternal generation, vicarious atonement, unceasing perdition and all the essential elements connected with it. They tore out the sacred heart, the completed formula of Christian faith;—aye, more, they embraced the full creed, and even kissed the sacred body, with unquestioning devotion, as washed, purified and dressed anew, by Luther, Calvin, Arminius and other great lights and leaders of the Reformation! They merely “reconstructed” the work of these reformers, and made the Reformation a reformed or “revised edition” of the old creed with an appendix.

That appendix was constructed with special reference to the deep religious fervor, the germs of which are always present in the human heart. In a religion deemed too cold and formal it became an essential force for the generation of more heat and more enthusiasm. It had its marvels and its mystery, its supernatural and inexplicable, attracting, alluring, captivating and even entrancing the lower class of mind. By means of its mysterious element it opened a new way to glory—a sort of illuminated avenue through which sinners could escape impending ruin—escape even the just punishment of their sin, and be made wholly righteous by substitution. It announced a striving spirit and a mysterious change or supernatural new birth wrought through its influence—all of which must be earnestly sought for, with agonizing prayer and entreaty, without intermission and without doubting, or even questioning its reality. Such was the substance of that sublime appendix superadded to the revised formula of the early Protestant Church. The mystery, the fear, the penitential delights, the sincere piety, the true religious fervor, the ear-
nest entreaty and the gushing enthusiasm, all conspired to render the progress of this form of old Christianity comparatively easy and remarkably rapid. In like manner all other sects erecting their superstructure upon the old foundation—the Athanasian creed—have found the work of proselyting and progress much less difficult. The work is already fitted to their hands. The formula, already drawn up and completed, was "signed, sealed, and delivered" amidst the stormy conflicts and fatal wranglings of a long past age. They have only to receive it, swear by it and place it in safe repose in the penetralia of their household gods. All that remains for them to do is to prune, improve, readorn and modernize the old structure. Thus whether the authority of the "Mother Church" be admitted or not, whether its infallibility be recognized or set at naught, all "evangelical" Protestant denominations stand openly and without concealment on its fundamental platform!

The condition of our own Church and of all liberal Churches is entirely different. Receiving the Hebrew and Christian books as divine Oracles, we go back to that foundation and begin anew. It is for us a work of renovation and reconstruction. Unfortunately, perhaps it may be said, scarcely a fragment from the old building can be received as suitable for the superstructure we propose to erect. It is absolute regeneration, or the restoration of primitive Christianity in adaptation to the countless changes of the world and the changed condition of the people, which we hope to achieve. The whole Athanasian formula, therefore, with its philosophy, its claims, modifications and adornments is thrown aside. Many of the early Universalists did indeed receive it, and attempted to engraft their distinctive doctrine upon the theory of an infinite vicarious sacrifice. But it was soon ascertained that their logic was fatally in fault. The new creed could not be wedded to the old. Such a union could only result in distraction and failure. Sprung from the same philosophy and sustained by the same moral perceptions which anciently resulted in human sacrifices, the vicarious atonement has no features, no
aims or affinities in common with Christ and Christian truth. An infinite vicarious sacrifice necessitates an infinite punishment. Without such infliction, actual or possible, present or impending, it is a great sham. The infinite sacrifice, also, necessitates a remorseless God who can be placated only by the “pound of flesh,” or “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.” Still more, by a kind of reflex action, an infinite punishment or endless misery equally necessitates an infinite atonement. It calls for a death, a sacrificial offering,—the loss of a world or the death of a God to appease the vengeance of a God! It was soon perceived that universal salvation had no affinity with such a sacrifice or the theological philosophy which embraces it. The two theories are logical and theological incompatibles. Those who receive the one must ultimately reject the other. Our Church, therefore, has appropriately and consistently thrown aside the whole theory of a tripersonal divinity and a vicarious sacrifice, and gone to the fountain of all revealed religion, for its facts, its formula and fundamental principles.

In this respect, we stand side by side on the same great plane of free thought with the Unitarian Church and the “Christian Connection.” Both alike reject the triune Divinity and the infinite sacrifice, and both apply to the original sources of divine revelation for authority and support in pursuing their Christian walk and Christian work. It is a matter of marvel then that these three isolated Christian communities are not able to come nearer together, act with greater unanimity, and work earnestly in common accord for the erection of a great Christian structure which shall command the attention, meet the demands and sweep away the errors of the whole Christian world. Unfortunately however, such is not the case. Each is working in a different sphere, from different impulses and with different tendencies, having little of that true accord and harmonious action prophetic of good and grand results. Among Unitarians the element of “Free religion” looks darkly and ominously downward to the point of naked unbelief so recently reached by an eminent English
philosopher. It may be stated too that, among scientific men there is a similar tendency clearly displayed towards the same end. It is really an attempted divorcement of science from religion — the announcement of a religion without any fixed and fundamental principles of revealed truth,—a Christianity without Christ, and a Theology without a God! These how-ever are eccentricities both in science and in liberal Chris-tianity. Unitarians as a Church stand strongly and squarely "upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

The "Christian Connexion," another branch of the Chris-tian Church, which has renounced the frowning creeds and formulas of the past, tends strongly in another direction. It has no written creed. The Bible is adopted as a sufficient "confession of faith." But this latitudinous confession, by common consent and popular explanation, becomes exceedingly limited. It is the first and highest endeavor of these people to do the world good. With this view, however mis-taken their policy and fruitless their methods, they approach, in the matter of supernatural conversions, as near as possible to the old half-paganized Christian theology without actually entering its confines. In all their exhortations there is im-plied a doom in the future as fearful and tremendous as that assumed by any of the popular "evangelical" sects. In all their inculcations there is assumed an "aton ing blood" and a supernatural regeneration, as the only means of escape from that prospective doom. Their efforts, however, in that direc-tion, encountering the same obstacles as other liberal sects, enable them to make no greater advances and achieve no more marked success in the promotion of truth and righteousness in the world.

Universalists are said to be too rigid in their ecclesiastical organization and too rigorous in the common hunt for heresy. Be that as it may, it is certain that any true Christian struc-ture demands a divine revelation and Christian oracles for its foundation. Mr. Brooks aims to draw the line still tighter, to bring the denomination into closer relationship with that
foundation, and nearer assimilation to the "evangelical" Churches. Hitherto, it is contended, we have been too lax in our religious practice and inclemations, dwelling too much on the one great point of difference which separates us from all other sects, and omitting those "weightier matters" of prayer, devotedness, self-consecration and experimental religion. All this may be so; but a question of serious concernment, standing back of all refers more especially to the great work before us. Is it possible to transfer to our own system the forms, inspiration, phraseology and practices of those sects who adopt the Trinity and its appendages as the essence of all true religion? Is such a mimicry of the old administration admissible under our new regime? Must we become servile imitators, mere followers in a long beaten pathway, all of whose landmarks point to some great error — an angry God, a frightful doom for his creatures, an appeasing sacrifice and a wily slip, through that means, from the claims of justice into heaven? All along the line of that pathway, the marks are set and referred to at every step in the march. The traveller in Pilgrim's Progress, saw no clearer marks and signs of his creed at every stage in his passage to the heavenly city. Is it not then — and here is the real question to be considered — is it not absolutely necessary that, having begun de novo we should work out a philosophy or a system of our own, upon the foundation of Christian revelation, and elaborate the whole structure, its spirit, philosophy, ethics and literature in accordance with that foundation, irrespective of the influences, the instruction, the practices and the spirit of surrounding religious sects? This seems, at least, to be the true course — a course indeed requiring time, patience, industry and perseverance. In such a work we can stand in union and cooperation with the Unitarian and "Christian" brotherhood. What we shall do in that matter must of necessity redound to their advantage.

What then shall we do? Is it time to lay aside our martial armor and direct our thoughts and our energies to the cultivation of the ground already obtained? Such is not the
course of other sects; such is not the inspiration of wisdom and prudence. Other sects at present admit indeed of little or no open warfare. They have withdrawn from the field, and ceased to attempt a direct vindication of the Trinity, vicarious atonement and the eternity of torment. These are assumed, implied; in all the prayers, entreaties, exhortations, religious instruction, and religious effort, they are left to be inferred, but are so presented that the inference in their favor is unavoidable. All the literature of our country, its philosophy, course of thought, colloquial phraseology and current religious conceptions are more or less imbued with the spirit and the elements of the old creed. The Scripture itself is corrupted, and its exegesis, especially in our common version, rendered more difficult and laborious, by the change of meaning which the lapse of years, and the persistence of false theology have wrought in many of its important words. Even the original tongues, pestered in like manner with erroneous interpretations, have been made subservient to the support of the standard theology. Without such interpretation who could have inferred, from the Elohim of the Jews, a Godhead or a Divine Being in three essences or persons? In such circumstances surely we are required to act, to move, to push forward with zeal and energy; we are not allowed to throw off our armor, lay down our weapons of war and pusillanimously yield the contest. Our theology as a matter of necessity must be polemic and continue so through the unknown lapse of the future. If we fail in this matter, we shall quietly permit the common enemy to steal into our enclosure, reconquer our positions, and annul our achievements.

The old creed, whatever its symmetry and nice adjustment of parts, rendering it a complete, coherent and harmonious whole, was not brought to its present condition without the severest struggles. All along the great history of past ages, there remain the records of the most violent and acrimonious conflicts. Sects in great numbers arose — sects often whelmed in persecution and forced into ruthless warfare from their very birth. Driven to the alternative, they fought — fought
well and nobly — fought alike with the pen, the voice and the sword. Those who came nearest to apostolic purity in their faith were among the first to fall. "As iron sharpeneth iron," so minds on both sides were rendered keen, sharp, severe and vindictive by their mutual attrition. In the first great controversy with Pagan worship, the Church was unanimous. To destroy the idols, to desolate the temples of an idolatrous people — this was deemed a noble and acceptable work. Iconoclasm soon became one of the first and highest of Christian duties, in which all classes, from highest to lowest, with reckless enthusiasm, were alike engaged. By this vandal ferocity, many of the most magnificent works of Grecian art and architecture were ruthlessly demolished.

But while all the external evidences of idolatry were thus passing away, the whole work of Christ, the whole system of Christianity, was undergoing vital changes in form and structure. It was easier to demolish temples and break down idols than to eradicate a philosophic Polytheism. The one required mere brute force; the other, great ability, great learning, and great perseverance. In this mental effort, the leading exponents of Christian doctrine, deemed it necessary, or at least expedient, to yield something to the demands of a popular Polytheism; just as we, in these later times, are accustomed, perhaps unconsciously, to make concessions to a proud, placid, imposing Tritheism, dressed in sacred robes and diffused extensively throughout the Christian Church.

When Paul at Athens encountered Epicureans and Stoics and preached to them Jesus and the Resurrection, he was thought to be presenting new Divinities for public veneration. Not many years later, so thoroughly had Christians become entangled in the web of philosophy, it seemed impossible to eradicate from the public mind a similar conception on the announcement of Jesus as a Saviour. A mere human Saviour, however highly exalted by divine authority and divine guardianship, was not to be admitted as a theological dogma. The Gnostic philosophers of Alexandria drove their Christian antagonists to the assumption that Jesus was equal to any of the
Æons in their divine system. It was here, in this school of philosophers, that the first great errors imposed upon the doctrine of Christ, chiefly received their origin. Here too commenced that great struggle which resulted in the establishment of the Athanasian Creed. Those Christian divines, most thoroughly imbued with Platonic philosophy, though strenuously opposed, at last prevailed. By slow degrees of advancement, and by many a hard fought battle, their purpose was accomplished. The elevation of Jesus to the rank of divinity was carried to its final completion. He was a God, a God in a mysterious Godhead, a God of an incomprehensible Three, each with different offices, powers and functions, but all one — one in nature, essence, thought, purpose, aim and scope of being. This theory so utterly at variance with all sound logic, and so absolutely absurd, thus gained its eminence and its mastery — gained its eminence and reached its completion through long decades and even centuries of conflict. Nor will it yield its power and sink into the repose of departed theories without an equal conflict. Through the long reign of ignorance and superstition called the "dark ages," its chief support was derived from the edicts of a monocratic hierarchy enforced by the strong arm of civil power. From that hour to the present, it has stood alone, frowning and fierce, like a grim spectre from the lower world; and the most persevering efforts have been made for its preservation and perpetuity.

With such a massive creed, a theory of such imposing features before us, adopted and defended by some of the best minds of the age and of the world, shall we lay down our arms and rest? Not unless we mean to give up the conflict and sue for admission again to the old home, the ancient mother, be it even the "mother of harlots." It is true our warfare must take a different direction. There is little need of hurling again and again the old bolts against the eternity of torment, or of repeating over and over the unexhausted and inexhaustible defences of a world’s salvation. The old imperious voices on these points are comparatively hushed. Indeed, the evidences are breaking forth on every hand that the
new doctrine, our own distinctive faith, is stealing, perhaps unwarily, but extensively, into the Churches which have hitherto condemned it. The divine Paternity, human Brotherhood, Christ and the ultimate success of his mission, Christ and the regeneration — these outlines or first truths of a better system are receiving acknowledgment on every hand. We hear, too, on our own side, expressions like these: — "I like to go to other Churches now; they don't preach hell as formerly. I hear as good Universalist sermons as I wish to." Darkly and fearfully ominous are words like these! Our doctrine is indeed creeping into Churches of other names, but our name, and light, and influence are ignored and condemned as much as ever. A calm is indicated after a long storm; but it is a calm foreboding evil, the certain forerunner of another more fearful storm, wherein our Church, in a few years or perhaps decades, may be utterly destroyed. Our children, if possible, will be taken from us and through the influence of Sabbath Schools, transplanted to other churches, and thus an open war again commence, while we shall be found powerless to resist. Who can say that after the lapse of a few centuries, there may not be enacted the same ecclesiastical tragedy which condemned Arius and anathematized the books, the opinions, and the person or manes of Origen? If then we expect to make ourselves a name, a power and a controlling institution in the future affairs of the world, even for another century, we must make ourselves felt now — felt as a Christian power to-day. Our work surely is a work of "eternal vigilance."

We are yet inchoate. Our Winchester creed is meagre. Perhaps it would be impolitic, and even impossible to enlarge it. Our religious structure, if such an expression may be allowed, is yet imperfect. It avails nothing to trim our sails in order to run as near as possible to the moorings of the old Church without touching them. We need a work ab initio, from base to capital, from centre to circumference, a complete reconstruction, which shall make our Church, aye the whole liberal Church a sort of homogeneity, a unity in diversity,
with essential distinctness of character, and thus give it a power to be felt, and honored, and imitated in the world. Such a work necessarily requires religious controversy. The old errors, born of Grecian philosophy, must be removed. In this contest we can join hands with all liberal Christians. All are equally interested in the success of our labors. How can they remain idle? How turn away cold and unsympathizing from our struggles? If they fail to act, they, too, will soon be engulfed in the great vortex of Platonized theology. Science, also, stands with us in the work; science condemns the inconsistent and incomprehensible formulas of the old Church. It is not so much the unknowable as the absurd, that points their plea, and shapes their attitude, their causa belli against religion.

The Unitarians in this country for the last fifty years have run a brilliant course. Rich in the ornaments of literary culture, strong in the prestige of an institution of learning standing among the oldest and best in the land, and thorough in every department of history, philosophy, science, theology, they have stood high in public esteem, and wielded a great power over public thought. But how stand they now? Have they passed the zenith of their glory? Is all this brilliant past to be obscured in the near or remote future? We certainly can look for no backward movement in that quarter.

On the point which makes them a distinct class in the Christian Church, they have an immense work yet to accomplish. The "seat of war," it may be said, is wholly transferred to their own borders. We have fought our own distinctive battle to comparative victory—a victory, however, barren of substantial results while the old formula retains its place. But the great work for them and for all liberal Christians still remains to be achieved.

In constructing a new system and in carrying out a great religious work there are several points to be considered. First, a frame-work of Theology is required. It is very common for people to speak of a "Body of Divinity." Let those who need a body of that kind erect their skeleton, bind it to...
gether with ligaments, support it with muscles, cover it with dermoid tissue, balance it with brain, interlace it with arteries, veins, capillaries and nerves, give it a heart and lungs, and fill it with all the essential parts of a living being, fitly adjusted and well arranged; and then—then make it live, if they can! For us a frame-work alone is needed—a sort of skeleton-fabric, wrought out of the most wonderful materials—God as a Father, and Man as a great marvellous Brotherhood. It must contain space for the immaculate Son, for him who was sent, must show his place in the great plan of the Infinite, must set forth his character, office, functions and mission; and especially it must disclose his peculiar and mysterious relations with God on one hand and Humanity on the other. With such a frame-work, such an adjustment of theological problems we may labor to bring the whole brotherhood into harmony with it—to convert the members of that brotherhood into muscle, tissue, brain, lungs, arteries, nerves—fill up all the interstices and make it a perfect structure; then we shall have a "building fitly framed together," a Church—aye, as Mr. Brooks not very gracefully intimates, a "live" Church, moving, breathing, active, and all instinct with thought, life, hope and animation! But who shall achieve the work—who erect a fabric that shall meet, and satisfy, and harmonize all the diversified interests and opinions of the liberal Church, or even our own Church? The fathers have gone; the sons must take their places and work out the problem. The factors are present—God, Brotherhood, Christ, his Mission. From these, the errors, if any, must be eliminated, and the unknown quantities brought to light. Are the master-minds among us—master-minds any where in liberal Church to do this work; or must it be, as with the formula, a growth, and a growth amidst turmoil, dissension, bigotry and conflict? If the latter, years and generations may be absorbed in maturing it; and years and generations persevering labor may be demanded for its perfection. When is most needed, then in our present condition is a leader—a leader or leaders of force and attraction to speak in the
manding accents, who shall deal with the problems of metaphysics, as with the generalizations and deductions of science, and bring out a system free from absurdity and acceptable to all.

Man as distinguished from all inferior beings has an inborn sense of right and wrong, and, in the language of Quartrefages, "an abstract notion of a Divinity and of another life." From this faculty and fountain spring all his desires and capabilities for divine worship. Religion then is a spontaneity, and prayer one of its essential manifestations. Conscious dependence upon a supreme Intelligence, a Being of power and goodness, implies both prayer and reverence. The religious element, even when controlled by reason, is often various in its demands and activities. Any religious structure then, if it aims to be successful, must, in its practical operation, be adapted to this essential element of human nature. But it is no part of wisdom for us, as a distinctive Church, to follow servilely any other sects, in our thoughts, feelings, inculcations and practices on this subject. The Moslems, required by their religion to pray five times a day, were notoriously a "praying people." The pious Jews often engaged in the same sacred exercise "standing in the corners of the street." The ancient eremites withdrew to the most secluded places for undisturbed devotion, continuous prayer and utter abstraction from all the affairs of the world. Are these examples fit to be a guide for us, or any true Christian professors? We might, indeed, as well take them for our pattern as to be influenced by the reproach so often uttered, the song so often sung, "Oh, you are not a praying people!" Yet for all this the fact of prayer and its exercise must be fully recognized and acted upon in the grand future of our course. It is a matter so inwoven with the very structure of human nature as to become a necessity of our being. It must, therefore, have its place and its functions, clearly defined, as a part of our religious system.

More than this; the whole Church from high to low needs a deep, strong, abiding sense of religious duty. Among all classes religion rests too lightly upon the conscience. It is
treated as a mere plaything of the hour to be used as social recreation on the Sabbath, or employed as a garment of pre-eminent sanctity to be worn in church once a week and laid aside in all the business and bustle of life. With such impressions, quite too common among all Christians, no Church or religious organization can permanently prosper. Those sects have always been most prosperous and successful whose adherents have been taught “line upon line and precept upon precept,” and have been made to feel and understand, the solemn duty of a religious life and the positive sanctity of religious worship. Be it fanaticism or bigotry which may possibly follow; better even is this as a moral restraint than that looseness of conscience which permits unlimited license in vice or crime; for it forms a cement to bind the soul still stronger to God and duty. What hidden charm attaches the devout Catholic to his “true Church?” What mysterious power brings the Moslem upon his knees so many times daily in prayer? And the Jew, too, even at this distance from Jerusalem, and at this late period of his “banishment” from the Holy Presence, still looks forward with undiminished faith and with unfailing hope and trust to a blissful return, and still maintains his integrity through all time and all change. Is not all this, the result of an irrepressible conviction of duty? Generation of this wonderful people has rapidly followed generation to the great, dark receptacle of the departed; but at every step the youth of each succeeding generation are thoroughly instructed in all the claims, duties, and obligations referring to God and Moses; and the lessons thus impressed upon them are faithfully cherished as a matter of sacred concernment. They are thus prepared to take the places of their departing and departed kindred. They seldom change. A Jew, an apostate? A Catholic, an apostate? A Mussulman, an apostate? Such things may occur, but except in some grand shaking of the religious elements, they are so rare as scarcely to make a ripple upon the surface of the waters. Even occasional commotions, disastrous in their results, are mostly repaired by a few years of quiet recuperation.
Shall our own needs and opportunities in this respect be overlooked? We have no "anxious seats" or penitential stools for sinners to flee to and rest upon, and no awful dilemma with endless results to bring them there. But no less essential is that deep feeling of religious obligation which smiles at dangers and fortifies the soul to submit to any privation, suffering and sacrifice, for God and Humanity. We have no martyrdom in fact or in prospect; but the time may come when a martyr's faith, a martyr's courage and a martyr's crown may be demanded. The necessary preparation for such an event involves the enlightenment of conscience and a profound conviction of duty. This preparation is no less important even at the present hour for the preservation and permanence of our Church.

A very grand work is before us, requiring thought, zeal, fidelity and perseverance. The Bible is our creed and our dependence. We have no faith in fables or traditions, ancient or modern, Hebrew or Christian, as a basis of religious belief. As little do we admit of an apotheosis of reason which shall make it a goddess or an oracle, and place it above the communication of God to men. In all religious development, it has its place and its sphere, appropriate and necessary; and especially in all divine revealments, it has an important office in the perception and elaboration of the truths enunciated. But in all this, the mind, seeking for God and a better life is obliged to rest upon something beyond its own scope, something reaching far into the great, dark, mysterious Unknown. Light is borne by true divine communications, and the Book containing them is not a congeries of myths and traditions, but the embodiment of a Revelation from God to the world. Reason therefore is indispensable to develop the facts and bring out the elements of that Revelation—to wrest them from the hands of mystical theologians, and present them in a vital formula, clear, reasonable, truthful and intelligible. Christianity is surely capable of such simplicity of development. It is capable of an interpretation in accord with all the facts of science and all the problems of sound philosophy.
The great conflict between Science and Religion has its origin solely in the inconsistencies and absurdities imposed upon Theology. Men accustomed to inductive reasoning, though they may admit the presence of mysteries not yet explained, turn away in disgust from a Theology which, together with mystery, involves a perpetual conflict with all the deductions of reason and all the known relations of things. It is only the presentation of a better theology, that can reconcile such men to revealed religion. Who shall achieve this acceptable service? Who shall separate the pure gold from the scoria or recrmon of Pagan errors embodied in Christian creeds? The work is ours; it is the work of liberal Christians everywhere;—their special mission, not only to purify the metal and cleanse the crucible, but to achieve, actually and truly, the preservation of Christianity itself! That beautiful system is now so corrupted in its popular presentation as scarcely to bear the resemblance of its former self.

But we are changing; we are transitional. Be it so; transitions never cease. Except in periods of the profoundest barbarism, there never was a time when the young mind was not seeking to outstrip the old,—when every boy did not aim and strive to become wiser and greater than his father. Though little addition may have been made, year by year and age by age, to the general stock of knowledge, yet changes must come. The popular mind must act, push, progress, burst the restraints of the past and emerge, beautifully decorated, into a new sphere. If nothing really original can be evolved, old forms of thought, old philosophical speculations, old problems of metaphysics are reproduced. It is no marvel that a certain uniformity of mental activity, in the whole race of men, from the earliest period, should, in different branches entirely separated by age and clime, and without the least intercourse with each other, result in a similarity of metaphysical speculation. “Great minds” are said in derision, “to run in the same channel.” The common mind has its limits and its identity of action. Beyond these it seldom travels. It is not surprising that philosophy as well as “history” should
"repeat itself." A sort of intellectual diving-bell is often employed, to scan the abysses of thought, which seldom pass beyond certain limits or extend into strange seas, when old theories, long buried in the profoundest depths of the past, are brought to the surface, dressed in young attire, and, without the least consciousness of their grim age or long sepulture, are presented to the world in glowing beauty, every whit "as good as new"! Yet from these deep seas, many things of truth and beauty, long buried by rank and overwhelming religious errors are again brought to life, light, favor and acceptance.

Our Church may not be entirely free from this kind of "progress." Let it come: we should greet its changes. Its effervescence will serve to purify the surrounding waters. At all events, it will serve to inspire a higher degree of mental activity, and do an effectual work in that theological transformation of living sects, which is now the most pressing need of the whole Christian Church. Changes and intellectual eccentricities can interpose no real obstacles to the permanence of religious principles, or in the least invalidate their soundness. Such changes may even serve as the seed and the stimulus to other and more important changes which sooner or later, may result in the overthrow of religious error and the establishment of a grand and graceful system of divine truth.

In the great conflict yet to come we have a work to perform of vast importance, wide extent and momentous interest. It is a work, too, which allows of no respite, suspension or relaxation. While men are born and men depart, while darkness, moral and intellectual, covers the earth, and the people sadly and sorrowfully cry out Pecceavi, "I have missed it!" we can never cease to act:—never, until we have reached a simplicity of faith in harmony with reason, science and Revelation,—a unity of aim and purpose without the loss of individual liberty, either of thought or of action, and a homogeneity in all the essential characteristics of a Christian life, without incurring the danger of ecclesiastical despotism. Our warfare is not a work of waste and desolation, but of preservation, repair and
the renewal of a true vital religion. Success in such a warfare may not be achieved in a few short years. The toil, the conflict, the sacrifice and the crown may reach far, far into the unknown future. Absolute uniformity in all matters of religious opinion cannot be expected. But surely a uniformity may be attained sufficient for a full concurrence and active cooperation in advancing a common work and reaching a common end. The best thought and most persevering efforts of our whole Church are therefore demanded, for a thorough examination of the grounds of the Christian faith, for the elimination of all its old errors, and for the completion of a formula based on the facts of Revelation, yet in harmonious relation with the advanced thought and improved philosophy of the age. And all along, as, joyous and hopeful, we tread the pathway of the future, opening daily and hourly into the ever-dawning present, it should be kept in mind that the one great obstacle to the success of a pure, divine, rational religion lies in the old Creed—the old Creed with its modern appendages,—a creed embracing errors borne from the dreamy past, and strangely set as a lamp upon the pedestal of Christ to enlighten, convert and save the world!

ARTICLE XVI.

The Present Condition of Mahometanism.

In resuming the subject set forth in our title, we begin upon the north-eastern frontier of the Islamite world, in the country across the Oxus. What makes this an admirable starting-point, is, that here has been, for many centuries, the classic ground of Mahometan orthodoxy. Not without a struggle did the people of Bokhara and Samarcand accept the Koran somewhat proffered them at the point of the sword; but when they did accept, their conversion was most hearty and thorough. Three times the Arabians conquered the country
and three times they were driven back across the Oxus; even when they had gained a complete and final mastery, they seem to have been at their wit's end, in the endeavor to crush out the old Iranian faith which — no one knows for how long — had been the popular religion. They tried every kind of persuasion known to the annals of proselytism; they even went so far as to offer a pecuniary reward, two dirhems, to every native who appeared at Friday prayers in the public mosque. Such soft inducements failing, a soldier was placed in every house who performed the double duty of a religious teacher and of a policeman or spy, upon the watch for any attempt to perform the old religious rites in secret places or at night. But the old adage about "convincing a man against his will" did not hold in this case. Indeed it is doubtful whether it ever does hold as a general rule; there is no feat of proselytism that is impossible by dint of oft-repeated blows and the lapse of time. At any rate, whether against their will or not, the people of Transoxiana were at last soundly convinced; and ever since they have remained the most devoted, the most orthodox and bigoted believers within the great brotherhood of Islam. Comparatively isolated by their envelope of deserts and mountains, no foreign influence has contaminated the purity of their faith. The ancient culture was so completely extirpated that it has left behind no heretical souvenirs. Schisms and apostasies have been unknown, at least, since the days of Hasham bin Hekim, the veiled prophet of Khorassan. In a word, orthodox and devout Mussulmen, until quite recently, have been in the habit of looking upon life in Bokhara, unpolluted by infidel presence and free from every taint of heresy, as making a very near approach to the golden age of Islam.

Here were witnessed the first indications of the "Revival;" if the term can be applied, in speaking of a country, where there has been no previous falling off, in religious zeal. At least, about the beginning of the present century, the tide of Mahometan zeal began here to rise to extraordinary heights — overflowing all former tide-marks in a manner that must
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and three times they were driven back across the Oxus; even when they had gained a complete and final mastery, they seem to have been at their wit's end, in the endeavor to crush out the old Iranic faith which — no one knows how long — had been the popular religion. They tried every kind of persuasion known to the annals of proselytism; they even went so far as to offer a pecuniary reward, two диреms, to every native who appeared at Friday prayers in the public mosque. Such soft inducements failing, a soldier was placed in every house who performed the double duty of a religious teacher and of a policeman or spy, upon the watch for any attempt to perform the old religious rites in secret places or at night. But the old adage about "convincing a man against his will" did not hold in this case. Indeed it is doubtful whether it ever does hold as a general rule; there is no feat of proselytism that is impossible by dint of oft-repeated blows and the lapse of time. At any rate, whether against their will or not, the people of Transoxiana were at last soundly convinced; and ever since they have remained the most devoted, the most orthodox and bigoted believers within the great brotherhood of Islam. Comparatively isolated by their envelope of deserts and mountains, no foreign influence has contaminated the purity of their faith. The ancient culture was so completely extirpated that it has left behind no heretical souverains. Schisms and apostasies have been unknown, at least, since the days of Hasham bin Hekim, the veiled prophet of Khorassan. In a word, orthodox and devout Mussulmen, until quite recently, have been in the habit of looking upon life in Bokhara, unpolluted by infidel presence and free from every taint of heresy, as making a very near approach to the golden age of Islam.

Here were witnessed the first indications of the "Revival;" if the term can be applied, in speaking of a country, where there has been no previous falling off, in religious zeal. At least, about the beginning of the present century, the tide of Mahometan zeal began here to rise to extraordinary heights — overflowing all former tide-marks in a manner that must
have sometimes astonished even the serious and fanatical Bokharioites themselves. It is a movement that has taken possession of all classes: in fact, it has been most sweeping among those who would naturally be supposed to be least sensitive to the influences of religious fanaticism. In the Ottoman empire, the revival has its strength in the rural districts; it is weakest in the metropolis, where the immense body of office-holders, have become very lax in their religious conceptions and are deeply imbued with European ideas of civilization and life. But in Transoxiana, it is precisely the reverse. The chief hot-beds of religious fanaticism are in the cities; and its rankest growth has been in the royal palaces. It is not many years since the Emir of Bokhara, clad in squalid garb, with bowed head and leaning upon a cane after the manner of devotees, used to daily patrol the streets of the metropolis, while the populace shed tears of rejoicing at the sight of their saintly ruler who had stained his career by the commission of almost every crime, including fratricide, known to the annals of Asiatic villainy. Indeed, the popular zeal for religion runs so high, that the rulers have used it as the chief, often sole means for gaining the affections of the people. Every act of royal injustice or oppression is forgiven, if the Emir will only appear, now and then, in the garb of a dervish, or spend a few hours each day in the society of holy men. The Emir Masum, about the beginning of the century, gained his royal power in this way. A young man of noble birth, but not belonging to the royal line, he became so famous for his devoutness and his austerities, that the people literally forced him to accept the throne, in spite of his feigned reluctance. Even when invested with supreme authority and surrounded by all the magnificence of an Asiatic court, he refused to lay aside his monkish garb and used to spend many hours each day kneeling upon a threadbare carpet, engaged in his ascetic devotions.

When kings are driven to such straits, we can easily imagine the condition of the people. One and all are under the rule of a grim orthodoxy, as rigid and relentless in its exactions as
the discipline of an army. Absence from the Mosque or the neglect of any religious duty is not only condemned by public opinion, but is punished, like theft or burglary, by the civil authorities. It is,—or was, six years ago, before the Russian conquest—as dangerous for a man to be found upon the streets of Bokhara or Samarcand, without the Mahometan catechism at his tongue’s end, as to be detected picking pockets in the streets of London or New York. For “the guardian of the law of religion,” accompanied by a body of policemen armed with whips, used every day to patrol the streets in order to examine the passers by as to their knowledge of religious matters: if any one was found ignorant, he was soundly flogged upon the spot and then dismissed to mourn over his ignorance and the rigors of Islam. Evidently, we have hardly yet approached the period of the final extinction of a religion whose zeal can mount to such fanatical heights as these.

But the most notable thing—and one that will meet us again and again in the course of our survey—is, that this movement in Transoxiana is merely dogmatic and formal. The revival does not touch what the religious writers of our day call “the root of the matter.” It betokens no awakening of the primitive energies of Islam, of the potent spirit which animated the great Prophet and his iconoclasts. Everything that Mahomet condemned in the old Oriental religions and which he sought to extirpate among his followers—monarchy, asceticism, theurgy, cabalism, sacerdotalism, mysticism,—now flourishes rankly beneath the fierce sunshine of the Mahometan revival. The “Mollahs,” once merely men learned in the law, have now become a veritable priesthood, regarded by the people with a reverence that amounts to worship and possessed of a greater influence, in affairs of church and state, than any Brahmin can hope to gain in the present day. Monkish devotees are not confined to monastic walls as in Buddhist Asia or Catholic Europe; they preside in the offices of government and even sit upon the throne. The old monotheism is still strenuously insisted upon; but its conceptions are so obscured by the blur of mysticism that it is hard to
distinguish the real theology of the Oxus from that of the Ganges; for, monotheistic and polytheistic pantheism differ more in their outward garb than at heart. In a word, the direction of the Mahometan movement has been entirely reversed. The Bokhariotes are never weary of crying that “Mahomet is the Prophet of God”; but, in reality, they are developing the ascetic and theosophic tendencies of India and of old Asiatic Christianity, beneath the shadow of the mosque.

Such then is the character of the revival upon the northeastern frontier. How little it has of the old energy of Islam, how feeble a defense it will probably prove for the political independence of Mahometan peoples, is shown by the fate of Bokhara and the surrounding Khanates. This land, first in orthodoxy and religious zeal, was also the first to fall into the hands of the infidel. And what is most noticeable, is, that the conquest was brought about, not so much by the strength of the Russian conquerors as by the feuds and dissensions of the conquered. In the hour of trial, the brotherhood of Islam proved all a myth. The rising tide of religious zeal brought with it no real unity. The country, divided by narrow local interests and wasted by political corruption, fell an easy prey to the Russian lust of conquest.

We are far from saying that the fate of Transoxiana forms a sure prophecy of the future of the Islamite world. But certainly, the conquest is a deeply suggestive fact and one that must have an ominous sound to all pious Mahometans. For, as we have said, they had long been in the habit of looking upon Bokhara as the favorite home of the purest orthodoxy. In the happier days of this nowretched country, students used to gather here from every part of the Islamite world in order to study the straitest theology at its fountain-head. Thirty thousand of them were, at one time, collected in the colleges of the metropolis. And now Bokhara has fallen into the hands of the infidel! The citadel of Mahometan orthodoxy has proven an open gate through which Russia advances upon a career of conquest that embraces the Persian gulf and the sea of Bosphorus in its ultimate designs.
From Bokhara to Persia—a short journey, but one that carries us from one pole of Islamite thought to the other. For, if Bokhara is the favorite home of the grimest orthodoxy, Persia is the chosen land of heresy and schism. As is well known, a wide gulf of mutual hatred divides the Shiite sect that rules in Iran from the Sunnites of Bokhara or the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, the rigid fanatics of Transoxiana do not simply class their Shiite brethren in Persia as heretics and schismatics; they number them among infidels and refuse to accord them the benefit of that Islamic law which forbids one Mahometan to enslave another. Even during the present century, the Bokhariotes have engaged in a "holy war" against the heretics of Khorassan. They destroyed the once splendid city of Merv and carried away its Shiite inhabitants into captivity in such numbers that the slave-markets of Bokhara were glutted and able-bodied Mussulmans were sold for a franc apiece! The Persians are less vindictive towards their Sunnite brethren, but no less devoted to their own system. Political feeling has strengthened their devotion to their sect. To them, the Shiite belief is the faith of Iran. Their heresy is the badge of their nationality; and all that there is of the patriotic sentiment in Persia finds expression in this heretical zeal.

Still, the immense gulf of separation between the Persians and their Mahometan brethren, is more a chasm of angry feeling than of any really essential difference in faith or practice. As every one knows, the original quarrel was concerning the legitimate line of succession to the primacy of Islam: and however important the question may once have been, it can hardly retain any great significance after the lapse of more than a thousand years. Add to this that the Shiites wish to replace the more ancient and orthodox traditions by some of their own fabrication—and one has about all the issues that have ever been openly made between the two sects; for, the differences in ritual are too trivial to demand a moment's attention from any one but a student of religious antiquities. It is true that Persian religion, as befits its heretical position,
has had a freer range for the development of its ruling tendencies; but after all, precisely the same order of evolution has been going on, in a more reserved and obscure manner, in every other part of the Islamite world. The Shiite faith, for instance, is everywhere pervaded by the influences of the old Iranian culture; its theology is that of ancient Parseeism, clothed with the scant drapery of Mahometan monotheism. God is One; but this Supreme Unity is merely impersonal, impassible abstract existence; and the chasm between this abstraction and the realities of life is bridged by the same doctrine of emanations and theophanies which formed the basis of faith, not only among the ancient Guebres of Persia, but among the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria and everywhere throughout the East. Such is the Shiite theology; but, after all, the same pantheistic mysticism runs through and through the more orthodox belief of Bokhara and the Ottoman Empire. Count de Gobineau is undoubtedly right when he says that the national faith of Persia in the present day, is, at heart, a resuscitation of the Parseeism of ancient Iran. But what escapes him and what it is one of the chief objects of this article to show, is, that this same resuscitating process has been going on, for centuries, throughout the whole extent of Islam. Everywhere the simple healthy monotheism of Mahomet has been gradually relapsing into a mode of thought which seems to form the constitutional and incurable malady of the East. In respect to this movement, which is really the essential thing, Shiite and Sunnite are virtually one.

Mr. Palgrave—who deserves all praise as a most impartial and intelligent observer of Levantine life—notes that these two sects, whose hatred of each other has been so intense and of such long standing, seem to fuse together beneath the glow of Mahometan rebellion in India. The Arab Wahabees, those most uncompromising Puritans of Islam, look with immeasurable horror upon the Shiite heretics, with their superstition concerning the coming "Mahde" and their belief in the holy efficacy and almost divine power residing in the "Imam" of the day. But in India, the most rigid Wahabee orthodoxy
freely amalgamates with Persian heresy: every division is forgotten in the presence of strangers and a common foe. But we can hardly accept Palgrave's idea that this fusion is the result of the growing heat of the great Mahometan "revival" which is now spreading in all directions from the Mediterranean to the Bay of Bengal. That such a revival is going on is plain; but that it has yet had any such momentous results, that it has welded all Islam into a real brotherhood, animated by a common purpose and red-hot with religious zeal, is not so clear. We remember that barely six years ago, the fanaticism of Transoxiana, whose growing fervor has been equalled nowhere else except, perhaps, in Arabian Nejd, furnished no bond of union in the hour of peril; that the country, one in sectarian feeling, could not forget its political fouds in the presence of the Russian foe, more formidable to Islam, than a score of British Empires in India. And the easy fusion of sectarian differences among the Indo-Mahometans is to be explained, it seems to us, not so much by this sudden glow of religious fervor, as by the character of the differences themselves. For the Shiite schism, as we have seen, is a political rather than a religious cleavage. It had its origin in Persian patriotism; and its hatreds have been kept alive by the jealousies of different nationalities. Naturally enough such differences are little respected among the distant Indo-Mahometans; the orthodox Sunnite, then, finds nothing revolting in the superstitions which so horrified his brethren in Arabia. For after all, when we come to the real drift of their thought, the Sunnite and the Shiite are virtually one. The Persian superstition concerning the Imamate and the coming "Mahdeed" are only the free expression of a tendency which rules everywhere in Islam.

According to our view, then, the difference between the two great Mahometan sects are merely superficial; internally, both are undergoing the same process of development; only, in one, the evolution has been freer and more rapid than in the other. If this is so, we have gained an important point of observation. The future of all Islam is foreshadowed by a
study of its present condition, the strength or weakness of its position and its moral influence in Persia. That it has lost its original impulse and does not now stand for what it once did, we have already seen. But that is nothing to our present purpose. A religion, by letting go of its original purpose and drifting with the general current of thought, may gain a stronger position and a better hold upon the popular life. Is that the case in Iran?

The strength of the position which a religion really occupies, is best tested when the waves of revolt are rocking against it. Through that test, Mahometanism in Persia has very recently passed. Every one has heard more or less of Babism—that great religious insurrection that spread like a whirlwind through the dominion of the Shah some twenty years ago. With the character of this extraordinary movement we have here no space to deal. We note only the position of Mahometanism in this hour of extremest peril that has threatened it for centuries.

Bab or Mirza-Ali-Mohammed, the author of the new movement was certainly justified in supposing that the times were ripe for religious revolution. Signs of a wide-spread and deep rooted disaffection towards the national religion were continually manifesting themselves. The long closed doors of Iran were beginning to open, somewhat, to the influences of Western civilization; there was no great storm of reform, to be sure, but still, an occasional whiff of innovation, not at all fragrant to orthodox and conservative nostrils. The philosophers, who are in Asia what men of science are in Europe, had outgrown the narrow dogma of the Koran and were eager in the search for something new in philosophy and religion. The higher classes and especially the government officials were anything but devoted adherents of the Prophet. Even the reigning Shah did not pretend to disguise his lack of sympathy with the faith of which he was the chief defender; he and his prime minister amused themselves with a half-serious and half-comic skepticism that would seem very much like buffoonery in the West. In a word, the established religion seemed to
have no friends but the Mollahs or priests: it was very much in the same plight as Christianity in Europe just before the French Revolution. At this auspicious moment, Ali Mohamned appeared with his new religion—not a commonplace, impertinent piece of vulgar fanaticism, but a comprehensive, opportune system of faith, which, however extravagant it may seem to us, was admirably adapted to win the sympathies of the cultivated classes as well as the common people of Persia. Its first success was sudden and immense. The whole kingdom was agitated by the rising storm. Everything indicated that Persian Mahometanism had fallen upon evil days.

But as the storm rose, the old religion began to develop the solidity of its foundations. In the first flush of success, the envoys of Babism appeared at the royal palace and besought official recognition of the new religion. But to their surprise, they found that the king was not their man. He and his prime minister, in spite of their religious indifferentism and skeptical buffoonery, saw in the cause of Islam the cause of law and order: they looked upon the reformers merely as disturbers of the public peace and absolutely interdicted the further promulgation of the new opinion. Then followed a sharp fierce insurrection which ended, as every one knows, in the death of Bab and the complete discomfiture of his followers, Mahometanism remains in peaceful possession of the field. Not, by any means, that Babism has been crushed out of existence. On the other hand, it seems to have gained moral strength through every material defeat. Its adherents are numbered by thousands in every large city and district of the kingdom—are especially numerous among the wealthy and educated classes, among philosophers, sufis, and even magistrates and government officials of the highest rank. But all these are content to enjoy the new heresy in private: they have little desire to openly break with the established religion. For Islamism is so vague and indefinite a system that it lays no heavy burden upon any man’s conscience: its flexible dogmas can be accommodated to every possible variety of opinion. It is seen, therefore, to be a thankless task to quarrel
with a religion whose yoke is so easy to be borne and which, at the same time, has so thoroughly identified itself with the established order of things. And Babism, now that its first fever of enthusiasm has passed, will probably make no serious attempt to realize its dreams of political and religious revolution. It will be content to remain a system of speculation—one of the countless heresies that lodge more or less peacefully under the broad elastic shelter of Islamite faith.

"In all Persia there is not one absolute Mahometan," said a Mahometan sufí to Count de Gobineau. Making all allowance for the exaggeration of so sweeping a statement, we believe it to be substantially true. Mahometanism in Persia is not so much a faith as an institution. It is the established religion and as such men conform to its easy service and accept its vague dogmas. But it has long since ceased to control the opinions of its adherents; its dogmas are explained so as to suit every whim of the hour; it is simply the convenient mantle under which every possible variety of ideas may be cloaked. This characteristic proved the secret of its strength in the recurrence with Babism and may prove the secret of its strength in many recurrences yet to come. For, as an established religion, with vague, indefinite formulas, it precisely meets the wants of the Oriental who is averse to any change in the actual order of things, but delights in a very chaos of speculation.

ARTICLE XVII.

Universalist Conventions and Creeds.

FOURTH PAPER.

The Philadelphia Convention held its session for 1794,¹ i

¹ The following note should have accompanied the account of the session of 1793, given in the April number of the Quarterly, but was inadvertently omitted. The Churchees and their Messengers in the session of 1793, were: Philadelphia, James Moore, Israel Israel, Hugh White, Thomas Bevens, Thomas Francis; Shiloh, Joseph.
October, but it proved to be an unfortunate change from May, as there was much sickness at that time in the city, and many at a distance were afraid to attend. Seven Churches were represented, and one new preacher, Rev. Joseph Stephens, was announced as being settled over the Church at Shiloh, N. J. The following is from the Minutes:

"Brother David Evans informs us that in November, last, he visited the Brethren and Church at Pike Run, in Washington County, Pennsylvania, of the same faith and gospel order with us, where he received certain information that said Church, and the Church at Morgantown, the Church at Georges' Hill, the Church at Clarksburg, and the Church lately constituted at Short Creek, of the same faith, on account of their great distance from us, had formed themselves into a Convention, and had their first meeting at Morgantown, the preceding August. That he had access to their Minutes, wherein it appeared that their second Convention was appointed to meet at Pike Run, last August, when as their minutes express, they would deliberate on the propriety of corresponding in future with us by letter and Messengers.

"Resolved, That this convention do acquiesce and rejoice in the proceedings of said Convention; and that we have not received any letter from them is perhaps owing to the present troubles in that country. That this Convention will endeavor to correspond by letter with them, and in order thereto, do request that Brother Evans do write them in our behalf, and that he enclose a copy of the minutes of our present proceedings.

"A letter from a sister Church in Sharon, Conn., consisting of fifty members; also from a sister Church in Egremont, County of Berkshire, Mass., consisting of thirty members, was read."

Ayers, Halbig's Ayers; Wrightstown, Rev. Artis Seagrave; New Britain, Rev. David Evans; Pittsgrove, Rev. William Worth; Upper Freehold, Rev. Nicholas Cox. Rev. Abel Sarjent represented the new Church near Havre de Grace, and the one at New Hanover. Letters were received from the Cape May, Pike Run, and Boston Churches.

The Convention was composed of Israel Israel, Thomas Fitzgerald, Elias Gordon, Anthony Cuthbert, John Vannest, George Morton, Thomas Francis, Philadelphia; Rev. Nicholas Cox, Kingwood; Rev. Artis Seagrave, Wrightstown; Eliza Swinney, Shiloh; Rev. David Evans, New Britain; Rev. William Worth, Cape May; Empson Kirby, New Hanover. Letters from Upper Freehold, and Pittsgrove.

The Whiskey Insurrection, 1791-94.

"William Slade, Abiel Goodrich and David Doty, were the Committee of the Sharon Church; Thomas Webb, John Tallar, and Jonah Westover, of the Church at Egremont. Rev. James Briggs was preaching to both Churches."
“Resolved, That this Convention will write a letter to said Churches, and that Brother Israel is requested to write said letter.”

Two of the Philadelphia delegates of the preceding year, had died since the close of the session: Hugh White, who was a lay preacher, a school teacher by profession; and Major James Moore, one of the most active members of the Philadelphia Church, a prominent member of previous sessions of the Convention, and the Standing Clerk or Recorder of that body. Both died of Yellow Fever, sometime between August and December, 1798. The Convention appointed Bros. Francis and Vannest to be the future custodians of the Convention Book and files.

In 1795 there were but four Churches represented in the Convention. It was agreed to “write to the Convention in the State of Vermont,” — the Convention of the New England States, had just held a session at Bennington, Vt., — “and to the Convention in the Western part of this State, giving them information of the number and state of the Churches here, also requesting them to write in like manner to our next Convention; and that they would write their opinion of the propriety of having a Triennial Convention, composed of delegates from the Annual Conventions.” A “particular Letter” was also sent to the “delinquent churches,” in which they were “earnestly entreated to send Letters and Messengers to our next Convention, and the reason of their neglect or failure at this time.”

What effect this entreaty produced, is unknown, as the Circular Letter for 1796, is the only document of that year preserved. The ministers in attendance were Artis Seag rav e e, Thomas Jones, (just arrived from Wales,) and David Evans. The last two, and Rev. Nicholas Cox, were present in 1797.

The next year the session was held in May, at the suggestion of the Philadelphia Church, who say in their letter to the

---

6 The Messengers were, Rev. David Evans, (the only Minister present) New Brit c Philadelphia, Zechariah Poulson, John Vannest, Israel Israel, Thomas Francis Shiloh, Elisha Swinney; New Hanover, Empson Kirby.
Convention: “In consequence of our City’s being visited last Fall, with an awful sickness, and not knowing but its fate might be of the same nature in that which is coming, we took under consideration the propriety of recommending a Convention for this year at the same time that was fixed at its first establishment. And conceiving it to be proper, took the liberty of addressing those letters which you received, for that purpose.” The Minutes for this year, 1798, are very meagre, simply setting forth that “The Introductory Sermon was preached by Rev. Thomas Jones; Rev. Nicholas Cox was appointed Moderator, Rev. Thomas Jones, Clerk;” and that “letters were read from the following Churches, Philadelphia, Kingwood, New Britain, New Hanover.” 6

The Convention probably failed to meet again until 1801. The letter of the Philadelphia Church, and the Circular Letter of the Convention, are the only papers preserved. 7 The former states that since the last Convention they have “lost seventeen members by death. The present membership is thirty-seven.” The minutes as examined by Rev. Mr. Thomas, show the receipt of “A printed circular letter from the Universalists of New England;” also that the Convention voted, “An Address to the President of the United States.” The Circular Letter excuses the Churches for neglecting to send Messengers or letters, on the ground that it was probably for the “want of timely information of the time and place of convening.” It expresses the hope that all the Churches “will join with us to praise God for His merciful kindness towards us, and the inhabitants of the land wherein we dwell, in placing by His Divine Providence at the Helm of Government, a Man friendly to the human Race, and the Religious Rights and Liberties of Mankind, under whose Administration we hope to enjoy two of the Greatest Blessings on Earth — Religious and Civil Liberty.”

6 Three of these letters are preserved, and from them it appears that the Messengers sent were: Messrs. Jones, Nelson, Gordon, Hammill, Philadelphia; Rev. David Evans, New Britain; Empson Kirby, New Hanover. Rev. David Evans was not present.

7 The Messengers from Philadelphia were Rev. Thomas Jones, James Hammill, Thomas Francis, Thomas Webb, Peter Lavell. Revs. Artis Soaggrave, and Thomas Jones, were the only Ministers present.
The Circular Letter, a letter from the Church at New Britain, and one from a new Church in Plymouth, Luzerns Co., Penn., are all the papers preserved of the Session of 1802. The Circular Letter says:

"We propose reprinting Rally's Epistles on the Great Salvation Contemplated, provided five hundred copies are subscribed for."

The Church at New Britain writes:

"We have a little Meeting House, built in a convenient place, by the side of a public road, and finished in November last. Since then we have had meetings of Religious Worship therein, every First day of the Week."

The Plymouth letter says:

"We are happy to inform you that we were constituted a Church in this place, by our Beloved Brother, Elder Nicholas Cox, on the 23d day of January, 1802. We have also had the labors of Elder Michael Coffin, among us, and to our great joy we see the pleasure of the Lord prospering in their hands. In Huntington, (though the people were almost all Presbyterians and Methodists) many are brought into the belief of the Universal doctrine, and they hear as new born babes, who desire the sincere milk of the Word, so that the present appearance of things promises a great harvest of souls to be gathered in in this settlement. We have prevailed with Brother Cox to come and spend six months among us."

This letter was "Signed in behalf of the Church, by Peter Steel, Deacon; David Runels, Adolph Heath, Matthias Vanloon, Moses Atherton." 8

The Minutes of the session of 1803 are preserved; but no other papers. The churches at Philadelphia, New Britain, Pittsgrove, were the only ones represented.9 "Bros. John Murray from Boston, and John McIntire of Salem County being present, their company and assistance was requested." 10

8 The Ministers present at this session were Revs. David Evans, Thomas Jones, Nicholas Cox.
9 The Messengers were: Rev. Thomas Jones, Thomas Francis, William Nelson, Peter Lavell, Thomas Kinston, Robert Blair, Philadelphia; Rev. David Evans, New Britain; Rev. William Worth, Pittsgrove.
10 The Minutes, as examined by Rev. Mr. Thomas, seem to show that John McIntire
very little business was done. The "Record and files were 
aced in the keeping of Bro. Thomas Francis."

The remaining papers, three in number, viz., the Minutes, 
letter from the Church in Philadelphia, and letter from the 
Church in New Britain, relate to the session of 1805.11 No 
usiness of importance was transacted. "Appointed David 
Evans to write the Circular Letter, and Timothy Banger that 
the Convention meeting in the State of Massachusetts."

The letter from the Church in New Britain is a fine speci-
men of the sturdy logic which characterized all that flowed 
rom the pen of its author, Rev. David Evans.12 It is worthy 

Joseph Ayars were Ministers. I think that this was a mistake of the keepers of 
records. Neither of them are mentioned as preachers in any of the documents 
here their names occur. They may have been lay-preachers, but there is nothing to 
ev even this. Mr. Ayars was a member of the Church in Shiloh. I think, too, 
at I fell into an error in note on page 12 of present volume of QUARTERLY, in class-
g William McIstre, of Virginia, with the Ministers. I am now of the opinion that he 
as a layman. In the letter certifying to his election as Messenger from the Society in 
rumag Town — they considered themselves "too few in number for a Church." 
it is said, "By him, brethren, we do most earnestly solicit your attention this way, 
ough we acknowledge ourselves scarcely worth your attention, by reason of the 
ailness of our numbers, but for the sake of the dear people around us who seem ear-
aly to wish a preacher of our sentiments to visit us. And we have been in hopes a 
time that the Lord in his kind providence would direct a minister of His Gospel 
way, among us, for we think, brethren, that a great and an effectual door might be 
ened here for the promulgation of the gospel among us, by men of sound piety and 
ininal principles."

11 The Messengers to this Convention were: Thomas Francis, Israel Israel, Thomas 
tzgerald, Rev. John Murray and Timothy Banger, Philadelphia; Rev. David Evans, 
w Britain; Rev. Nicholas Cox, Kingswood.

12 John Murray regarded David Evans as one of the strongest men in the ministry. 
nd would be, for as Rev. A. C. Thomas justly says of him, "I think in closeness 
d clarity of analysis, vigor of thought and fitness of utterance, overwhelming all 
dsances to the doctrine of Universalism, David Evans deserves to take rank with 
sc System. Writing from "Gloucester, Aug. 26, 1786," Mr. Murray says: "Yest-
day my hearers had the pleasure of attending in the afternoon on Mr. David Evans' 
ning the Universality of Election. Thus you see I have preferred him to your poor 
vant. I intend to get it reprinted in Boston, anddisperse them about as far as pos-
ble. How glad I should have been if this sermon had been the product of Elhanan's 
m; but God will send by whom he will send. When you see my brother Evans, 
my love to him." A month later, writing from Boston, he says, "Our friends 
arehave, from the sermon we have seen, conceived a very high opinion of Mr. Evans, 
d would be exceeding glad to see him this way. Pray, is that gentleman fixed any-
here? has he what they call Pulpit talents? We have now our Meeting House in 
ston very elegantly fitted up, and there is, when they have a preacher, a very large 
d very attentive congregation. If Mr. Evans is not already engaged, he would find
of preservation, as among the last utterances of the Revelations.

The Universalist Church meeting in New Britian, To the Ministers and Messengers of the several Churches of the same faith with us, meeting in Convention at Philadelphia, May 25th, 1805. Greeting.

Dear Brethren: — An Inspired Apostle defines the Gospel of Christ to be Glad tidings of good things, and what tiding can be more gladdening and better, to him that knows the fallen, helpless state of man, who knows that he is a sinner and that sin doth involve the curse which he is not able to endure or to extinguish, — than to hear that God, who is infinitely wise, powerful and good, is the first cause and last end of all things? That thereby limits are fixed to the degree and duration of all evil, that all the evil which hath entered into the moral and physical world, is the subject of annihilation, and shall through the strict execution of the unfrustrable decree, be made to subservie the promotion of final, universal, purity and happiness. That the mediation of our most adorable Lord Jesus, doth, and eternally did exist, and that the existence thereof doth eternally interest mankind therein, although the far greater number in the present time know it not, and do not desire the knowledge thereof. That the mediation of Jesus Christ laid on him the iniquity of us all, and brought him under the obligation of delivering us from the Curse, by being made a Curset for us, and that through an illumination of our minds in the knowledge of his grace and truth, mankind are saved from the dominion of sin, and from the tormenting fear of the Curse of the law, and are sweetly reconciled to God and to each other in Evangelical love and purity. That God most absolute, according to His Sovereign Will, hath elected a particular number of mankind to be real Believers in this life, all whom he doth in the present life sweetly incline to seek to know the Lord; to all such, (with out any exception) God doth in the present life shew His Salvation, and that the manifestation thereof shall be their All-sufficient and unceasing heaven. That all those who are not thus elected, God doth suffer them during the present life to rest easy in their sins; and in the embraces of irreconcilable

an open door in this place, and a hearty welcome. They beg me to inform him that a visit, at least, would be very thankfully received. I write you, my friends, for this purpose, begging you would convey the request as soon as possible." A month later he writes: "I am exceedingly sorry to hear of Mr. Evans' inability to come." For further specimen of Mr. Evans' work, see "Century of Universalism," pp. 48-53.
contradictions, they have no desire to attain to the knowledge of the only True God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent; — Therefore, their lot will be, to die ignorant of their salvation from the charge and demerit of sin being fully completed in Jesus Christ. That their ignorance will be their sufficient future hell, binding them as much under the tormenting fear of the charge of sin and its demerits, as if Jesus had not saved them therefrom; in which awful state they must remain until the dispensation of fulness of time. But the evil being temporary, God's distinguishing mercy to the one, and His awful severity to the other, is to subserve the promotion of final and universal purity and happiness in all. Therefore, manifestly consistent with every attribute in God, and the existence of the most glorious mediation of Jesus Christ, this being a summary of the Gospel of Christ, every part thereof is Glad Tidings of Good Things.

Also it is plain from metaphysical deductions, that Whatever God doth hate He will finally annihilate. God doth implacably hate sin, Therefore He will finally annihilate it.

Further, What God will not finally hate, He doth necessarily love, Therefore, if God will not finally annihilate all sin, He doth necessarily love it.

These arguments, in conjunction with the word and oath of God that He hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked, do demonstratively and superabundantly prove the limitarian doctrine to be false and Anti-Christian. Although in the present day a few only are inclined of God to desire to attain the knowledge of the most precious truth, — the absoluteness, universality and immutability of God's love, — the universality and absoluteness of Salvation through the merits of Christ alone, — that God will finally gather all into the knowledge of Himself, — yet we are under the greatest obligations to rejoice in God, that the proof of the existence of this truth is so plain, demonstrative, and invincible, that the most accomplished limitarian will never be able argumentatively to answer and confute. The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His. Therefore let us not be discouraged, but animated untedly to defend the truth, illustrating it and the necessity of seeing, knowing and believing it, in order that we may partake of eternal life.

To meet with you we have appointed our Minister, David Evans, to be our Messenger. Praying for the promotion of the real Gospel, we subscribe, Your Brethren.
Subscribed by request of our meeting of worship, May 19th, 1806.

Thomas Morris, Clerk.

We know nothing more of this Convention, save that it held a session in 1806, at which Revs. David Evans, Artis Seagrave, and Nicholas Cox, were present; and another in 1807, when the following were in attendance, Revs. Artis Seagrave, David Evans, Noah Murray, Timothy Banger, John Rutter. Its last session was probably held in 1809.

Why did this Convention die? and why have the Churches of which it was composed, with but one exception, passed out of existence? It seems to us, as we reconsider their history, that three reasons may be assigned in answer to these queries. First, Distance, at that time of difficulty in passing from one section of the Country to another, was an obstacle to any general attendance upon the sessions so long as the Convention had but one place of meeting, and attempted to have but one general organization. And when at least three Conventions took the place of one, the scattered Churches were too few in number, and too feeble, except in New England, to maintain such ecclesiastical relations. The Triennial Convention, which was proposed when the Eastern and Western Sections separated from the Parent Body, might have remedied this evil, as the subsequent organization of State Conventions did, but nothing was done towards carrying out that suggestion.

Second. With the exception of the Philadelphia Church, (and the Boston and Gloucester Churches, represented at the first session only), the Churches composing this Convention were all small. In the largest the Membership did not exceed fifteen, in several it was less than ten, and in one it was as small as six. They were also, almost without exception, and especially those located in New Jersey, in places thinly

12 Rev. Mr. Thomas speaks of John Rutter "as a convert from the Baptists, a lay-preacher among them and among us." Century of Universalism, p. 59.
14 See Note 1, p. 6, of present volume of the Quarterly.
15 So great was this obstacle, that it was not till 1820, eleven years after the Convention of 1790 ceased to exist, that the Church in Philadelphia sought the Fellowship of Conversion of the New England States and others.
inhabited, where the young people could not be induced to remain, and which had for the most part been missionary fields for the older denominations represented in them, who freely bestowed aid on their struggling churches. And even the Church in Philadelphia, through inability to secure the services of a pastor, and other causes, had a severe struggle to keep alive, and could not, unaided, complete its House of Worship. In many localities, therefore, the Churches probably developed their full strength at the start, all changes that occurred were against them, and removals and deaths inevitably extinguished the organizations.

Third. The uniform complaint from first to last, was, that there were not enough preachers to meet the constant demands for the preached word. A settled ministry, engaged to any great extent in pastoral work, was an impossibility, for where could such an one be supported? The nearest approach to it was probably in the single case of Rev. David Evans, at New Britain, and no doubt he was so dependent for his support on his daily labors on his farm, as to leave him no time for pastoral work. The other preachers were of necessity itinerants, and probably were obliged to resort to other labors a portion of their time, in order to provide for themselves and their families. That they did itinerate in large circuits, and that

16 Writing to Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, from "Philadelphia, June 24, 1794," Dr. Priestly said: "A place of worship is building here by a society who call themselves Universalists; they propose to leave it open to any sect of Christians three days in the week, but they want money to finish it. My friends think to furnish them with money, and engage the use of it for Sunday mornings. The society itself, I hear, intend to apply to me to open it, which I shall gladly do." Belsham's Memoir of Lindsey. This arrangement was perfected, the Unitarians advancing "some hundreds of dollars" for the completion of the Church. Universalist Magazine, Boston, June 18, 1825.

17 Even in New England, which was a favored place for compensation, country preachers could seldom realize above "two hundred dollars each per year." Letter of George Richards. Quarterly, July 1872, p. 282.

18 Rev. Duncan McLean, residing in Loudon Co. Va., in 1790, writes to a friend: "I preach steadily in Alexandria to great audiences, and in several other places at considerable distances from my own residence. This is attended with toil, and my support hitherto hath been inconsiderable, in fact I have often suffered respecting the conveniences of life." This was no exceptional experience. The Church at Pike Run, in their letter to the Convention in 1792, say of their minister: "Our beloved Brother Abel Sargent who has faithfully laboured these four years in this country, is now, we expect, about to leave us; — we have no room to say aught against it, for he
they understood the Value of Organization, and sought to
band together those who were brought to the knowledge of the
truth, is evident from the foregoing sketch of the history of
the Convention. But grand and glorious as their work and
its immediate results was, and however great and real their
sacrifices, strong and overwhelming as were their arguments,
and intense as was the satisfaction which they imparted to be-
lieving souls, permanent results and growing organizations
could not be expected from an itineracy which was powerless
to occupy the fields which it had conquered.

If to these reasons, we add the facts that all these Churches
were subject to constant and unscrupulous persecution from
other sects, that legal obstacles were thrown in their way,¹⁹
that slanders were hurled against both preachers and people,
that missionaries were multiplied and liberally supported in
all the places where Universalism was introduced, and that
Sunday Schools,²⁰ and kindred helps were then unknown,—
has faithfully laboured, and has been instrumental in convincing very many, and we
may say it has been chiefly upon his own charges, and he is now thereby so reduced
that he is in a likely way to be distressed by the law, for want of cash to defray his
necessary charges in life, and we cannot help him, because it is impossible to obtain
cash in this country."

¹⁹ The Church at Kingwood, New Jersey, had a severe struggle for the possession
of their House of Worship, the minority of a former Baptist Society being determined to
take the whole without allowing them any compensation for their share. In 1791 they
reported to the Convention that a Committee of mutual friends had at length settled
the difficulty. But in 1792 they had to report this condition of things: "Our oppo-

¹⁰ On page 17 of present volume of the Quarterly, it will be seen that the Conven-
tion recommended the "Establishment of schools under the direction of every Church,
in which shall be taught reading, writing, arithmetic and psalmody," and that there
should be "stated meetings appointed for" the instruction of "the youth of our
we shall not wonder that the Convention died, nor that the Churches at last passed out of existence, but rather that organizations of Universalists could have been formed in any of these localities, and that the Convention could have lasted so long as it did. For although individuals may be able to stand firm through such disadvantages and assaults, it certainly requires numbers, means, and the influence of those who can furnish more than counsel, to enable Churches to maintain their ground under such circumstances.

But the Convention of 1790, although its age was but a score of years, did a good work during its brief life. If it churches " in the Bible. But it is doubtful if they intended to recommend the establishment of such schools on Sundays; at all events there is no proof that any of the Churches so understood and practised. But one thing is certain, that six months after this recommendation was made, Bishop White, (Episcopalian), Dr. Benjamin Rush, (Universalist), and Matthew Carey, (Roman Catholic), called a meeting of the citizens of Philadelphia, "for the purpose of taking into consideration the establishment of Sunday Schools for that City;" and that they and their associates organized "The First-Day or Sunday School Society," having for its object the instruction of "the offspring of indigent parents." Teachers were employed who received a slight compensation for their services. One of the first acts of the Society was to petition the legislature to establish these as free schools, but the petitions being in vain, the expenses were borne by voluntary subscription. Three schools, containing about two hundred scholars each, were established the first year. In 1798, to prevent sectarian abuse of these schools, the Society voted, "that the instructions to be given in their schools should be confined to reading and writing from the Bible; but for such scholars as had not learned to read, spelling-books and primers might be used." In 1816 the Churches in the Northern Liberties commenced the organization of sectarian Sunday Schools; the next year the example was followed in the City proper, and the three schools of "The First-Day or Sunday School Society," were absorbed by them. The first Universalist Sunday School, of which we have any knowledge, was then, 1816, formed in the First Universalist Church in Philadelphia. Is it too much to assume that the action of the Universalist Convention of 1790, incited Dr. Benjamin Rush, and through him his associates, to a work which came to such results?

Notwithstanding the disadvantages mentioned above, it is evident that Universalism was felt to be a spreading power far beyond the territory represented in any session of the Convention. From a "Digest Compiled from the Records of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and from the Records of the late Synod of New York and Philadelphia;" I make the following extracts:

"Whereas the doctrine of Universal Salvation and of the finite duration of Hell Torments, has been propagated by sundry persons who live in the United States of America, and the people under our care may possibly, from their occasional conversation with the propagators of such a dangerous opinion, be infected by the doctrine; the Synod take this opportunity to declare their utter abhorrence of such doctrines as they apprehend to be subversive of the fundamental principles of religion and morality; and therefore earnestly recommend it to all their Presbyteries and members to be watchful upon this subject, and to guard against the introduction of such tenets amongst our people." 1787. p. 457.
could not harmonize differences, it made those who advocated the Great Salvation from various standpoints, more than tolerant of each other. It brought them together in love and good will, to work unitedly for the success of the spread of the truth in which they did agree, and thus demonstrated the possibility of uniting the believers in Universalism, in one body. The Western Convention, to whose existence it consented in 1792, probably did not live more than two years, the poverty of the people, greatly augmented by the political difficulties terminating in an Insurrection in the section of Country where it was located, made sad wreck of all religious en-

"A Question from the Synod of the Carolinas was introduced through the Committee of Bills and Overtures, which was as follows: viz., 'Are they who publicly profess a belief in the doctrine of the Universal and actual Salvation of the whole human race, or of the fallen angels, or both, through the mediation of Christ, to be admitted to the sealing ordinances of the Gospel?" The Assembly determined that such persons should not be admitted." 1792. Vol. I. p. 64.

The consideration of Dr. McC's letter was resumed. On the first proposition in the letter, requesting a consideration of the sentence of the General Assembly respecting the doctrine of Universal Salvation, passed at Carlisle in 1792, the Assembly unanimously agreed to adhere to the aforesaid decision." 1794. Vol. I. p. 94.

It is easy enough to see who were the "propagators" in the bounds of the "New York and Philadelphia Synod," who so alarmed that body; but how had the doctrine so extended in the Carolinas as to occasion excitement there? Rev. Elhanan Winchester, in the preface to his edition of "Dialogues on the Universal Restoration," published in Philadelphia, in 1792, states that, when a Baptist Minister in South Carolina, in 1778, he called on a friend who put into his hand a copy of Siegrdul's Everlasting Gospel; and that some months later, a Physician with whom he had been acquainted in Virginia, came to live in his parish, and that among his books he found another copy of Siegrdul. Doubtless the circulation of this book influenced many. But perhaps the most powerful influence was exerted by the writings of Rev. William Law, some of which, read by Rev. Mr. Martin, Pastor of a society of Dunkers, in Fairfield District, adjoining Newberry, in 1780, convinced him that he ought to preach the doctrine of Universal Salvation in its fulness. Giles Chapman, also a Dunker, followed his example, in 1782, and at last the entire Dunker Church in that neighborhood, became pronounced and zealous Universalists. It was their efforts, no doubt, that gave occasion for the Inquiry from the Carolinas. In the Annals of Newberry, S. C., written by Judge O'Neal, a Baptist, there is the following notice of Giles Chapman: 'Often have I heard his discourse. He was beyond all doubt an eloquent and gifted preacher, and seemed to be inspired with a full portion of that holy and divine spirit which taught 'God is Love.' His education and means of information were limited, yet his Mighty Master spake by him as he did by the fishermen, 'in thoughts that breathe and words that burn.' His ministry was much followed, and in recurring to his spotless life and conversation, his continued zeal to do good, his kind and benevolent intercourse with men, and the meek humility with which he bore the railing of the sects who differed in opinion with him, I have never entertained a doubt, that whether right or wrong in abstract matters of faith and theology, he was indeed a disciple of Him who came into the world to save sinners." In Murray's Letters, Vol II. p. 302, there is a letter "to the Rev. A. B. of South Carolina," written probably about 1808.
The Opinions of John Wesley.

[concluded.]

Unwilling, for various reasons, to dole out in meagre and infrequent instalments our statements concerning the subject of these sketches, we have decided to withhold a large mass of the evidence, and bring these series of Articles to a close.

Our article of July, 1872, was, as we have previously stated, reviewed by Dr. Whedon on the following October. In this review he says, "Neither the contemporaries of Mr. Wesley, nor his personal friends ever suspected him of the least momentary belief in Universalism." Such a statement reveals our Reviewer's assurance, if not his discretion. Our readers are asked to believe, on his ipse dixit, that Samuel Wesley, William Law, Drs. Cheyne, Hartley and Robertson, George Whitefield who once accused 1 Wesley of affirming that "God will

1 Gillie's Whitefield, p. 641.
save all, i. e. every individual soul," and all of Mr. Wesley's contemporaries never once suspected him of "the least momentary belief in Universalism." How does Dr. Whedon know that Wesley was never suspected of at least a transient sympathy for that doctrine? Have all the contemporaries of the latter left affidavits on that point? Certainly in this case our Reviewer cannot speak from personal knowledge.

But he goes farther, and says: "Of all the lives published, not one has furnished any sentence, any anecdotal remark of his indicating a leaning to the actual salvation of all mankind." Was Southey free from such suspicions when he quoted and thus italicised the following from one of Wesley's sermons:

"But will the creature, will even the brute creation always remain in this deplorable condition? God forbid that we should affirm this, or even entertain such a thought. While 'the whole creation groaneth' together, whether men attend or not, their groans are not dispersed in empty air, but enter into the ears of Him that made them. Away with vulgar prejudices, and let the word of God take their place. 'God shall wipe away all tears, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying. Neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away.' This blessing shall take place, not on men alone (there is no such restriction in the text) but on every creature according to its capacity."

Commenting on that and some of Wesley's kindred assurances, Southey says, "Wesley was sometimes led to profess a different doctrine, in consequence of discussing questions which serve rather to sharpen thequisititious faculties than to improve a Christian disposition." Nor should our readers forget that Southey concludes the chapter with these words: "The more humane opinion was more congenial to his temper, and in that opinion he rested." Yes, and in another portion of the same work it is affirmed that "the avowal of that more hopeful belief was what drew upon Wesley such loads of abuse from the ultra-Calvinists." What does Watson's

4 p. 171.
4 Quoted in our Article of Oct., 1878.
THE OPINIONS OF JOHN WESLEY. 825

"Observations," professedly a review of Southey's Wesley, say respecting the preceding quotation? The following is Watson's only reference to the subject: "It is to be feared that Mr. Southey, in reality, takes exceptions to the doctrine aught by Mr. Wesley, the real liability of unconverted men to future (?) punishment, and that he would have much pre- serted the ministry of those who "never mention hell to ears olite." Was evasion ever more complete! No wonder that John's edition of Southey's Wesley construes Watson's silence respecting the real charge of the former as "a tacit admission that Mr. Southey's statements as to Mr. Wesley's doctrines and opinions on the whole are just and fair." In the resence of such facts we would fain ask, Is Dr. Whedon a liable writer?

Mr. Wesley published the Second Volume of his Sermons, 1788. Prior to a critical examination of particular passages in them, we remark, 1. That in those passages he is not content with affirming what may be, but instead, speaks strongly and positively of what shall be; 2. That they cannot, ith any propriety, be regarded as hasty and heated utterances; for their author had but little of merely passionate, nasty emotion, though fraught with such enthusiasms as clarify nd invigorate the understanding. So deep was his communion with God that, despite his hearty sympathy with humanity, he could say, "I do not remember to have felt les of spirits one quarter of an hour since I was born," and, ten thousand cares are no more weight to my mind than ten thousand hairs are to my head." Such avowals recall the logy of his celebrated Baptist contemporary, the Rev. Robert all, where the latter says, "The wonder of his (Wesley's) character is the self-control by which he preserved himself, hile he kept all in excitement around him. He was the last an to be infected with fanaticism." Many facts attest the stness of that estimate. Wesley's emotions, though they

* p. 171.
* Note, p. 172.

Hayward's Book of All Religions, Art. John Wesley, where also may be found the following quotations.
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impelled him to almost matchless sacrifice, were directed by a cultured understanding, and restrained by a will potent to sway thousands. Hence the manifestations of his almost reckless energy seem deliberate as the pulsings of some mons ter engine.

Further, we remark that the sermons we are about to examine came out in "The Arminian Magazine" several years prior to their appearance in a separate volume. Our extracts from them must therefore be regarded as his deliberate utterances. Nor should our readers forget that for several years these sermons were open to the inspection and criticism of Methodists only, but of the entire British public. How could these discourses have come forth under circumstances more favorable to judicial exactness? Yet many of the twice-told messages are full of the vernacular of Universalism. It will not avail, waiving all the difficulties we have cited, and others reserved for the present, to claim that his portrayals of the ultimate domain of righteousness are rendered valueless by the "gushings" of his emotional nature, for then should have full liberty, as his were creedless Societies, in the same manner to explain every dark threatening in his writings. These sermons bear marks of great care and finish. Even Dr. Whedon admits that Mr. Wesley "carefully revised" them before he sent them forth a second time.

In our Article of July, 1872, we introduced the following from Mr. Wesley’s sermon on "The Mystery of Iniquity":

"Have we not farther ground for thankfulness, yea, and strong consolation, in the blessed hope which is given us, that the time is at hand when righteousness shall be as universal as unrighteousness is now? Allowing that the whole creation now groaneth together under the man of sin, our comfort is that it will not always groan. God will arise and maintain his own cause; and the whole creation shall be delivered both from moral and natural corruption. Sin, and its consequence, pain, shall be no more! Holiness and happiness will cover the earth. Then shall all the ends of the world see the salvation of our God. And the whole race of mankind shall know and love, and serve God, and reign with him forever and ever."
Such words, in their normal sense, proclaim Universalism, and it is noticeable that the Doctor finds nothing in their immediate connection, nor even in the sermon itself, to contradict that doctrine. How, then, does he seek to explain them? By asserting, 1, that “Mr. Wesley would very plainly affirm a salvation of a whole race of mankind”; but it is a whole race of mankind at one particular period living on earth. This is far from including, in the absolute, the entire race descended through Adam. Nothing is more natural than for the census-man to say that the whole race of mankind numbers so many millions; meaning the race now living. There are philosophers who believe that, by a law of progress, the race is tending to perfection, until finally “the whole race of mankind” will walk the earth perfected beings, i.e. the race then living.”

To make his explanation look more plausible the Doctor then introduces the following from Wesley’s sermon on “The General Spread of the Gospel”: “It will not always be thus. . . God . . . will never intermit . . . until he hath put a period to sin, and misery, and infirmity, and death, and reestablished universal holiness and happiness, and caused all the inhabitants of the earth to sing together, Hallelujah, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth”; and by asserting, 2, That Wesley taught the strict eternity of hell torments. The following are our Reviewers own words on the subject: “A little later, in this same volume, is a terrible sermon on Hell, describing its fearful conditions, and asserting its absolute perpetuity of sufferings.”

Though Wesley asserts that the Spirit will be freely poured before the General Conflagration, he also teaches that both of these events are preliminary to the “new heavens and new earth” of unending glory. The question is, to what epoch does he refer in the passage just quoted from The Mystery of Iniquity? We believe that he refers to the ultimate domain of righteousness, and for the following reasons:

1. The design of the sermon, unless we rank him a very pigmy among theologians, seems to require our interpretation
of its closing words, the quotation in question. Does not every sensible writer seek to "vindicate the ways of God with men" by presenting, in contrast with the dark pall of sin, choicest pictures of the "exceeding and eternal weight of glory"? If, instead, passing the endless felicity of the redeemed, a writer contents himself with a contrast between the temporal bliss of one generation of mankind and the great at realm of moral evil, his effort is an abortion and a deformity. Y. Yet this is precisely the outline of Mr. Wesley's thought in The Mystery of Iniquity, if Dr. Whedon is correct.

2. The disputed sermon and quotation describe a "forever" state. Not only do they declare that "sin, and its conse- quence, pain, shall be no more," but also that "the whole race of mankind shall know, and love, and serve God, and reign with him forever and ever." These words necessarily include the description of a period subsequent to the Resurrection: therefore, their exclusive reference cannot be to the temporary bliss of those "at one particular period living on the earth."

In another portion we are informed that,

"According to Scripture, the Christian religion was designed for the saving from sin by means of the second Adam, all that were constituted sinners by the first. But it does not answer that end: it never did; except for a short time at Jerusalem. What can we say but that if it has not yet, it surely will an- swer it? The time is coming, when not only 'all Israel shall be saved,' but 'the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in.' The time cometh, when 'violence shall no more be heard in the earth, wasting or destruction within our borders,' but every city shall call her 'walls salvation and her gates praise,' when the people, saith the Lord, 'shall be all righteous, they shall inherit the land forever.'"

Dr. Whedon's exegesis of these passages is inadequate, because eternity cannot be compressed within the limits of "one

8 He seems to have interpreted literally the Messianic promise in Zech. xii. 10, "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem (not all the families that remain ! v. 14) the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son." Thus is Wesley's proneness to hope for the best; to adopt the bright- est views of things, revealed.
particular period” of time. Can we wonder, then, that he is led to style the former of these extracts a “delusive quo-
tation,” and some of its leading declarations “mere verbiage!”

3. The salvation spoken of in the contested quotations, in-
cludes too many to be confined to those living in this world
“at one particular period” of time.

(a) “The time is at hand when righteousness shall be as uni-
versal as unrighteousness is now.” How extensive, according
to Mr. Wesley, is the present bondage of corruption? So far
from limiting it to this world, he teaches that there is an out-
lying realm of evil which overflows its own limits, and inter-
blends with all terrestrial life. If such is the domain of un-
righteousness, how can we deny that his contrast has the
widest possible sweep; especially when we consider the in-
clusive nature of the word universal; Wesley’s proneness 9 to
use it in its largest sense, and the fact that the antithesis is im-
mediately followed by the assertion that “the whole creation”
shall be delivered from Moral evil?

It may be queried whether we can consistently explain the
following, contained in our original quotation from this ser-
mon: “Holiness and happiness will cover the earth: Then
shall all the ends of the world see the salvation of our God.”
We ask, To what period does “then” have reference? The
context answers, To the era that will follow the deliverance of
“the whole creation,” i. e., as we shall soon show, to the new
heavens and new earth. And is it not proper for one who
construes 2 Peter iii. 13 very literally, in describing that pic-
ture of what the recreated universe will be, to specifically refer
to the “new earth” and its inhabitants? 10. We shall soon
emphasize and enforce these considerations by showing when,
according to Mr. Wesley, “the whole creation” will be de-
ivered from the bondage of corruption.

9 We are acquainted with eight instances, aside from the antithesis in question,
where he uses the word universal, and in seven of these he employs it, to the best of
our knowledge and belief, in the widest possible sense.

10 Thus Chev. Ramsay, In his Natural and Revealed Religion, and Mr. Wesley, in
The New Creation, have done. In both we find ample and undeniable descriptions of
the new earth.
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(b) "The Christian religion was designed for the saving from sin by means of the second Adam, all that were constituted sinners by the first. But it does not answer that end. . . . It surely will answer it." The related assurance, "all Israel shall be saved," and, "the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in," may be construed to refer to a temporal millennium (we do not think Wesley thus applied them), but other portions of the context do not seem to admit of that limitation. To the latter belongs the statement, "the people shall inherit the land forever." Whether we suppose the people to embrace one generation, or many, the promise has reference to the new earth, since Mr. Wesley believed that, in a few thousand years at farthest, this world would be "no more." In the same mould runs the contextual assurance, "the people shall be all righteous," a declaration associated in The General Spread of the Gospel with the era when God will have "put a period to sin, and misery, and infirmity and death," and "fulfilled all his promises." From our standpoint how perfect is Mr. Wesley's contrast between the work of the first and second Adam. Frankly confessing that the Gospel does not yet save "all who were constituted sinners by the first Adam" (the reference is not, cannot be, merely to "a whole race of mankind," no Arminian can thus limit the Redeemer's mission), our arch-Methodist, instead of giving place to despair, draws the comforting conclusion that the Gospel "surely will answer" its blessed purpose. No doubt lingers in these words, for they enfold "every soul of man" in the arms of an everlasting salvation. If this is not Universalism, what is it?

(c) The whole race of mankind shall know, and love, and serve God, and reign with him forever and ever." We have already marked the futility of Dr. Whedon's attempt to limit

11 His journal for April 1, 1777, contains the following in reference to the corner at one, that day laid, of the new Methodist Church at City road: "Probably this will be seen no more by any human eye at will remain there till the earth and the works thereof, are burnt up." In the New Creation he represents God as "about" to open that last chapter in the world's drama.

12 A quotation from Rev. xxii, 5, where it is intimately associated with the time when "there shall be no more curse."
these words to "a whole race of mankind" living on earth "at one particular period." They must therefore, it would seem, be interpreted in the most literal sense. And how unfortunate the Doctor's reference to the "census-man": as though there can be any parallel between the "census-man," dealing with a limited class of material facts, and Mr. Wesley, discoursing on the overweening "mystery of iniquity."

(d) "Allowing that 'the whole creation now groaneth together;' under the man of sin, our comfort is, it will not always groan. God will arise and maintain his own cause; and the whole creation shall then be delivered both from moral and natural corruption."

What are we to understand by this? In his sermon on "The Fall of Man" 13 he says that "Christ is a remedy for all the corruption of our nature," and immediately specifies the scope of the remedy by declaring that it seeks to renew man in his "natural image," and also in his "moral image, namely righteousness and true holiness." And thus he ever, so far as we are aware, defines the subject. "Natural corruption" is a phrase easily understood, embracing as it does, according to Sacrificial theologians, man's heritage of frailty and mortality through Adam, together with those changes which The Fall has produced upon the world itself. These two kinds of corruption must, then, embrace all the consequences of Adam's sin. In these definitions Mr. Wesley is sustained by Buck, 14 and probably by the great body of Particlist commentators. When, then, according to our Preacher, will the deliverance from all corruption, prophesied in Romans viii. 19–22 take place? Dr. Whedon argues that the apostle's assurance will find its fulfilment in the temporal bliss of "a whole race of mankind at one particular period living on earth." We question whether his New Testament Commentary thus interprets St. Paul's words; indeed, we query if any Commentator of respectable ability thus construes that sublime prophecy. How can we then avoid the conclusion that Mr. Wesley in the words we are considering, refers to an era when "this world

shall be no more”? How many will be freed from “natural corruption”? That all men will be, even modern Methodists, admit. So then “the whole creation” to be freed, through the Resurrection, from that thraldom, embraces not “a,” but “the whole race of mankind.” Yet Mr. Wesley asserts that the same whole creation will also be delivered from moral corruption. Is not this Universalism?

Further: “the whole creation” to be delivered from these evils is antithesized with “the whole creation” in the bondage of corruption, so that if “a whole race of mankind at one particular period living on earth” is “the whole creation” in the one instance, it is in the other also. Are we to understand that Mr. Wesley limits sin and misery to this world? In other words, that he was a “death and glory” Universalist? Dr. Whedon agrees with us in admitting that the salvation proclaimed in the words under consideration, is universal within the included time and space. If we can prove then that these words describe the ultimate condition of the universe, there would seem to be no reason to doubt that they proclaim Universalism. That demonstration we will now attempt.

Mr. Wesley’s sermon on “The General Deliverance,” in which likewise involves his exegesis of Romans viii. 19–22, in so many words describes the “deliverance” of “the whole creation” from the “present bondage of corruption,” declares also that it will embrace “the children of men,” “every creature,” and “the whole animated creation;” that they will be freed from pain, and enjoy a happiness “without interruption and without end.”

By these five points of agreement it is evident that the same deliverance is described in both sermons. The sermon on “The New Creation,” no less than that on the “General Deliverance,” treats of this event. The former describes a deliverance from “the present state” of things, the latter, from “the present bondage of corruption”; the former specifies a time when there “shall be no more pain,” and so, in precise terms, does the latter; the former relates to an era when “there

---

14 Sermons, Vol. II. 16 Wesley’s Sermons, Vol. II.
shall be no more death,” the latter to a period when “this corruptible” shall have “put on incorruption”; the first sermon describes that hour when “the former things are passed away,” the second occupies the same field; the former proclaims a deliverance of “the whole animated creation,” so does the latter in precisely the same words; the blessings rehearsed in the former involve “all the creatures in Christ,” “all mankind,” “all animated nature,” “the whole animated creation,” “the universal restoration,” this last phrase being made to include the inanimate creation, while the beatitudes of the latter sermon embrace “the children of men,” “every creature,” “the whole animated creation,” “the whole creation”; the former portrays that day when “God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes,” the latter quotes that Scriptural assurance, and identifies it with “the general deliverance”; the former relates to a state of “unmixed holiness and happiness,” the latter to a happiness “without alloy”; the first describes an “uninterrupted” and “constant” union with Christ, the second, a bliss great as God can give, “without interruption and without end”; the former declares that He that sitteth upon the throne is about to give a demonstrative proof that “His tender mercies are over all his works,” while in the latter we are assured that “the general deliverance” will “illustrate that mercy of God which is over all his works.” Both sermons also speak of a time when “no rage will be found in any creature, no fierceness, no cruelty, nor thirst for blood,” and they likewise involve Mr. Wesley’s exegesis of Romans viii. 19–22.

Here are twelve points of assured agreement. Both discourses proclaim a deliverance of “the whole animated creation,” and describe its entire subsequent condition. They therefore refer to the same event. And can we doubt that they both inculcate the Universal Restoration? Yet, like “The Mystery of Iniquity,” they contain sketches of a terrestrial scene. Is not the reference, in each instance, to the

17 Quoted from Rev. xxi. 4. 18 Also from Rev. xxi. 4.
"new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness?" In "The General Deliverance" Mr. Wesley says,

"A general view of this is given us in the 21st chapter of the Revelation. Whon He that 'sitteth on the great white throne' hath pronounced, 'Behold, I make all things new;' when the word is fulfilled, 'the tabernacle of God is with men, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be their God.' — then the following blessing shall take place (not only on the children of men; there is no such restriction in the text; but) on every creature according to its capacity: 'God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes. Neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.' In 'The New Creation,' based on the words, 'Behold, I make all things new,' treating exclusively of his text he says, 'Very many commentators entertain a strange opinion, that this relates only to the present state of things. . . . Nay, some of them have discovered, that all which the apostle speaks concerning the "new heaven and the new earth" was fulfilled when Constantine the Great poured in riches and honors upon the Christians. What a miserable way is this of making void the whole counsel of God, with regard to that grand chain of events, in reference to his Church, yea, and to all mankind, from the time John was in Patmos, unto the end of the world! Nay, the line of this prophecy reaches farther still; it does not end with the present world, but shows us the things that will come to pass when this world is no more.'"

Thus we prove that the reference in the passages under consideration is, not to "one particular period" of time, but to eternity. Then the "new heavens and new earth" must be the arena wherein "the whole creation" will enjoy perpetual and unalloyed happiness! As much is asserted, not

---

19 In the "Spirit of Prayer," Wm. Law, (a work Mr. Wesley published in an abridged form in 1772) we are informed that in the "purifying flames" of the "last fire," "the sun, the stars, the air, the earth and water" . . . shall again become "that first heavenly materiality, a glassy sea," pp. 14, 15, vide Rev. xv. 2. Mr. Wesley also teaches that the Conflagration will destroy the "starry heavens," and seem to teach also that the "new earth" will be the abode of universal humanity. Few, if any, then believed that mankind had lived upon this planet so long as six thousand years. Behmen, Dr. Burnet, Prof. Wm. Whiston, Dr. Doddridge, Bengel and many other distinguished scholars and thinkers have literally construed the words of 2 Peter iii. 13. We are reminded by such facts of the excellent observation of the Duke of Argyle that "in philosophy the most extravagant errors have been constantly associated with the happiest intuitions."
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ally in "The General Deliverance," but also in "The New Creation." Will that domain include the entire realm inspired by The Fall? Waiving the fact that Mr. Wesley quadruple antithesizes "the whole creation" to be delivered from moral evil with "the whole creation" in present bondage, we present the following: Treating of the extent of the nal Conflagration, he says, "We cannot think that this eaven will undergo any changes any more than its great inhabitants. Surely this palace of the Most High was the same from eternity, and will be world without end." This is the only realm that will escape the fire of the last day. What follows: Mr. Wesley adds: "This is the introduction to a far other state of things, such as it has not yet entered into the eart of man to conceive, the universal restoration, which is to succeed the universal destruction. 'For we look,' says the postle, 'for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.'" As the "universal destruction" will embrace the entire realm assoiled by The Fall, so also will the universal restoration, for these two great eras are directly antithesized. And how our Preacher heightens the effect by etically asserting that the descriptions such Universalists he Chev. Ramsey, Dr. Bonnet, and Bengel have given of the new creation fall immeasurably below the picture of the universal restoration contained in that vast beatitude, hold, I make all things new." If we have correctly inverted Mr. Wesley's thought, that Scriptural pledge does include "all mankind" in its blessed fulness. And not this agree with his long previous declaration that the ted universe will contain "only righteous spirits?" Haps some of our readers may be inclined to infer that a believer in what is often termed Annihilationism. ew Creation." Perhaps Mr. Wesley means by "third heaven" a most celestial sphere of life. Does he not, after mentioning it add, "if we speak manner of men?" If we are correct the universal destruction will have a very sweep.

ird, as the context expressly states.

erved testimony shows that Mr. Wesley bestowed very high praise upon universalist works, written by Ramsay, and Bonnet. We have already pre-
The General Deliverance, which also treats, as we have abundantly shown, of the emancipation of "whole animated creation" from the "present state" of things, explicitly says, "They shall be delivered (not by annihilation; annihilation is not deliverance) from the (present) bondage of corruption, into (a measure of) the glorious liberty of the children of God." Nothing can be more express: away with vulgar prejudices, and let the plain word of God take place. They shall be delivered from "the bondage of corruption, into glorious liberty," even a measure, according as they are capable, of "the liberty of the children of God." If we can show, in addition, that the "universal restoration" will find its limits by the overcoming of all evil, and not by the measure of the phrase "heaven and earth," these reasonings will be both sustained and fortified. In his sermon on "The Omnipresence of God" Mr. Wesley says: 22 "It is well known the Hebrew phrase, 'heaven and earth' includes the whole universe, the whole extent of space, created or uncreated, and all that is therein."

We thus see that his assurances concerning "the whole race of mankind" and "the whole creation" are not limited by "this world" and "one particular period" of time, but portray the ultimate condition of the entire created universe. We apprehend that the words quoted from "The General Spread of the Gospel," by Dr. Whedon in his critique of Oct. 1872, also have reference to the same era. In a preceding portion of the sermon occurs the following:

"Such is the present state of mankind in all parts of the world! But how astonishing is this if there is a God in heaven, and if his eyes are over all the earth! Can he despise the work of his own hand? Surely this is one of the greatest mysteries under heaven! How is it possible to reconcile this with either the wisdom or goodness of God? What can give ease to a thoughtful mind under so melancholy a prospect? What, but the consideration that things will not always be so? God will be jealous of his honor: He will arise and maintain his own cause. He will judge the prince of this

22 Wesley’s Sermons, Vol. II., p. 413.
world, and spoil him of his usurped dominion. He will give
his Son 'the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost
parts of the earth for his possession.' 'The earth shall be
filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the
sea.' The loving knowledge of God, producing uniform, un-
interrupted holiness and happiness, shall cover the earth,
shall fill every soul of man.'

Again Mr. Wesley revels in contrast, offsetting his grief at
the "present state of things" with a joyful faith concerning
"another scene." What scene, a temporal millennium, or a
recreated universe? Mr. Wesley says that "scene will be
opened," when God shall "arise and maintain his own cause."
When? The Mystery of Iniquity says: "God will arise and
maintain his own cause, and the whole creation shall be de-
ivered both from moral and natural corruption." In other
words, the reference in both instances is to the era of "new
heavens and a new earth." And is not the spoliation of Sa-
tan's "usurped dominion," and the filling of "every soul of
man" with holy joy, tantamount to the deliverance of the
whole creation? Again, the quotation in question expressly
treats of a state of perfect and uninterrupted enjoyment. Did Mr.
Wesley imagine that such a state could be inaugurated and
sustained in the present order of things? In answer, we sub-
mit the following:

"The Son of God does not destroy the whole work of the
devil in man as long as he remains in this life. He does not
yet destroy bodily weakness, sickness, pain, and a thousand
infirmities incident to flesh and blood. He does not destroy
all that weakness of understanding, which is the natural con-
sequence of the soul's dwelling in a corruptible body, so that
still, 'Humanum est errare et nescire.' Neither can man,
while he is in a corruptible body, attain to Adamic perfection.
Adam, before his fall, was undoubtedly as pure, as free from
sin, as even the holy angels. In like manner his understand-
ing was as clear as theirs, and his affections as regular.
In virtue of this, as he always judged right, so he was able always
to speak and act right. But since man rebelled against God,
the case is widely different with him. He is no longer able to

24 From "The End of Christ's Coming" Sermons, Vol. II.
avoid falling into innumerable mistakes, consequently he cannot always avoid wrong affections; neither can he always think, speak, and act right. Therefore man, in his present state, can no more attain Adamic than angelic perfection." 

"But as long as evil spirits roam to and fro in a miserable, disordered world, so long they will assault (whether they can prevail or no) every inhabitant of flesh and blood. They will trouble even those whom they cannot destroy: they will attack, if they cannot conquer. And from these attacks of our restless, unwearied enemies, we must not look for an entire deliverance, till we are lodged 'where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest.'"

Add to this that, in his comment on 1 Cor. xv. 28, in The New Creation, and also in The General Deliverance, the state of "uninterrupted" enjoyment is identified by Mr. Wesley with the recreated universe, and the reference in the cases under examination seems clear beyond cavil. Dr. Whedon, in quoting from The General Spread of the Gospel, drops the following words from the body of his quotation. Why?

"These things are only permitted for a season by the great Governor of the world, that he may draw immense, eternal good out of this temporary evil. This is the very key which the apostle himself gives us in the words above recited. 'God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.' In view of this glorious event, how well may we cry out, 'Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!' although for a season 'His judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out.' It is enough that we are assured, that all these transient evils will issue well, will have a happy conclusion, and that 'mercy first and last will reign.' All unprejudiced persons may see with their eyes that He is already fast renewing the face of the earth and we have strong reason to hope that the work he hath begun, he will carry forward unto the day of the Lord Jesus that he will never intermit this blessed work until he hath fulfilled all his promises."

Had Dr. Whedon no space for these vitally important words? Reuniting them with those cited by him, and what a picture is presented of God's triumph through Christ Jesus! When

---

will that triumph take place? The phrases, "that he may draw immense eternal good out of this temporary evil," "He hath concluded them all (i. e. Jews and Gentiles, o. w. w.) in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all," "all these transient evils will issue well, will have a happy conclusion," and, "mercy first and last will reign," are, among others, expressions which seem too strong to brook the limits of the temporal. The quotation characterizes the "renewing" of the earth as the avenue to endless glories, and identifies the completion of that work with "the day of the Lord Jesus." When will that day arrive? In another sermon Mr. Wesley mentions "that latter day in which our Redeemer shall stand upon the earth" as the time when "this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall be clothed with immortality." The General Deliverance says: "In the new earth, as well as the new heavens, there will be nothing to give pain, but everything that the wisdom and goodness of God can create to give happiness. As a recompense for what they once suffered while "under the bondage of corruption," when God has renewed the face of the earth, and their corruptible body has put on incorruption." How full and explicit are these testimonies. And even Dr. Whedon's fragmentary quotation from The General Spread of the Gospel describes the time when God will have "put a period to sin, and misery, and infirmity, and death."

In the light of these quotations is not the reference apparent? If not, let the reader ponder the following: "God leaves us encompassed with all these infirmities, particularly weakness of understanding; till the sentence takes place, 'Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.' Then, error, pain, and all bodily infirmities cease; all these are destroyed by death, and death itself, the last enemy of man, shall be destroyed at the resurrection."

To whichever kind of death God "puts a period" in the "day of the Lord Jesus," the reference is to an era beyond the limits of mortality. And it is then, unless Mr. Wesley's...
narrative violates historic sequence, that God will "re-establish universal holiness and happiness." How extensive, according to Mr. Wesley, was the primal reign of holiness? It embraced "the whole creation." He asserts that man by his apostasy from God, threw not only himself but likewise the whole creation, which was intimately connected with him, into disorder, misery, death. Does not the antithesis then authorize us to assume that the "universal restoration" will embrace most literally the whole creation? We also observe that The General Spread of the Gospel refers not only to the time when "uninterrupted holiness and happiness will cover the earth" and "fill every soul of man," but also to an era when God will have "fulfilled all his promises." Is not the inference apparent? Exactly accordant with our view of the case is this: As for God, his way is perfect, and such originally were all his works, and such they will be again, when the Son of God shall have destroyed (all) the works of the devil. How significant that addition of the word all! And do not the Moral and Sacred Poems teach that God, when he shall "recompense" mankind "their Eden's loss," will destroy "all the works" of the devil? We find it pleasant to trace such harmonies.

In another portion of The General Spread of the Gospel we meet with these words: "Then the Saviour of sinners will say, 'The hour is come; I will glorify my Father; I will seek and save the sheep that were wandering on the dark mountains. Now will I avenge myself of my enemy, and pluck the prey out of the lion's teeth! I will resume my own, for ages lost: I will claim the purchase of my blood.'" What, according to Mr. Wesley, is the purchase of Christ's blood? In answer we submit the following from the New Testament notes:

28 Sermon on "God's Approbation of his Works." Vol. II.
29 Though Dr. Whedon would restrict Mr. Wesley's assurances concerning the deliverance of the whole creation to one generation of mortals, it is not likely that he carries out that exegetis in this instance. If so, he is unsound concerning The Fall. We confess dislike of the microscopic method of interpreting the testimonies of Christian faith.
30 From God's Approbation of His Works.
"That by the grace of God he might taste death, an expression denoting both the reality of his death, and the shortness of its continuance; for every man,- That ever was or will be born into the world" Com. on Hebrews ii. 9. "Who gave himself a ransom for all: Such a ransom the word signifies, wherein a like or equal is given, as an eye for an eye, or life for life. And this ransom, from the dignity of the person redeeming, was more than equivalent to all mankind." Com. on 1 Tim. ii. 6. "And he is the propitiation,—The atoning sacrifice, by which the wrath of God is appeased: for our sins, —who believe, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Just as wide as sin extends, the propitiation extends also." Com. on 1 John xi. 2. "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times. In this last administration of God's fullest grace, which took place when the time appointed was fully come, he might gather together into one in Christ, might recapitulate, reunite and place in order again under Christ their common head,—all things,—all things which are in heaven and on the earth. All angels and men, whether living or dead in the Lord." Com. on Eph. i. 10.

What a unique and grand view of the extent of the Atonement is here presented. And we trace, not only provision, but assurance of fulfilment, in the passage under examination. He is Faithful and True who says, "I will resume my own, for ages lost." Does that accord with the Probation theory to-day so popular among Methodists? We cannot dwell upon the argument furnished by the uniform trend and testimony of these collocations, or sum up the identities between this sermon and those of Mr. Wesley's discourses which palpably treat of "the new creation;" neither may we pause to designate the points of similarity and identity between this sermon and the most explicit witness of the Moral and Sacred Poems.

Cramped for space, we cannot give any adequate outline of our method of interpreting his primitive statements; neither can we present certain facts we would fain bring forward in such connection. That he threatened sinners with unending woe, we admit, but this does not refute the theory that he was a Universalist. There were men not a few in those days who, though they threatened the wicked with endless misery, taught
the esoteric Universalism. On the other hand, none of those who believed in endless torments ever made it a part of their policy to teach Universalism. From the nature of the case, they could not. When, therefore, we find in writings of that period, assertions of everlasting misery offset by manifold and mutually-corroborative declarations of Universal Restoration; especially if those writings are the carefully matured products of scholarly men, well informed in Christian dogmatics, what is the inference? And just here we would urge these important considerations: 1. Wesley's primitive utterances so collocate as to bring out unlooked for definitions; and, 2, they reveal a door of egress from headean torments. In conclusion we present the following: 21

"But the heathen himself will bear us witness: 'Jovis omnia plena,'—all things are full of God. Yea, and whatever space exists beyond the bounds of creation (for creation must have bounds, seeing nothing is boundless, nothing can be, but the Creator,) even that space cannot exclude him who fills the heaven 22 and the earth. Just equivalent is the expression of the apostle, Eph. ii. 23, (not as some have strangely supposed, concerning the Church, but concerning the Head of it) "The fulness of Him who filleth all in all;" τα πάντα εν πάσιν: literally translated, all things in all things: the strongest expression of universality that can possibly be conceived. It necessarily includes the least and the greatest of all things that exist. So that if any expression could be stronger, it would be stronger even than that, the filling heaven and earth.""

In Scripture both these phrases are employed to describe the ultimate extent of the domain of righteousness, a fact of which Mr. Wesley must have been aware. Indeed, he thus employs them himself. Turning to his New Testament Notes, edition 23 of 1757, we find the following: "That God may be all in all": Gr. θεος τα πάντα εν πάσιν: All things (consequently all persons) without any interruption, without the intervention of any creature, without the opposition of any enemy,

21 From "The Omnipresence of God." Sermons, Vol. II.
22 In The New Creation he notes the fact that the word so uniformly rendered heaven in the Bible, should be heavens.
23 The first edition, whose comments on these passages are probably the same, was published in 1755.
shall be subordinate to God. All shall say, "My God and my all." This is the end. Even an inspired apostle can see nothing beyond this." From Com. on 1 Cor. xv. 28. And did not Mr. Wesley grandly reaffirm this exposition in 1788? Recurring to the Notes, we find the following: "We look for new heavens and a new earth,—raised, as it were, out of the ashes of the old: wherein dwelleth righteousness: only righteous spirits. How great a mystery." Com. on 2 Peter iii. 11–13. In 1779 we find him writing, 24 "This is our comfort, that we know our Lord has all power in heaven and in earth; and that whosoever he willeth to deliver, to do is present with him." Modern Methodists teach that God desires to save all, and cannot, but our rare Arminian, despite his peculiarly ample ideas of the Atonement, designates God's desires as the exact measure of his power. In 1788 this venerable Preacher asserted, as we have shown, that the new heavens and new earth are to be the everlasting abode of "the children of men," "every creature," "all animated nature," "the whole animated creation," yea, and of "the whole creation"; and that, minus the third heaven and all that pertains thereto, this realm will "include the whole universe; the whole extent of space, created or uncreated, and all that is therein." These statements he never retracted. It follows that, during a period of more than thirty years he steadfastly employed, in describing the ultimate domain of holiness, what he considered the two strongest possible affirmations of universality, and, dying, bequeathed them to humanity, his last will and testament of faith concerning the "power of Jesus' name.

ARTICLE XIX.

The Origin of the Persecution of the Apostolic Church.

In the first chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, we find this seeming contradiction,—The first persecution of the Apos-

24 From a letter to Mrs. Jane Barton. The italics are his. The letter is in Wesley's Works. Vol. VII. p. 47.
tolic Church was instigated and vigorously pursued by the Sadducees; but the Pharisees, under the lead of the great Gamaliel, enabled Peter and John to escape from their persecutors, without harm. But within a very brief time, these Pharisees, who effected the release of the two disciples, became the instigators of a more violent persecution against Stephen. The Sadducees procure the arrest of Peter and John; and when they are brought before the Sanhedrin for trial, Gamaliel speaks the word which occasions their release. Yet almost immediately the Pharisees arrest Stephen and bring him before the same body for trial. But Gamaliel is silent now. The history of the trial does not yield us even a hint that such a man as Gamaliel was living. A calm word from the Pharisaic side of the Council releases the two apostles; but no word from the Sadducean side favors the release of Stephen.

And we inquire why the Sadducees were the first persecutors? and why, when persecution was checked by the Pharisees, it was commenced again by these very men who had stopped its progress?

Nearly every Hebrew belonged to the one or the other of the two great sects into which the Jews were divided. Two questions, and only two, divided the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees believed in the resurrection and immortality of man. The Sadducees asserted that men will not live after this life, and they denied even the existence of spirits. The Pharisees exalted religion above morality. They held that the law of duty to God was more binding than the law of duty to man. Therefore they regarded morality as of secondary importance. The Sadducees on the other hand, held that the law of duty to man was more binding than the law of service to God. To them morality was the prime interest of man, and religious duty was of secondary importance. We find traces of the rise of these sects as far back as the Babylonian captivity. Consequently, they had discussed these questions for five or six hundred years, and were perfectly familiar with all the weak and strong points in each others’ positions and reasonings.
The faith of the Jews that the Messiah would be the King of their nation, break every foreign yoke, raise the nation above all other nations in prosperity and glory, and never die and leave it to a weak successor, is familiar to all. It was the great hope of the nation, of which they talked and sang, and for which they gave praise and glory to God. It was the hope of Mary when Jesus was born, the destruction of which, Simeon told her, should be as a sword piercing through her soul. And so full were the twelve of this great expectation, that the mother of James and John requested the two highest offices of the realm for her two sons; and Jesus could speak of the certainty of his death, only in the most delicate manner. And for nothing were the twelve so severe with him, as for even hinting that death was possible to him. Three years spent in his presence and under his teaching and training, could not break the delusion. The veil that hid the truth respecting the death of their Master, was as thick as ever when, after the crucifixion, some of them walked together on the road to Emmaus. The death and resurrection of Christ seem to have been necessary to break the illusion. And even when, after his resurrection, he had been with them forty days, they remained as blind as ever; for the very last question they asked him on earth, within hardy a week of Pentecost, was, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"

On the day of Pentecost, the light came. They suddenly saw what they had been utterly and strangely blind to,—that the Scriptures teach that the Messiah must die and rise again, and that he is not to have his throne in Jerusalem and wield a sceptre over one nation only, but that his throne is to be in the heavens, and that he shall rule over all nations. Coming, as they did, from deep darkness into midday light, with the troublesome mysteries about their Master's course completely solved at once, it is not strange that they preached the newly found doctrine, the long hidden, Scriptural doctrine of the death and resurrection of the Messiah, with an earnestness that seemed like the utterances of drunken men, to those who were still in the deep darkness from which they had so re-
ently come. Their only theme was, the resurrection of Christ and the universality of his reign. And on the first day of their preaching, “there were added unto them, about three thousand souls.”

The Sadducees cannot be indifferent listeners to this preaching nor quiet spectators of this work. Probably many of their own number were converted to faith in a resurrection. Their old opponents, the Pharisees, never made such inroads upon their numbers. This is something new and even marvellous; and it threatens to greatly weaken the Sadducees if not to exterminate the sect. We can imagine the Sadducees calling in at one another’s houses or gathering in knots in the places of public resort, reporting one to another the strange facts occurring, and earnestly discussing what must be done to save their existence as a sect. They well understood, and doubtless said as much, that it would be useless to procure the arrest of the leaders and to arraign them before the Sanhedrim, for teaching the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, for the Pharisees were in majority in that great Council, and would not do so ridiculous a thing as to join the Sadducees in punishing men for preaching one of the two articles of their faith. At last an event occurs which affords the Sadducees an opportunity to bring a grave charge against Peter and John without naming the doctrine of the resurrection. They have cured a lame man by some strange power; and they can be arrested for working miracles by the use of some unwarrantable force. If their condemnation and imprisonment or death can be secured for this offence, it will as effectually stop them from preaching the doctrine of the resurrection, as if they were condemned and punished expressly for that; and the Pharisees can aid in their condemnation for this offence without inconsistency.

The historian informs us of the real reason for the arrest of Peter and John, while the ostensible one is entirely different. He tells that while they were preaching in the temple, “the priests and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, being grieved that they taught through Jesus the
The excitement and alarm of the Sadducees have rapidly increased, for on the day of the arrest the converts numbered "five thousand men"; and probably the female converts were equally numerous.

The next day, Peter and John were brought forward for trial. And when they were asked "by what power, or by what name ye have done this," although he knew he was in the power of men who said "there is no resurrection," Peter answered boldly, "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him cloth this man stand here before you whole." This very unexpected mention of the resurrection of Jesus, embarrassed the Council; and after removing the apostles from the room, a private consultation was held. The question which the persecutors endeavored to exclude, has been forced into the foreground. In the private consultation the Pharisees doubtlessly told the Sadducees that they could not and would not participate in punishing men for preaching their own doctrine of a resurrection from the dead, even if it had reference to the resurrection of Jesus. And probably influenced by the advice and decision of the Pharisaic majority, the Council decided to do nothing but to order Peter and John to cease preaching in the name of Jesus, and to threaten them with severe treatment if they should disobey the order. It will be noticed that the Council did not order them to stop preaching the resurrection, but to cease preaching in the name of Christ.

After most fervent prayer that these threatenings might not deter them from proclaiming the truth publicly, the apostles continued as bold as ever; and the converts increased. "Then the high priest rose up, and all that were with him, (which is the sect of the Sadducees,) and were filled with indignation, and laid hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison." But they were miraculously released from prison, and without hesitation they went at once to the temple and again preached their doctrines to the multitudes. When the Sanhedrim was called to order in the morning, the officers re-
ported to it the escape of the prisoners. But they were soon found, and brought in for trial. And when the high-priest inquired of them, "Did we not straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name?" Peter and John boldly proclaimed the resurrection of Jesus again, saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged upon a tree." "And we are witnesses of these things." "When they heard that, they were cut to the heart, and took counsel to slay them." But the Sadducees had now proceeded as far as the Pharisees could permit them without a compromise of themselves and their doctrine. In all the proceedings, they must have seen through the thin disguise 'of the charges made against the apostles. But they have been perfectly willing to aid their old opponents in securing the condemnation of the men, so far as the condemnation did not involve their doctrine. And the whole affair, no doubt, has troubled them exceedingly, for the Sadducees have pushed them into a position from which there seems no escape without inconsistency and dishonor; for either they must join their old opponents in punishing men for proclaiming one of their fundamental doctrines, or they must become the friends of the followers of Jesus of Nazareth. Going over to the Sadducees upon this question cannot be entertained for a moment. It would be taking their own life. To sustain Peter and John would be as repugnant to them. Evidently the Sadducees see their advantage, and they are not slow to use it. And the Pharisees look to their great leader Gamaliel, to find a way of escape for them. As the only way out, he proposes to "let them alone"; for after reciting some instances from history that he asserts will shed light upon the proper course to be pursued in this instance, he moves to "refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." And he gives them a solemn warning not to permit themselves to "be found even to fight against God." This proposition was adopted, and the apostles were released, though no Pharisee said a word against the
beating of the prisoners before they were released. By some Gamaliel has been regarded as a man of most catholic spirit, while others have thought his course betrays sympathy for Christianity. But his course was that of a shrewd man intent only upon saving his party from a difficulty from which, at one time, there seemed no escape.

This action of the great Council, put an end to the first persecution of the Apostolic Church. At both times when Peter and John were before the Council, they were removed from the hall when the Council proceeded to consider what should be done to them, and their case was considered in secret session. Therefore we have little more of the history of the proceedings than the conclusion to which the Council came. We know not whether the deliberations of the case were calm or violent, deliberate or heated. But we obtain an inside view of the body, when, years afterwards, St. Paul was before it for trial, upon his last visit to Jerusalem. He forced upon the Sanhedrin the same question which Peter and John forced upon it. For "when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the Council, I am a Pharisee, and the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a discussion between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry: and the scribes that were of the Pharisees part arose and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man: but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God. And when there arose a great dissension, the chief captain, fearing lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces of them, commanded the soldiers to go down, and to take him by force from among them, and to bring him into the castle." Possibly the scene in the secret session of the Sanhedrin, at the trial of Peter and John, was as stormy as this. And in this instance as well as in that, the Pharisees propose no higher course than the "let them alone" doctrine of Gamaliel.
Possibly within a few weeks after this action of the Pharisees in the Council, certainly within a very brief time, the Pharisees themselves become leaders in a more violent and successful persecution. It originated in some foreign synagogues at Jerusalem, in consequence of some expositions of Scripture and some statements respecting the providence and presence of God, and the work of Christ, made there by a disciple of Jesus named Stephen. He asserted that the time had come when the especial presence and worship of God would no longer be confined to the Jewish temple. He declared that the time had come when there would be no difference in the sight of God, between Jew and Gentile, and when no man would need to leave home or country to enjoy the presence and worship of Jehovah. He announced a universal religion to take the place of Judaism, and proclaimed a love of God embracing all mankind, against the partialism of the Jews. And therefore he proved that the temple service, with its rites and ceremonies would cease. We may believe that in his addresses in the synagogues as well as in his speech in the Sanhedrim, he startled his hearers with this wonderful but grand use of Scripture,—"Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool; what house will ye build me, saith the Lord!"

The Sadducees were offended by the preaching of the resurrection; but Pharisees, who exalt religion above morality, are offended by the teachings of Stephen. Among the synagogues in which Stephen "reasoned" upon this great love of God and this great work of Christ, was "the synagogue of them of Cilicia." When in Jerusalem at the school of Gamaliel, the young man Saul went to this synagogue of his native province; for Tarsus was the capital of Cilicia. And there the Martyr put into his heart the goads which drove him into the Christian Church and gave to the world Paul the Apostle. It seems to have been regarded an easy thing, at the first, to silence Stephen by facts and reasoning. And we may believe that Saul engaged with him in discussion. But we are
told, (and undoubtedly Paul had often told the historian —
his dear friend Luke — ) "they were not able to resist the
wisdom and spirit by which he spake." At last, made deeply
sensible of the strength of Stephen's positions and the weak-
ness of their own, the Pharisees resort to violence. They
carried him before the High Court of the Jewish nation upon
these charges — "This man cease not to speak blasphemous
words against this holy place, and the law, for we have heard
him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place,
and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us."
Evidently, this is an exaggerated statement of Stephen's doc-
trines; for it gave the impression and was intended to give
the impression, that he had been teaching that Jesus would
come as a warrior and destroy the temple and abolish its rites.
In teaching what his Master taught, that "the hour cometh,
when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem,
worship the Father," he could not but declare that "the law
is a shadow of good things to come," and that whatever should
stand in the way of its fulfilment, be it temple or temple rites
and ceremonial, must pass away.

Gamaliel, who saved the Pharisaic side of the Council from
inconsistency in the treatment of Peter and John, is silent at
Stephen's trial. History affords us not even a hint that such
a man was living. But we know he must have been active,
for his great pupil takes a prominent part in the persecution.
And Stephen dies, not because he believed in a resurrection,
but because he taught that there is "one Lord, one faith, one
baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and
through all, and in all."

And from this time this opposition of the Pharisees to the
universality of the gospel and of Christ's mission, was the
ground of the persecution of the Apostolic Church. Saul de-
sired letters to Damascus, "that if he found any of this way,
he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem." At An-
tioch in Pisidia the Gentiles urged Paul and Barnabas to
preach their new doctrines to them the next Sabbath; but the
Jews created a mob and drove the missionaries out of the city.
While the missionaries were absent, Jews went down to the mother church at Antioch, and said to the members, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." And upon the decision of this question, depended whether we should have a partial or universal church. And the contention was earnest, even to the breaking of such strong and tender friendships as those of Paul and Barnabas. The persecutions at Thessalonica and Berea were caused by this opposition to a universal religion. And when Paul arrived at Jerusalem, the brethren went to him the moment he arrived, and said, — "the multitude must needs come together; for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee; We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads; and all may know that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself walkest orderly, and keepest the law." But, zealous of their religion, the Pharisees were determined to find some plea to destroy him who taught that Gentiles are equal with Jews, in the sight of God. Therefore when Paul went into the temple to comply with the request of his brethren, "all the people laid hands on him, crying out, Men of Israel, help. This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere, against the people, and the law, and this place." "And they took Paul and drew him out of the temple, . . . and they went about to kill him."

It will be observed that the charges here made against Paul are the same as those made against Stephen. The Sadducean persecution ceased, although the Christians believed in and taught the resurrection of the dead. But the persecution which was commenced against Stephen by the Pharisees, for the breadth of his views, was continued against the Apostolic Church throughout its history.
PROPHECY AND PROVIDENCE.

ARTICLE XX.

Prophecy and Providence.

"I will give all Judah into the hand of the King of Babylon, and he shall carry them captive into Babylon, and shall slay them with the sword. Moreover I will deliver all the strength of this city, and all the labors thereof, and all the precious things thereof, and all the treasures of the kings of Judah, will I give into the hands of their enemies, which shall spoil them, and take them, and carry them to Babylon."

Twenty years from the time this was uttered it was fulfilled to the letter, thus verifying the claim of the prophet of God, that he spake by divine authority. Jerusalem was overthrown, the king of Judah was taken prisoner, the wealth of the city spoiled, and the people carried into captivity by the Chaldeans, under the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, as the prophet had elsewhere particularly specified.

On the death of Solomon, the ten tribes revolted from his son Rehoboam, and formed the kingdom of Israel. The tribes of Judah and Benjamin remained true in their allegiance to the royal house of David, and were known afterward as the kingdom of Judah.

The fatal example of idolatrous worship set by Solomon toward the close of his reign, left its blighting effects; and though the revolt of Israel restored Rehoboam for a little time to his senses, and made him think of the need of divine aid and guidance, yet he very soon fell away again into evil practices, and the people willingly followed.

The Lord consequently abandoned them to the results of their sinful practices. They forsook him, and he forsook them; and the seed they had sown they reaped in desolation and sorrow. In the very beginning of their estate as a nation, God had promised them if they were faithful and obedient, they should eat the fat of the land, and live in peace and security; but if they went after other gods, and followed iniquity and wickedness, then they should eat the fruit of their evil doings. See Deut. xxviii.

Now we may philosophize as we choose in regard to the laws of nature, and the connections and dependencies of moral and political action, one thing is certain, the prophetic truth of the
sacred record, has been confirmed and established again and again in the actual life of the Jewish people, both before and after their separation into two nations or peoples. Follow them in their marvellous history from Sinai to Babylon, from the giving of the Law, through all the changes of more than 1500 years of their national life, down to the time when the Romans made Jerusalem a heap of ruins, and it will be found that these words of God held true. When they were obedient, pure, and faithful — when they did justly, loved mercy, and walked humbly before the Lord, the promises were fulfilled, and they prospered. But when they set all these at naught, refused to serve the Lord, and worshipped idols, then the threatenings were fulfilled, and famine, and pestilence, the sword and captivity, desolated them. They were cast out from the presence of the Lord, a by-word and a hissing.

We shall enter into no metaphysical disquisition in answer to the questions, “What connection is there between the moral and political status of a nation? and how can it be shown that faith and worship have any relation to the material prosperity or the national security of a people?” Our business in this article is simply to narrate the facts, and to show that somehow, for some sufficient cause, national prosperity and safety did follow national virtue and righteousness; while on the other hand disaster and overthrow did as invariably follow disobedience, wickedness, and moral and religious corruption. We give the facts, not explanations, nor theories.

Only five years from the beginning of Rehoboam’s reign Judah was invaded, Jerusalem taken, and the temple plundered by Shishak king of Egypt. And from this time there was a continual shifting from sin to repentance, from idols to Jehovah, from prosperity to adversity, from great power to the very borders of national destruction. Sometimes the monarch was a man of truth and piety, following the Law, and rooting out the altars and groves of the false gods; and sometimes king and people were utterly abandoned to idolatry, and the splendid temple of Solomon left to fall into partial ruin for the want of suitable repairs.
Of the first sort was Jehoshaphat, who was a good man, and an able ruler. His reign extended to twenty-five years, and was distinguished by its regard for the honor of the ancient worship, and for the benefits conferred on the nation.

His successor however was the reverse of this, and, influenced by his wife, who was the daughter of the famous Ahab, king of Israel, he soon undid the good work of his father, and set up idolatry of the most corrupt, obscene and dangerous character. Rites similar to those Jehoshaphat had forbidden, again made their appearance on the hills of Judah, and the people were invited to the worship of strange gods.

Quick on the track of this, exactly in accordance with the words of the prophet, came the judgment. Disease and death after a horrible sort — and “ moreover,” says the record, “ the Lord stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines, and of the Arabians, that were near the Ethiopians. And they came into Judah, and they carried away all the substance that was found in the king’s house, and his sons also, and his wives — and Jehoram himself died of sore diseases.” 2 Chron. xxii.

Thus it went on until the time of Ahaz, some 240 years from the death of Solomon, when, beset by the combined armies of Israel and Syria, he sent to Tiglath-Pileser for assistance. Thus enters on the stage the Assyrian of Nineveh, who though he comes first as friend and saviour, comes last as an enemy and destroyer. His powerful aid was secured only by the large bribe of the royal and sacred treasurers, and the acknowledgment of vassalship.

This state of things continued till the time of the next king, Hezekiah, a truly religious monarch, who swept the country clean of idolatry, restored the temple of Solomon, re-opened it, and established the great national festivals. In a word, there was a general reformation, and the fickle people seemed once more to return heartily to the Lord Jehovah, and honor his name and worship.

This was the posture of affairs when Hezekiah encouraged by the promise of assistance from Egypt, ventured to refuse
his annual tribute to the king of Nineveh. The result was an
invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, with an overwhelming
force, spreading alarm and terror through the country. He
sent an insulting message to Hezekiah at Jerusalem, telling
him resistance would be vain, that Jehovah could not deliver
him out of his hands. A copy of this letter has been pre-
served, and our readers will do well to turn to 2 Kings xix.
9-19, and give it a careful perusal.

"And Isaiah said unto them, Thus shall ye say to your master, Thus saith the Lord,
Be not afraid of the words which thou hast heard, with which the servants of the king
of Assyria have blasphemed me. Behold, I will send a blast upon him, and he shall
hear a rumor, and shall return to his own land; and I will cause him to fall by the
sword in his own land."

All this came to pass precisely as predicted—the "rumor"
was that Tirhakah king of Ethiopia was on his way to give him
battle, and he marched away to meet him. And while en-
camped in the desert, "it came to pass," says the historian,
"that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp
of the Assyrians a hundred fourscore and five thousand. And
when they (the survivors) arose in the morning, behold they
were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib departed, and went,
and returned and dwelt at Nineveh."

There has been much discussion in regard to this event.
The number of those who perished, viz.: 185,000 is large;
but all history shows large numbers in these respects. In the
wars of the Romans, in the conflicts of Julius Caesar with the
Gauls, one and even two hundred thousand of the barbarians
perished sometimes in a single battle. And the army with
which Xerxes invaded Greece, including camp-followers, num-
bered nearly a million. The Biblical record therefore corre-
sponds in this regard with history; and it must be remem-
bered that at this period the Assyrian empire was the most ex-
tensive and populous in the world.

As to the "angel of the Lord"—It is well known that
whatever instrument or agent God employs to work out his
judgments, or accomplish his purposes, is called his angel.
In this case, it was doubtless the sirocco or simoom, the hot sand
blast, or fire-wind, by which whole caravans have sometimes
been overwhelmed and destroyed in the desert. In 1655 four thousand men perished in this way, and three years later about 20,000 met a similar fate. On another occasion 1800 camels and 4000 men were buried by a sand storm. Cambyses in his invasion of Egypt lost 50,000 troops in the desert. These facts serve to illustrate and confirm the statement of the sacred historian.

A learned writer on this subject says, "I believe this angel or messenger of the Lord was simply a suffocating or pestilential wind, by which the Assyrian army was destroyed. Thus was the threatening of verse 7 fulfilled, "I will send a blast upon him." This without doubt is the true interpretation of the passage in regard to the angel or agency employed by the Lord.

Here again we have the record in Deuteronomy illustrated. According to the promise, when the people were obedient, they prospered. To all appearances Jerusalem and Judah were at the mercy of the cruel and victorious Assyrian; but there is here again a providential protection of the weak but righteous king and people. God who holds all physical as well as spiritual agencies in his power, in whose hand the material worlds are as clay in the hands of the potter, who makes the winds and the lightnings his messengers of judgment, calls up the Ethiopian invader from the extremities of the earth, sends a rumor to startle the Assyrian monarch on his march to Jerusalem—turns him back by the way he came to seek this new enemy; and in his desert march meets him by night in the fiery sand blast, and in the morning his conquering hosts lie along the scorching sands, a testimony that God only is Great!

On the death of Hezekiah his successor began again the old sin of introducing the service of false gods, and mixing the worship of idols and Jehovah all in one. And so it went on with fickle moods of repentance and reform, till at last it reached a point where the anger of the Lord was kindled against them, and he gave them into the hands of the De-
Our Denominational Position and Duty.

The history of sects, or of the various parties into which Christians have, from age to age, separated themselves, is full of instruction, and should be studied more than it is. Such study would show how necessary it is to sink the shadow in the reality, to submit the form to the spirit, if it be expected that any permanent impression will be made on the minds of men, or on the institutions of society.

If a sect or a church expect to live any length of time, it must live on something more than a mere form or abstraction, or the negation or denial of a false doctrine. There must be a positive force, an absolute truth and substance, a living activity in every sect that hopes to do any great part in the work of establishing on earth the kingdom of righteousness, peace and the joy of a holy spirit. There may be errors mingled with the truth, but there must be some truth in order to keep the errors from perishing. A falsehood may contrive to live for a long time, if it can get associated with a truth. So many sects and creeds are able to maintain a tolerably long life by a mixture of the wisdom from above with the wisdom from beneath, by the incorporation of some great theological truth into the system of their false dogmas, or by yoking a mere form, of little worth or vitality in itself, with some acknowledged fact or doctrine of revelation.

Calvinism is false enough, and revolting to the last degree in some of its particulars, and left to these it would be cast out as an unclean beast from the sanctuary of worship. It could not command the faith or respect of its disciples for a day, were it not that all these offensive details and logical contradictions rested on a momentous and vital truth of religion and revelation.

The fact that God is the living, active, and almighty Ruler of the universe, that he does whatsoever he will in heaven and earth, and none can stay his hand; that his will is law, and that he created man and all things with a purpose and a plan which cannot by any possibility fail — This is the life-preserver of Calvinism, which keeps it from sinking beneath the weight of its absurd and cruel and blasphemous dogmas.

Take this great and vital truth out of Calvinism and its power and
life would speedily come to an end. It would be like taking out the heart from the human body. Life can be continued while the heart is right, sometimes even when the extremities are palsied and dead. Sometimes one entire half of the body is paralytic, while the functions of life still go on through the action of the heart. So Calvinism, which is struck with palsy, rejected with unbelief, in many of its parts, still lives through the vigorous action and life-impacting energy of the sublime truth that God controls the universe, and all its issues and possibilities, by the power of His almighty will. There is pulse and blood enough in this grand doctrine of the Bible, to keep life in the withered limbs of Orthodoxy for these many years to come. And the history of its monstrous errors only serves to show the power there is one great truth of God.

*Arminianism*, or modern *Methodism*, holds its place in the same way, by laying its foundation in a great fact of human consciousness, confirmed by the whole spirit of the divine requirements and teachings of the Law and the Gospel, viz.: The moral freedom and responsibility of man. Whatever we may think of the metaphysical difficulties involved in the assertion, nothing is more clearly and positively affirmed by the universal conscience, conviction and conduct of mankind; nor more obvious on the face of all the commandments, encouragements and warnings of Scripture, than the fact that there is a circle within which we act freely so far as to be fit subjects of rewards and punishments; though beyond and outside this sweeps the greater circle of God's eternal, invincible, and unfailing purpose.

Seizing on this great truth of revelation and common conviction, *Arminianism* secures for itself a place in the general faith of Christians, and reacts on the extravagances of the opposite creed. It is a cardinal truth this, that we are responsible for our conduct, for our use of means, our obedience or disobedience to the law of righteousness; and it is strong enough to bear up many contradictions and foolish dogmas of church creation, which, without its inherent energy, would sink of their own weight.

*Unitarianism* could not live at all on mere negation, the denial of the Trinity, of total depravity, and kindred absurdities of Orthodoxy, if it did not borrow some vital force, some living blood, from the assertion of the Fatherhood of God, his infinite goodness, and moral providence. The question of one God or three is of little consequence in comparison with the question of his character and government, of his relation and disposition toward man. If I am to be damned, what
is it to me whether I am damned by one God, or three, or thirty? But if he is my Father—that is the supreme truth. This last rightly understood and affirmed is great enough and inspiring enough to infuse life into the most meagre system of negations. But in this inquiring age, when men are so given to pushing all facts and reasonings to their inevitable conclusions, Unitarians must do something more with this truth than they have been doing, or they will cease to exist as a religious sect. They have lately discovered this fact. They begin to see that they must accept the necessary doctrinal and practical deductions which follow from the fact that God is the Father of all men, or be set aside by all who are in thorough earnest in religious things, and seek to build their house of faith upon the Rock of Ages.

The sect that is destined to live while the world stands, and to swallow up all other sects in the unity of its faith and spirit, must embody in its creed the essential truths of all these sects, and must represent these truths in its denominational position and action. It must take its stand on fact and not on form. The truth, the doctrine and its reduction to life must be first and paramount, and subordinate to this whatever forms may legitimately grow out of it.

The Universalist Church seems to occupy more favorable ground in this respect than any other. It has gathered into its creed the cardinal doctrines of these other sects, the leading truths of the gospel, accepting both the sovereignty of God and the agency and responsibility of Man; the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man; the rewards of righteousness and the punishments of sin; and in addition to, and crowning these, the eternal supremacy of good, the destruction of evil, and the final restoration of all souls to the image of the heavenly.

These are the gospel doctrines, the great Christian facts entering into the structure of our denominational faith. But a denomination cannot live on faith alone, any more than the individual soul.

Faith without works is dead, as St. James says. There must be a fruit of good works, a moral and spiritual activity, an earnest devotion to the true purposes of life; there must be a reduction of the abstract doctrine to the concrete form of practice, of living and doing; or, in the natural course of things, it will wither, shrivel up, and drift away before the wind, like chaff or stubble.

If as a sect we are to occupy that high position in the onward march of the world's growth and civilization, to which we seem called in the providence of God, and by the spirit and wants of the age,
then we must do something more than believe, we must stand forth before the world as ready to every good work.

It would be a grand thing to see our denomination stand in the front rank of every noble enterprise, as the first and foremost to enter upon every true reform, every genuine labor of love. We shall be proud when the name Universalist stands as naturally for denominational and individual antagonism to Intemperance, Gambling, aggressive War, Political Corruption, and every form of evil, as the name Episcopalian suggests a special form of church service, or that of Baptists consecration by water or that of Quaker a peculiarity of dress and speech. It would be a thing worthy of our doctrine and of our strength, to have the name which distinguishes us from other sects, identify us as directly with every generous effort for humanity, and every manly conflict with sin.

And at last it must come to this with us, if we expect to live in the ages to come, and to leave our mark on the civilization of the present. A large and growing denomination like ours, growing in numbers and wealth, in educational culture, and in the means of doing good and making war on evil, must aim at something more than proving the absence of evil in the life hereafter. It must strike boldly and persistently at the evils of this life; it must generously, and with faith in God's blessing and help, devote of its ample means to a settled, organized and unflinching opposition to the reign of Satan among men.

We must stand up in the foremost ranks of the army of Humanity, and be willing as soldiers of the Cross to meet the brunt of the battle. We must aim to identify ourselves with every interest of man, to make actual the boasted doctrine of human brotherhood, by making war on whatever conflicts with the interests and happiness of that brotherhood; on Intemperance, on Fraud and Dishonesty, on Social Corruption and Political bribery, on every form of vice, on every barbarous law and custom, on every abuse of power to the prejudice of the liberty, industry or happiness of our fellows.

To this high ground of Christian duty and action we are called alike by the voice of our large and liberal faith toward God and man, and by the earnest temper of the times. If we refuse the honorable position, and fear to march in the van of the Lord's host; then the world, which is waiting for some new embodiment of the Christian spirit, some new demonstration of the living power of Christian faith and love, will impatiently shake us off as mere talkers and idlers, and look elsewhere for its leaders and commanders, elsewhere for those
who in Christ's name shall build up the walls, and open to the nations the gates, of the New Jerusalem on earth.

Smith's Assyrian Discoveries.

Assyrian Discoveries; an Account of Explorations and Discoveries on the Site of Nineveh during 1873 and 1874. By George Smith, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum. With Illustrations. Scribner, Armstrong & Co.

Some of our readers will remember the sensation created by the discoveries of Botta and Layard, fifteen years ago, among the ruins of Nineveh, and the finding of the Royal Library, or Hall of Records, of Assurbanipal, established, in the words of the founder himself, "in my palace for the instruction of my subjects," — antedating our public libraries some twenty-five hundred years or more! About three years ago Mr. Smith, the author of the volume named above, while rummaging among the immense collection of clay tablets, impressed bricks, and cylinders, which were the books of this ancient people, and which Layard had deposited in the British Museum, came upon a portion of a series of tablets containing the Assyrian story of the Flood. On examination it was found that it agreed strikingly with the Bible record, overlaid largely with legend and table, but still retaining all the essential features of the Mosaic account. Its translation and publication produced a profound impression among biblical students, antiquarian scholars, and Christians generally. Here was something new; a confirmation of the Bible narrative coming to us from Nineveh, underneath whose ruined palaces and temples it had been buried between two and three thousand years!

The interest excited was so great and wide-spread that the London Telegraph, one of the most extensively circulated newspapers of England, offered five thousand dollars to the British Museum toward defraying the expenses of Mr. Smith in an expedition to the East for renewed excavations and explorations on the sites of Nineveh and Babylon. The offer was accepted, and resulted in two expeditions, the fruits of which are given in this volume.

Over three thousand inscriptions, perfect and imperfect, including some texts of the first importance, beside valuable antiquities, were secured, adding largely to our knowledge of Babylonian and Assyrian history in their connections with the Bible narratives. And by one of the most singular and fortunate chances Mr. Smith, among his first discoveries, came upon some of the tablets missing from the Flood series in the British Museum, brought home by Layard, and so has
nearly completed the Assyrian legend concerning the Deluge! How many chances there were against this discovery. And since his book was published we learn that in his continued researches among the archaeological treasures of the Museum, he has brought to light a large number of clay tablets containing the Assyrian story of the Tower of Babel. So that we may soon look for another revelation of great interest to the Biblical student.\footnote{1}

The new inscriptions of Mr. Smith have added largely to the list of Babylonian kings, and “reach up to the twenty-fourth century B.C. and some scholars think they stretch nearly two thousand years beyond that time.” Certainly the civilization, architecture, government and literature which we know existed 2,000 years before Christ, must have required a long time to grow up to such a high degree of completeness, if we suppose man began as a savage.

The new discoveries have added largely to that portion of Assyrian history contemporary with the kings of Judah and Israel, a most important period of Jewish history — being additions and corrections to the records of Tiglath-Pileser; new portions of the annals of Sargon giving his expeditions against Ashdod and Palestine, mentioned in Isaiah xx.; new tablets of Sennacherib’s reign; Esarhaddon’s Egyptian and Syrian campaigns; new texts of Assurbanipal, the founder of the Library; and fragments of his successors’ reigns, &c. It is a curious fact that not a line has been discovered belonging to the renowned monarch, Pul, who first reduced the kingdom of Israel under Assyrian control.

The Chaldeans were distinguished for their knowledge of astronomy. They mapped out the heavens, located the stars, traced the motions of the planets, and foretold the future by the movements of the heavenly bodies. The Cabala account of the Creation. It begins with chaos, presided over by a female power. One of the celestial hierarchy in his ambition "raises his hand against the sanctuary of the God of heaven, and the description of him is really magnificent. He is represented riding in a chariot through celestial space, surrounded by storms, with the lightning playing before him, and wielding a thunderbolt as a weapon. This rebellion leads to a war in heaven, and the conquest of the powers of evil, gods in due course creating the universe in stages, as in the Mosaic narrative, surviving each step of the work, and pronouncing it good. The divine work culminates in the creation of man, who is made upright and free from evil, and endowed by the gift with the noble faculty of speech. The Deity then delivers a long address to the new created being, instructing him in all his duties and privileges, and pointing out the glory of his state. But this condition of blessing does not last long before man, yielding to temptation, falls; and the Deity then pronounces upon him a terrible curse, voking on his head all the evils which have since afflicted humanity. These last results are upon the fragment which I excavated during my first journey to Assyria."
of the planets, made observations of comets, fixed the signs of the
Zodiac, shaped the constellations, and studied the aspects of the sun
and moon, and the periods of eclipses. Among the newly discovered
tables is one giving the divisions of the heavens according to the four
seasons, and the rule for regulating the intercalary month of the year,
and a fragment of an Assyrian astrolabe.

Besides these have been found tables of fables, concerning omens
and witchcraft, texts of laws, geography, natural history, &c., which
will hereafter engage the attention of scholars, and throw new light
on the customs, superstitions, character and intellectual status of the
people.

A large part of the 460 pages of this noble octavo is occupied with
translations of some of the more important tablets, those of the Flood
series filling more than thirty pages. From these last we learn that
this people believed in a life after death; in a soul, spirit, or ghost,
distinct from the body; in a hell, or place of misery, under the earth:
and in a heaven, or place of honor and happiness, in the sky — and
this in the days of Abraham, 500 years before Moses. Our readers
may like to see the description of these last on the tablets. The
periods represent broken portions of the tablets, or places where the
inscription is defaced.

"From Hades . . . from the house of the departed, the seat of the god Irkalla;
from the house within which is no exit; from the road, the course of which never re-
turns; from the place within which they long for light; the place where dust is their
nourishment and their food mud. Its chiefs, also, like birds, are clothed with wings;
light is never seen, in darkness they dwell. Over the door and its bolts is scattered
dust."

"To the place of seers which I will enter . . . treasured up a crown . .
wearing crowns who from days of old ruled the earth . . . A place where
water is abundant drawn from perennial springs. To the place of seers which I will
enter, the place of chiefs and unconquered ones, the place of bards and great men, the
place of interpreters of the wisdom of the great gods, the place of the mighty."

Mr. Smith proceeds to give some further details, which he leaves
us to suppose are derived from other tablets, as follows: "This dark
region where the inhabitants in their hunger devour filth, and thirst
for light, is guarded by seven gates, and surrounded by the waters of
death; it is the home of the weak and conquered ones, of wives who
stray from their husbands, and men who abandon their wives, and
disobedient children. They are represented as weeping in misery
and corruption in their dark and eternal prison-house." But we find
nothing of this in the Old Testament. How strange that all contem-
porary peoples should have so exact a knowledge on this subject re-
ecting which the Hebrews knew so little, and their sacred books say little. How shall we account for this if the teaching regarding it of divine origin? The Hebrew Noah and Moses give no word of formation on this all important question, but the Babylonian Noah d Izdubar are as full of talk and detail as a village gossip. If it is doctrine of divine revelation, the fact is beyond explanation; but if is an invention of pagan priests and lawgivers, the enigma is easily lived.

The historical tablets are valuable contributions toward Biblical story. We have thirty pages of translations from those of Tigrath-ileser. The names of no less than five Hebrew kings are mentioned the annals of this one monarch, three of which Mr. Smith's discoveries have brought to light: Ahaz and Azariah kings of Judah, Menas, Pekah and Hoshea kings of Israel, beside Rezon of Damascus, and Iram of Tyre. We have also a record of Tigrath-Pileser's campaign into Syria to assist Ahaz; the defeat of Rezon king of Syria, d the siege of Damascus; the conquest of the Philistines; the spoiling of Israel, death of Pekah, and accession of Hoshea—all of which commanded be read also in Isaiah and the Books of Kings.

Then we have translations of tablets and monuments belonging to the reigns of Sennacherib, Sargon, Nebuchadnezzar, Esarhaddon, Assurbanipal, &c. This last seems to have been the literary monarch the dynasty, not only establishing the Nineveh Library, as we have seen, but giving the history of his own deeds and conquests at great length. He says of himself, “I Assurbanipal preserved the wisdom of Nebo, all the royal tablets, the whole of the clay tablets, all there are; and their subjects I studied.” To his love of letters, doubts, we owe the preservation of a large portion of these historical tablets. All the Assyrian kings seemed inclined to glorify themselves, d to record the story of their deeds. Sennacherib says on his celebrated cylinder, “A tablet I caused to make, and the glory acquired in my hand, which over them I had gained, upon it I caused to write, d in the midst of the city I set up.”

We should like to give the reader lengthy examples of the correspondences between the Old Testament and the Assyrian tablets, but must be content with one or two brief collations; and in passing, let us remark that Mr. Smith would have added greatly to the value of a book if he had given marginal references to the parallel Bible accounts. Many of his readers would in that case have compared the
Hebrew and Assyrian records, who will not now laboriously look up the Scriptural passages:

1. 2 Kings XV. XVI. "In the days of Pekah, king of Israel, came Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and took Kedesh and Hazor, and Gilgal, all the land of Napthali, and carried them captive to Assyria. And Hoshea made a conspiracy against Pekah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead." 1. "Rezin, king of Syria, and Remaliah, king of Israel, came up to Jerusalem to Ahaz (king of Judah) sent messengers to Tiglath-Pileser king of Assyria, saying, I am thy servant and son; come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me. And the king of Assyria hearkened unto him, and went up against Damascus (the capital of Syria), and took it, and carried the people captive to Kir, and slew Rezin." 2.

This is the Bible history, but until within a few years, we could furnish no proof of its truth to the unbeliever outside of the Bible itself. But lo! the tomb of old Nineveh is opened, and there are the witnesses, unknown to us, who have been concealed and silent for 2500 years or more! And now the old Assyrian kings rise from the dead, as it were, and testify to the truth of the sacred record — nay, bring us their own records, made at the time the events occurred, and ask us to read, for ourselves, from the tablets recording the invasion of Samaria and Syria, and set up by this very Tiglath-Pileser:

"The cities beside the upper sea I possessed by my generals, the boundary of the land of Beth-Omi (Samaria or Israel), the whole of it to Assyria I joined. Gaza I captured . . . . his gods, gold, silver, clothing of wool and linen, the goods of the people, and their furniture to Assyria I sent. Pekah their king [a break in the tablet] . . . . and Hoseshe to the kingdom over them I appointed, their tribute I received, and to Assyria I went." 3. "The warriors I captured. He (Bezin) to save his life fled away alone, and like a deer, and within the great gate of his city he entered. His generals alive I captured, and on crosses I raised them. His country I subdued. Damascus his city (capital) I besieged, and like a caged bird I enclosed him. Sixteen districts of Syria like a flood I swept. Their oxen and sheep I carried captive, 13,520 women and their children." [Accompanied with a long list of the cities destroyed, and the number of prisoners taken.]

2. Next comes the capture of Ashdod as given by Isaiah, who reproaches the people for trusting to Egypt for help in their revolt against the Assyrians, and prophesies the defeat of the Egyptians:

Isaiah xx. "In the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod, when Sargon, the king of Assyria sent, and fought against Ashdod, and took it. At the same time spake the Lord by Isaiah, saying, the king of Assyria shall lead away the Egyptians as prisoners, young and old, naked and barefoot. And they shall be afraid and ashamed of Ethiopia their expectation, and of Egypt their glory. And they shall say in that day, Behold, such is our expectation whither we fled for help to be delivered from the king of Assyria! How shall we escape?"

Now let us summon Sargon, and see if he will corroborate the testimony of Isaiah. The following is from the cylinder set up by this monarch in Nineveh 2400 years ago, now in the British Museum, which contains the record of this campaign, and shows us how completely the Assyrian history fulfills the Hebrew prophecy:

"In my ninth expedition to the land beside the great sea (Mediterranean), to Philistia and Ashdod I went. Azuri king of Ashdod not to bring tribute, his heart hardened. Over the people round him his dominion I broke. The people of Philistia,
Judah, Edom and Moab, dwelling beside the sea were speaking treason. The people and their chiefs, to fight against me, unto Pharaoh king of Egypt, a monarch who could not swore there, their presents carried, and besought his alliance. I Surgen, the noble prince, over the rivers of Tigris and Euphrates in their full flood the warriors of my guard entirely I passed. The cities of Ashdod and Gimzo I besieged and captured. His gods, his wife, his sons and daughters, his furniture and goods and the treasures of his palace, as a spoil I counted."

He farther tells us, in the great inscription in his palace at Khorsabad, that after the capture of Samaria, Hanon king of Gaza and Saba; sultan of Egypt met him in battle and were defeated; and four years later he records the receipt of tribute from Pharaoh king of Egypt. And Sennacherib, his son and successor, has the following on one of his clay cylinders taken from the ruins of Nineveh:

"The kings of Egypt, and the archers, horses and chariots of the king of Meroe, a force without number gathered and came to their help. Before me their lines were placed, and they urged on their soldiers. With them I fought, and I accomplished their overthrow. The charioteers and sons of the kings of Egypt of Meroe alive in the midst of the battle my hand captured."

Thus was fulfilled to the letter the prediction of Isaiah that Egypt in which Israel trusted for help should be overthrown and her people "led away as prisoners."

We could fill pages with similar confirmations of Bible records from these historical treasures of Babylon and Nineveh; clay tablets and cylinders, marble obelisks, and winged lions and bulls which flanked the entrances to the royal palaces. Buried, forgotten, preserved for ages under the vast wreck of those great cities, they are now, at this distant period, brought up from their graves, and we of to-day have them just as they were left by the hands of those who wrought them, and had part in the events which they record. How wonderful the Providence which has had these witnesses for the Bible so long in its safe keeping, and now sends them into the world to testify to its accuracy and truth!

**Election and Reprobation.**

"Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure." — 2 Peter ii. 10.

It is often said that the doctrine of Election and Reprobation is not taught in the Scriptures. That the doctrine of Election, however, is found in the Bible, is made very evident from the passage placed at the head of this article. The only inquiry is, what kind of election is this? to what are the elect elected, or called? In order to answer this question we must ascertain who the elect are of whom the apostle speaks, and we shall find that the facts answering one inquiry involve the answer to the other also. Let us then consider the question, **Who are the elect in Scripture?** The Jews were originally the elect
or chosen of God, as Isaiah shows, especially called of him. Hence the expressions, “Israel mine elect,” “mine elect shall enjoy the work of their hands.” xlv. and lxv.

So Moses says, “The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.” Deut. vii. 6. And David says, “The Lord hath chosen Jacob.” Ps. cxxxv. 4. And Paul argues the question at great length in his epistle to the Romans.

But what were they chosen or elected to? what was the object of Providence in this special calling of the Jews? Paul answers in this very epistle to the Romains by saying that unto them were “committed the Oracles of God.” They were elected, not to immortal life in the future world, but to the truth, to the preservation of the divine oracles or revelations—and this not for their own benefit exclusively but for the good of the world. This idea is specially to be noted—and it will be farther set out by-and-by.

We are to note also that the Jews were not elected unconditionally, but on the express condition of preserving pure and uncorrupt God’s oracles and commandments. This they failed to do in course of time. The Saviour charges them with having corrupted the truth, and made void the commandments of God by their traditions; as having shut up the kingdom of heaven, instead of keeping it open wide for the nations; as falling into others’ idolatry, instead of converting them from it.

The consequence was that this elect and chosen people were reprobated, rejected, and cast out; as Jesus had distinctively told them that they as “children of the kingdom should be cast into outer darkness,” while “the Gentiles should enter in and sit down with Abraham and Isaac.” Matt. viii. Ceasing to guard the truth, and to shine forth to the nation as a beacon and guiding light, and having failed to perform the condition of their election, they were thrust out as reprobated, and continue to this day in condemnation. Romans xi.

So in the New Dispensation, the disciples, the Christians or believers, are called the elect or chosen, and the same terms are applied to them, that were formerly applied to the rejected or reprobate Jews.

And they also are elected in their turn to the knowledge of God and his Christ, to the truth and salvation of the Gospel. The children of the kingdom are cast out, and the kingdom given to a people bringing forth the fruits thereof. Matt. xxi. 43.

Hence James says, i. 18: “Of his own will begat he us with the
word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." Now the "first fruits" do not exclude the harvest, but are an earnest or promise of it. So the first Christians were elected as the beginning of the great and general harvest, not to the exclusion of those not Christians, but for the benefit of these, for the enlightenment and restoration of those not then elected.

Hence it is said of Paul, Acts ix. 15, "He is a chosen (elect) vessel unto me, to bear my name before Gentiles, kings and the children of Israel." Paul was elected of God, not for his own sake alone, but expressly for the salvation of others, for preaching the gospel to unbelievers in order to bring them into an elect state. Precisely so, with the first converts and believers generally — they were elected for the benefit of unbelievers, of the non-elect, implying the salvation of these through their agency.

The idea of Election, as here set forth, is well illustrated by our election of officers and magistrates, whether of the nation, state or city. What are these elected for? and what is implied in their election as respects those not elected? Nothing is plainer than that these Elect or Select Men, as they are called in towns, are selected or elected by the purpose or fore-ordination of the people, for the benefit of the non-elect, as fit instruments to carry out their wishes, care for their interests, and promote the public good.

For what are Pastors elected by the churches? Expressly for the instruction of the ignorant, the conversion of the sinful, and the enlargement of the kingdom of Christ. For what are Missionaries elected and sent out among the heathen? For their own exclusive benefit, or that of Christian churches? No, but precisely that these non-elect heathen may be saved, or in other words be elected to the everlasting life of faith. So God elected the first believers for the good, the redemption of those who were yet in darkness and unbelief. Hence the exhortation to preach the gospel to all nations, even unto the ends of the earth. And thus we see that the election of the few does not imply evil, but good, to the many through these elect; till all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest, and it will no longer be necessary for every man to say to his neighbor, "know ye the Lord," for all shall be taught of him, and rejoice in the knowledge and salvation of the truth.

From these facts we get at the following conclusions respecting the Scriptural doctrine of Election and Reprobation.

1. Election is not election to immortal glory in the future world,
but to faith, knowledge and usefulness in this world, to the diligent improvement of certain privileges and gifts for the benefit of the unbelievers. "For the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man for the profit of all," as it should be translated. Rom. xii. 7. See the whole chapter on "gifts."

2. Reprobation is not to endless woe in a future world, but to the evils of disobedience and unbelief in this, as in the case of the Jews. And this reprobation is the penalty of unbelief and sin.

3. Neither Election nor Reprobation are unconditional or absolute. The Jews, though once elected, were afterward rejected and cast off, because they failed to fulfil the condition of their calling. So Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 27, who was an elect and specially chosen vessel of the Lord, says he took care "lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." Even his election was not absolute. And Peter says, "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall." Nothing can be plainer than the conditions here.

So, on the other hand, Reprobation is not absolute. The Reprobate may become elect again, as well as the Elect reprobate. The case of the Jews fully shows this also, as set forth by Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, where he declares not only that they are not finally reprobate, but argues at length to prove the fact of their final restoration. We give a part of his argument:

"I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid — God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew — What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded unto this day — I say then Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid! but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles — For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead? — For I would not that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved. — As concerning the gospel they are enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes — For God hath concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! For of him, and through him, and to Him are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen." Rom. xi.

The Russian Church and Clergy.

Our readers will remember the efforts recently made by the Eng-
lish clergy to bring about a union between the Anglican and Greek Churches, and the comparative indifference with which their overtures were received by their Oriental brethren. The result of the negotiations however was a better knowledge among us of the organic structure of the Greek Church, and of the position, character and education of its clergy. To this knowledge a large contribution was made by a Roman Catholic priest, Father Gagarin, whose work was translated from the French, and published in London in 1872. An interesting abstract of its contents is given in The Catholic World, a few facts from which we think will please and inform our readers. Of course large allowance must be made for the prejudices of a Roman priest against a church which denies the supremacy of the Pope.¹

The Russian priests are divided into two classes, the white and the black clergy, or seculars and monks. The great difference between them is, the white clergy are married, and the black are celibates. Whatever learning there is in the ecclesiastical order is found among the monks. The bishops are always chosen from the monastic class. The marriage of priests is an old custom in the East, which antedates the organization of the Russian church. It prevails in some of the Oriental churches to this day.

The candidate for orders must choose between matrimony and the monastery. The ignorance of the white or secular clergy led to the establishment of seminaries for the education of their children, who are compelled to attend; and, once in the seminary, they are compelled to embrace the ecclesiastical profession. No other career is open to them. The sons of the secular clergy only are admitted to the clerical profession, which, therefore, is substantially hereditary. By another law the young seminarian is not only obliged to marry, but he must marry a priest’s daughter, and in some cases is not allowed to find a wife beyond the limits of his own district or diocese.

"The number of parish priests in Russia is about 36,000; of deacons, 12,444; of inferior clerics, 63,421. One-half of the revenue

¹ Since writing the above we have read a letter in the Transcript from a Boston gentleman travelling in Russia, which strikingly confirms very many of the statements of the author. We can find room for only two or three extracts, which will be given as notes in their proper places. The writer says: "The most distressing thing one meets with is the universal ignorance and superstition everywhere so prevalent among the lower classes. I came to Russia with a very excited idea of the Greek Church, but my first impressions faded gradually, until now I much prefer Catholicism. The entire country seems imbued with a fanatical theology which exerts its influence throughout all the branches of the Government. The religious tyranny fully equals that of Rome, and all classes seem equally under subjection to the one law of the Church."
of the parish belongs to the priest, one-quarter to the deacon, and one-eighth to each of the two clerics. The prizes of the profession are the chaplaincies to schools, colleges, prisons, hospitals, in the army, in the navy, about the court, etc., most of which are liberally paid. The parochial clergy are supported by: 1. Property belonging to the parish, chiefly in the towns, yielding about $500,000 per annum; 2. A government allowance of $3,000,000 per annum; 3. About $20,000,000 per annum contributed by parishioners; 4. Perpetual foundations, with obligations to pray for the departed, invested in government funds at four per cent., say $1,075,000. The average income of a priest is thus about $341. In addition to this, however, each parish has a glebe, of which the incumbent belongs to the clergy. The minimum extent of this church domain is about eighty acres, and it is divided after the same rule as the revenue, namely, one-half to the priest, one-quarter to the deacon, and the remainder to the inferior clerks."

At St. Petersburg the Church provides the priests with spacious houses, elegantly furnished, where costly dinners are given, and sometimes fashionable parties, on wedding days, saints' days, the birthday of the curé &c.; and then dazzling toilettes, music, dancing and drinking are in full blast. Country priests have comfortable homes, where they too have evening parties at which their daughters, elegantly attired, dance with the students from neighboring theological seminaries and the next day may be seen, with their mother, in the fields hoeing corn and potatoes!

"The voluntary contributions of the parishioners are collected, or enforced, in a variety of ways, and paid in a variety of forms. Towards the feast of St. Peter, each house gives from three to five eggs and a little milk. After the harvest, each house gives a certain quantity of wheat. When a child is born, the priest is called in to say a few prayers over the mother, and give a name to the baby; the fee for this is a loaf and from 4 to 8 cents. Baptism brings from 8 to 20 cents more. For a second visitation and prayers at the end of six weeks there is a fee of a dozen eggs, At betrothals the priest gets a loaf, some brandy, and sometimes a goose or a sucking-pig. For a marriage he is paid from $1.60 to $3.20; for a burial, from 80 cents to $1.60; for a Mass for the dead, from 28 to 64 cents; for prayers for the dead, which are often repeated, 4 to 8 cents each time; for prayers read at the cemetery on certain days every year, some rice, cake, or some pastry. The peasants often have a Te Deum chanted either on birthday or name-day, or to obtain some special favor; the fee for that is from 8 to 16 cents. The penitent always pays some-

2The peasantry, formerly serfs, would seem to be in comfortable circumstances in the country; but freedom has not as yet greatly improved their condition in the cities. Says the writer of the Letter already quoted, "I have been greatly interested in the
thing when he receives absolution. In the towns the fee is often as high as $1, $2, $4, and even more. Among the peasantry it sometimes does not exceed a kopeck (one cent)."

The priest in his round of parish visitations is expected to take a taste of brandy at every house, and the peasant counts it an insult if he refuses. Of course before he completes the circuit of the village, his legs refuse to do duty, "but then," says our Roman celibate, "the reverend gentleman has a wife to help him home."

The above refers altogether to the white clergy, or the married priests. The black or monastic clergy constitute another class. One hundred years ago there were nearly 1000 convents of these in Russia proper. Catherine II. confiscated the property of the clergy, and reduced the convents to 400.

"The number of recruits supplied to monasteries by the clerical profession averages 140 a year. These comprise a curious variety of persons. First, there are priests or deacons who have committed grave crimes; they are sentenced to the convent, as lay convicts are sentenced to the galleys. Next there are seminarists who have failed in their studies; if they quit the ranks of the clergy altogether, they are forced into the army; if they remain among the white clergy, they have no prospect of becoming anything better than sacristans or beadle; by entering a convent they will at least live more comfortably and may aspire to become deacons or priests. Then there are deacons and priests who have lost their wives; they cannot marry again; the Russian government hesitates to entrust a parish to a wireless priest; so the unfortunate widower is not only advised but sometimes compelled to go to a convent.

"Again, there are seminarists who after completing their studies act as professors for some time before they are ordained. Suppose such a man has been married and his wife dies. He cannot be ordained if he marry again. He cannot be ordained a secular priest without a wife. He must therefore either go to the convent or seek some career outside the clerical profession, and that it is almost impossible to find."

The result in such cases is, of course, that the poor man turns monk of necessity. On the other hand some ambitious young men serve, who seem to be hopelessly ignorant. In St. Petersburg I found the drivers often did not know the names of the nearest streets. I never saw the faces of animals even so expressionless. It makes my heart ache to look at them. Their habits are like those of beasts. I have often seen them in the middle of the day asleep on a manure heap, with the burning sun beating down upon them. Most of those in the cities have no homes. They habitually sleep where they can find a resting place. They are half clad, and often so ragged that their garments are dropping from them."
from the academies choose the monastery as the road to preferment, since the bishops are mostly taken from this class. Still there is a great scarcity of educated monks, and so, if we may believe Father Gagarin, extraordinary devices are resorted to in order to supply the demand.

"When persuasion has failed, the student whom the convent wishes to capture is invited to pass the evening with one of the monks. Brandy is produced and it is not difficult to make the young man drunk. While he is insensible the ceremony of taking the habit and receiving the tonsure is performed on him, and he is then put to bed. When he awakes, he finds by his side, instead of the lay garments he wore the night before, a monastic gown. All resistance is useless. He is told that what is done cannot be undone, and after a while he submits angrily to his fate."

This, however, was fifty years ago, says our Roman priest, and then tells us that there is a shorter way now of reaching this result:

"The students of the academies, who are theological students, are in the habit of frequenting public-houses and getting drunk. They are carried home on hand-barrows, and this proceeding is known as the 'Translation of the Relics.' When a young man has been fixed upon as a desirable recruit for the monastery, the superior has only to watch until he is brought home on a barrow; the next morning, while his head and his stomach are rebuking him, he is informed that he has been expelled for his disgraceful conduct; but, if he will give a proof of his sincere repentance by making a written request to be received as a monk, he may be forgiven!"

The revenue of these monasteries is in some cases very large; one deriving, as a single item in its income, ten thousand dollars from the resin collected in its forests. That of St. Sergius in Moscow has an annual revenue of $1,680,000; and a single chapel in that city yields $30,000 to the convents to which it is attached. An important portion of these revenues comes from the voluntary offerings of pilgrims and visitors. The shrine of St. Sergius is visited every year by at least a million pilgrims, who never go there empty handed. And to

---

8"We stopped at Kief, the most sacred city in the country, and spent one day in examining their monasteries, of which there are a great number. All the roads were crowded with pilgrims going to visit its shrines, some of which possess miraculous healing powers. There were men, women and children, all bound on the same errand, carrying their packs upon their backs and crossing themselves every few steps. A vast amount of money is expended by a person on a pilgrimage. He gives at every shrine, that he may receive the prayers of the dead saint. These priests exceed even the Yankees in trade, for they carry on a more thriving business after death than
these gifts must be added those of the government, which bestows on
certain classes of monasteries sums varying from $600 to $1,700. In
former years, each convent was entitled to the compulsory services of
a certain number of peasants. Since the emancipation of the serfs
the government has commuted this privilege by paying an annual
sum of more than $250,000. Endowments with an obligation to pray
for the departed yield in addition $2,150,400 to white and black clergy
together; of which the monks get one-half. Then the convents pos-
sees large properties in arable lands, woodlands, meadows, fisheries,
mills, &c.

Taking all these together the monks and priests of the Orthodox
Greek Church seem to have as sharp a lookout for the good things of
this world as their brothers of the Holy Roman Catholic Church.
The Superior, or Archimandrite, of a convent, who has the lion's
share of the revenues, often accumulates a large fortune, and enriches
all his family. 4

The Great Synod consists of the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg, a
number of bishops chosen by the Czar, and two or three secular
priests, one of whom is his chaplain, and another chief chaplain of the
Army and Navy. The Czar is supreme in Church as well as in
State; and creates, transfers, promotes, degrades, imprisons, knouts,
or puts to death bishops and clergy, at his pleasure.

"The Synod of St. Petersburg, which is always watched by an Im-
perial Procurator who controls all its doings and decisions, exercises
the whole ecclesiastical authority of the empire. The bishop has no
power, and nothing to do but to sign reports. All the business of his
diocese is really transacted by a lay secretary, appointed not by the
bishop, but by the synod. Under the secretary is a chancery of six or
while on earth. The pilgrim fears to withhold his gift from any one lest he may re-
cieve a spiritual injury from the person, which is one of the principal reasons for such
a congregation of beggars. Their business is to say masses for the souls of those who
give them money. The more money, the more masses, and the easier the road to par-
adise."

4 And that the Greek clergy, even of the highest rank, are fully equal to their Roman
brethren in the matter of miracles, legends, and frauds, is clear from the Letter. The
country abounds in saints and relics: "I have seen three pictures of the Madonna
painted by St. Luke. In Moscow, where the metropolitan archbishop resides, they
prepare all the holy ointment that is used in baptism. They are much before the Ro-
manists in their sacred rites. They have something far holier than water to baptize
with. You remember that before Christ died Mary Magdalen washed his feet with a
costly ointment. Of course she only used a portion of it. What was left has been
preserved in some miraculous way, and may be seen in a little vase, if the priest be
good natured."
seven chief clerks, with assistant clerks and writers. This office superintends all the affairs of the clergy, and transacts no business without drink-money. It is the most venal and rapacious of all Russian bureaus, and a mine of wealth to the officials. The secretary is the one all-powerful person of the diocese. From 12,000 to 15,000 files of documents are referred to the chancery every year for decision, and it is he who passes upon them, asking nothing of the bishop except his signature. He is almost invariably corrupt, and as he possesses, through his relations with the synod, the power to ruin the bishop if he chooses, there is no one to interfere with him.”

Religious World.

The battle over the dogma of endless punishment still rages in England. According to the Liverpool Albion, as quoted in the Banner, the Rev. Robert Ashcroft, of Rock Ferry Congregational church, having rejected the harsh dogma of everlasting perdition in a series of sermons to his congregation, and presented to them what he conceived to be a nobler, and higher view of the Deity in his dealings with the wicked, ventured into print, and a pamphlet, stating the popular view of everlasting punishment to be revolting and unscriptural, was the result. This roused against him the wrath of certain evangelical clergymen, who replied to his sermons and pamphlet in print, calling hard names, as usual. This brought to the assistance of Mr. Ashcroft, Rev. H. Constable, of whom our readers have heard before, and also Rev. H. S. Warleigh, rector of Ashchurch. “Both verbally and in print have these gentlemen sustained Mr. Ashcroft’s position, and to-morrow evening Mr. Warleigh again expounds his views at Birkenhead. At Tuesday night’s lecture it was stated that ‘two-thirds of the ministers of the Baptist Union hold these views, and several dignitaries of the Church of England, only they are not bold enough to avow their belief.’” To the above we add that James Haywood, Fellow of the Royal Society, offers in the London papers a prize of $500 for the best essay on the expediency of an Address by the House of Commons to the Queen in favor of such a Rubrical Revision of the Service of the State Church as will abrogate the threat of Everlasting Perdition to those of Her Majesty’s subjects who do not agree with the Doctrines contained in the Athanasian Creed.” The Irish Church has already struck off the “damnable clause” of the creed by a strong majority.

— We wish earnestly to commend to the notice of our readers the article in the last April Atlantic Monthly, “Crime and Automatism,”
Oliver Wendell Holmes. It is based on M. Prosper Despine's *psychologie Naturelle*, of which Dr. Holmes gives an abstract, while the same time he furnishes, in his own way, much valuable matter the discussion of a subject which is beginning to command the rious attention of those who think with Pope, that "the proper study 'mankind is man." There is much in it, as in all recent scientific scissions of moral and mental responsibility in crime, which will subtlest call out the challenge of the reader; but there is also much st will compel his serious thought; and show the need there is that is difficult, entangled and awful question of the causes and proper ovement of crime should be studied *de novo* by law-makers, judges, trists, and all having anything to do with its punishment, or the nagement of criminals.

— Among the tablets brought from Nineveh by Mr. Smith are me containing a legend of *The Seven Wicked Angels*. The reader ll doubtless turn to Jude vi: "The angels which kept not their first tate, but left their own habitation," &c. This Assyrian legend repre-sents that in the beginning, before the sun and moon were in their aces, there was chaos in the heavens, monstrous animals as evil irits ran riot through the universe, and finally attempted to estab-h their own kingdom of darkness. Bel, the great god of the Baby-nians, (compare the apocryphal book of "Bel and the Dragon"), sing the confusion, established the sun and moon and the planet s (Ishhtar) to rule the heavens, which the evil angels resisted and ght against; and thus began a war in heaven.

Singularly enough they won to their side the Sun, and Venus, and l, the god of the Atmosphere; and "Ishhtar with Anu the god, sir king, in the government of heaven they fixed." "Sin (the oon) the ruler of mankind, of the earth, troubled on high he (mas-line) sat, night and day fearing; in the seat of his dominion he did t sit." The chief god, Bel sees the trouble of Sin, and sends a ssage for help to Hea the god of the ocean, who commands his son, her Madach, to aid Sin, and "his trouble *from heaven expel, en of them the evil gods*, spirits of death, having no fear, who like a od descend and sweep over earth." The remainder of the tablet oved, but doubtless contained an account of the expulsion from aven of the rebel angels by Merodach. We have here a curious

"And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, n the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found r more in heaven." Rev. xii. 7, 8.
example of the kind of mythological fables and myths which prevailed in Mesopotamia, the valley of the Euphrates, even before the time of Abraham.

— No wonder the Pope doesn’t like the turn things are taking in Rome. More than a dozen Protestant places of worship have been opened; and at least $500,000 invested in buildings and missions. Think of the Waldenses flourishing in an edifice worth $60,000! The Free Church of Italy has several preaching places in the city; the English Evangelical party has put $40,000 into a house which will hold but three hundred, while the American Episcopalians are erecting near the railroad station a church which will seat nearly one thousand. English and American Methodists and Baptists are also pushing their missions and schools.

— In an editorial notice of Von Oosterzee’s “Christian Dogmatics,” the Methodist Quarterly gives us the following regarding Professor Scholten. Our readers will learn from it what progress the doctrine of the final blessedness of the race is making in Holland:

“The University of Leyden, which rejected the theology of Arminius, has been obliged to father the system of Professor Scholten, occupying the same theological chair. Scholten’s doctrine is a blend of fatalism and restorationism. He holds the doctrine of absolute necessity (determinism) ruling not only the causations of nature, but the volitions of man, and even of God. He maintains that by the necessary order of events all sin and misery will be abolished through Christ, and the race attain to a final blessedness. And yet Christ is but an incident in the scheme. The system of Scholten has ruled the public mind with mighty power. The pupils of the talented professor (among whom the rationalistic Biblical scholar Kuenen is eminent) have been able and active. The evangelical Churches, both Arminian and national, have met the Scholten party ably, but with equivocal success. Among the evangelical leaders on the synodical side, the most eminent is Dr. Von Oosterzee.”

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

Without regard to the spirited and very general discussion which Dr. Clarke's volumes have inaugurated, without regard to the theory of Dr. Clarke, whether right or wrong, we have this much to say, though we may be late in saying it—No parent who has young daughters to educate can afford to be ignorant of the physiological information which these volumes impart, of the facts respecting the physical organization and growth of girls, of the statements from teachers and physicians in illustration and confirmation of Dr Clarke's position, and of the fact and cause of the acknowledged difference in health, strength, and physical development and capacity between American girls, and English and German girls. It must be confessed that there is a deplorable ignorance or a culpable indifference, on this subject among the parents of our country. If our earnest pleading could accomplish it, there is not a family in the land from which these books would be absent; not a father nor a mother who would not make them a study, and have them always at hand for use. Every parent having daughters, is morally and religiously obligated to possess the knowledge here furnished, and to be governed by it in the physical and mental, or, in one word, educational training; which, properly understood, includes the physical, mental, moral, social and religious culture, the industries, manners, conversation and refinements of the perfect woman.

We have said for years that the system of education practised in our public schools and higher institutions, especially in its effects on girls, is radically, thoroughly, and wickedly wrong. The many cases in which this crowding and stimulating the brain, this overtasking the mind with long and multitudinous lessons, giving no rest in school nor out, has proved fatal; and the many others in which the brain instead of being built up is broken down, health destroyed, diseases established in the system, and all capacity for enjoying after life destroyed, to say nothing of the cases ending in insanity; these are sufficient to show that a course of teaching which makes such results possible is, as we have said, both false and wicked, and in open violation of the laws of human nature and organization. And we heartily thank Dr. Clarke that he has aroused the attention of parents, teachers, and school boards to the cruelties of the system; and we trust the discussion will not cease until our educational methods are completely revolutionized, and reorganized on a plan more accordant with the laws and needs and conditions of the young mind and body.

All that we have said of Education in the first paragraph, may be said with equal force of Industries, the conditions of which in their relations to the female organism Dr. Ames has discussed with equal freedom and knowledge. Let all parents whose daughters are required to labor for bread read his book, and be warned by its facts as to the age and time, the conditions and kinds of labor; especially marking what is said of factory and shop work, of type-setting, the sewing machine, and perhaps telegraphy.

Another, and one of the best of that admirable and most useful series, "Epochs of History." It is exactly the thing for the large class of busy people who have not time for the voluminous records of that remarkable historical crisis, known as the French Revolution; but who nevertheless wish for a reasonably short, and reliable sketch of the underlying causes and manifestations of its spirit and character, its excesses and successes. For such, we know of nothing more likely to meet and satisfy their wishes than this volume of Mr. Morris. For an Englishman he is eminently impartial and appreciative in his judgment of the wrongs which led to, and the crimes which distinguished, the Revolutionary frenzy; and we have never read an English author who so frankly and generously does justice to the royal ability, the intellectual grasp, the political sagacity and statesmanship, and the military genius of Napoleon. If the reader, prompted by this volume, wishes to go more deeply into the history of this remarkable event, he will find in the ample bibliography of President White all the assistance he will need.

3. The Natural History of Man: A Course of Elementary Lectures. By A. D. Quatrefages, Member of the Academy of Science.

The above are the first volumes of The Popular Science Library which is to be issued by D. Appleton & Co., at the uniform price of one dollar per volume.

A very cursory examination of Evolution-Philosophy gives us the impression that those who wish to know exactly what this philosophy, as expounded by Herbert Spencer, teaches will find it in this book. If the author rightly interprets Spencer, it will be found that his teachings are somewhat different from the popular impression regarding them. At any rate it is claimed by the writer that "Mr. Spencer enjoys above all others the privilege of laying down the preliminaries of a treaty of perpetual peace between religion and science." But what does Mr. Spencer mean by Religion?

"The Natural History of Man" is a work of great merit, clear, definite and somewhat positive in its statements, repudiating utterly the evolution doctrine or the origin of man from the monkey, and maintaining its position with signal ability, in language stripped of all technicalities. And as the author is counted among the founders of the science of Anthropology his opinions cannot but command attention. In order, however, that the reader may have both sides of the question before him the publishers have given an Appendix in
which may be read the counter opinions and arguments of Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, &c. The chapters on the Origin and the Antiquity of Man, are remarkable alike for simplicity of statement, wealth of information and candid argument. The Illustrations are numerous, well executed, and very helpful to all who wish to see as well as read. We heartily welcome this book as a valuable contribution to a subject which is now everywhere in discussion.

And now a few words of strong commendation for "Health," which is truly a book for households and schools. It would not be easy to make, or to find, a more useful and timely book than this. It tells us what every human being, young and old, ought to know about Foods, Clothing, Rest, Sleep, Exercise, Cleanliness, Dwellings, Atmospheric Conditions, the Sick-Room, and the various diseases which afflict us, together with a brief sketch of human Physiology. It is the most sensible and practical manual on the subject we have lately met with. If parents, teachers, students, workmen and their employers would pack the facts of this little treatise into their memories, and render strict obedience to its precepts, an immense amount of suffering, and ill-nature and wickedness would be saved.

Health, food, cooking and eating have more to do with a man's religion, virtue and philanthropy than is commonly supposed. There is much in Paul's exhortation, "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Let a man eat hard-boiled eggs, or bread as heavy as clay, or meat spoiled in cooking, or fill his stomach with whiskey and muddy coffee, and in what condition is he to praise God or love his fellows? Very likely his piety will be as bilious as his food is indigestible, his prayers as sour as his stomach, and in selecting from the Bible for family reading his dysepsia would naturally suggest the imprecatory psalms. We hold it to be a religious duty therefore for a woman to set before her family well cooked food; and this she must do if she expects her husband and children to be healthy, good-natured, pleasant spoken and happy; if she expects them to "break their bread and eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." When shall we have a school to educate young women in cooking and thorough housekeeping — or in one word to teach the art of making a perfect Home?


It would be an impertinence to praise the poetry of Whittier at this late day, or to set out in formal phrase its characteristics, or to attempt to explain the secret of its universal acceptance with the people. Several years ago we printed in these pages, from a correspondent, an appreciative estimate of the poet and of his verse, which, if we remember, was acknowledged by him as having caught the true spirit and purpose of his writing. Whittier is the poet of the people,
of his country, of the times; the inspired interpreter of Christian truth and manhood; catching the spirit of the age, of great events, of noble lives, of the nation's thought and purpose, and giving them voice in his stirring and quickening verse, ringing sometimes like a trumpet, and sometimes sweet and soothing as a mother's lullaby.

"Hazel Blossoms" takes in the poems written since the publication of the first named volume, among which are "Summer," "The Friend's Burial," "In Quest," "A Sea Dream," "The Golden Wedding of Longwood," "John Underhill," &c.; to which are added several poems of his sister Elizabeth, marked by the same sweetness of soul which gives the charm to so many of his own songs of hope and faith. We must give place to the following from "In Quest":

"The riddle of the world is understood
Only by him who feels that God is good,
And only he can feel who makes his love
The ladder of his faith, and climbs above
On th' rounds of his best instincts; draws no line
Between mere human goodness and divine;
But judging God by what in him is best,
With a child's trust leans on a Father's breast,
And hears unmoved the old creeds babble still
Of kingly power and dread caprice of will,
Chary of blessing, prodigal of curse,
The pitiless doomsman of the universe.
Can Hatred ask for love? Can Selfishness
Invite to Self denial? Is He less
Than man in kindly dealing? Can He break
His own great law of Fatherhood, for sake
And curse his children? Not for earth and heaven
Can separate tables of the law be given.
No rule can bind which he himself denies;
The truths of time are not eternal lies."

5. Warrington's Manual — for the information of officers and members of Legislatures, Conventions, Societies, &c., in the practical government of all such bodies, according to Parliamentary Law and Practice in the United States. By Wm. S. Robinson, Clerk of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts from 1863 to 1873. Lee & Shepard. 75 cts.

The long legislative experience of Mr. Robinson would lead us to expect such a manual as he has given us — a complete guide for those presiding at any kind of public meeting, political, religious, business or otherwise. And we commend it to all who are in any danger of attaining to such an honor. A knowledge of the rules laid down here would greatly facilitate the conduct of business in our Conventions, Associations and Parish meetings, where we so often witness a deplorable ignorance regarding the powers of the chair, the rights of members, the relevancy of motions and amendments, reconsiderations, questions of order, division of questions, duties of committees, and the general order of business. We advise all who are ambitious of presiding or speaking at our public business or conventional meetings to study this manual.


A very convenient and useful work, including a large amount of
valuable matter in a very small space. The tables are so arranged as to give the present condition of the world at a glance—each nation, its area, form of government, population, expenses, public debt, army, navy, merchant marine, imports and exports, chief products and manufactures, coins, weights and measures reduced to our standards, the population of the chief cities, religious and educational statistics, &c., &c., all corrected to the present year. In the corrections we notice considerable changes from the edition of 1873, showing the growth in population, produce and general wealth. Nearly a million square miles of territory are added to Russia. More than 300,000 are added to Turkey, an area five times as large as all New England—but what conquests has Turkey made in the last two years? Egypt is raised from 659,000 to 1,063,000, and in population from 8,000,000 to 13,400,000. This, we suppose, is to be put down to Pacha Baker’s annexation (?) of the region beyond Kondokoro.

In Religious Statistics some great corrections have been made, and more are required. In 1873 the Friends are counted at 14,000, but in 1875 they are raised to 22,000! 57,000 Orthodox, and 35,000 Unitarian. The Catholic population is raised from 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 in two years! Is this correct? Unitarians are put down at 31,905, an increase of 905; and Universalists at 60,000—no increase. Is this correct? We cannot speak for the Unitarians, but 60,000 is far from representing our numbers. Our Register for this year gives 55,000 children in our Sunday Schools alone, and 31,000 Church members. The Editor says the “Statistical Year Books, Almanacs, &c., have been consulted, and the information brought down to March 1875.” Our Statistical Year Book must have been overlooked.


A lively picture of Spain and its People by a competent observer and a most entertaining writer. He entered the Carlist service expressly to see and learn, and to tell the world the results, which he does in his first chapters; while the last half of the book describes the country and Spaniards in general. His description of Don Carlos, his character and pretensions, of his army and officers, their methods of warfare, &c., are informing and interesting; while the stories he tells of Santa Cruz, the curé, fully authenticate the reports of the cruelties and murders of this reverend tiger.

The chapter on the Spanish Clergy, and the alienation of the majority of the men from the church, is a fresh contribution to modern Spanish history—though we confess to doubts as to the last statement. It is the same in substance with what was said in our last of the French masses. The portraits of Amadens, Alfonzo, Prim, Castellar, Serrano, Figueras, &c., are of great interest and value, and indispensable to a correct understanding of the present political condition of Spain, and of the strange vicissitudes through which this strange country has passed within the last few years. The following from the grandmother of Prince Napoleon, is worth a thought:
"We are a strange people, not like everybody else. Look at the mob, for instance, that is now complete master of every one of us. Do they do any harm to any one? Personal safety was never greater in Madrid than it is now. All the ruffians get a gun, suppose themselves to be somebody, and are quite satisfied. They watch over that very property they might have otherwise destroyed, and protect those lives they might otherwise have taken. I begin to like republican arrangements. Turn all the thieves and brigands into guardians of peace and order, and all the difficulties of the so-called large agglomerations of modern cities are got over. It it not nice?"


It cannot be said that the first two hundred pages of this book are very entertaining or even instructive. It is a somewhat monotonous record of the common incidents of African travel, repeated from day to day, with little variation. Their only value lies in the fact that they give us the last experiences of such a Christian hero and martyr as David Livingstone; and show what a man can cheerfully endure and suffer and surrender when filled with the spirit of God, and made willing to live and die in the cause of Christ and humanity. As a missionary Livingstone began his labors; but in time, convinced of the wide-spread existence and indescribable horrors of the over-land slave trade, he entered on the career of Explorer with with a view to bring this "open sore of the world" to the attention of European churches and governments, and through them secure a united protest against the diabolical traffic, backed by demonstrations which should compel its abandonment by the Arabs, Portuguese and native Negro Chiefs. In addition to this he had an unconquerable desire to solve the geographical problem of the ages—the Sources of the Nile. Still the predominant feelings and motives are seen in such constantly recurring passages as the following: "Birthday. My Jesus! my King! my life! my all; I again dedicate my whole self to thee. Accept me, and grant, oh gracious Father, that ere this year is gone I may finish my task. In Jesus' name I ask it. Amen. So let it be."

The book confirms all that is said by Baker of the terrible effects of the slave trade as conducted by the Arabs—whole districts once populous, and alive with the hum of industry, reduced to a wilderness, villages in ashes, fugitives flying from the kidnappers, hundreds starving, dead bodies scattered along the highways, terror and cruelty prevailing everywhere, slaves murdered, or tied to trees and left to starve, with the "slave-stick" (a heavy forked piece of wood fastened to the neck) still on, or abandoned to die when too weak to travel farther, and sometimes a general massacre of the people from revenge for some trivial offence, or out of pure demonism. Livingston was eye witness of one of these frightful tragedies on a market day in one of the vil-
lages. A thousand or more women and children were attending market when they were suddenly set upon by a party of Arab slave traders, and three or four hundred butchered—and the reason given was that they belonged to a tribe whose chief had traded with a slave instead of with them! And such scenes are frequent on the river Lualaba. How long will it take in this way to make a desert of the beautiful and fertile regions of interior Africa?

Another fact appears in this narrative confirming Baker’s witness to the cruelty, falsehood and infidelity of the negro races, notwithstanding the editor’s remark that Livingstone, living and dying, testified “to the goodwill and kindness which exist in the heart of the African.” This is true of individuals, and specially true of the devoted and faithful attendants who bore his body back a thousand miles toward the coast, and so religiously preserved all his journals and memoranda. But these individual examples are not an offset to seven years of robbery, treachery, meanness and baseness toward a man who gave his strength and labor and life for them. Then their cruelties to each other, as in the case of the chief who amused himself with cutting off the ears and hands of his subjects, and killing them at his pleasure—and the remark of some regarding a chief, that he thought, if he did not kill somebody occasionally, his people would suppose he was dead—the horrible barbarities of the Manyuama and Maziu—and the savage superstitions which require a child to be killed if he cuts the upper teeth before the lower, or turns from one side to the other when asleep! to say nothing of the chief who, if he dreams of a man two or three times, puts him to death as one who is practising secret arts against his life! These things reveal the actual condition of the negro tribes. But then, in justice, it should be added that, in all this lying, and treachery, and stealing, and barbarity, the Mohammedan Arabs are fully the equals of the pagan negroes.

Beside these matters, the Journals abound with shrewd and careful observations of the physique, the customs, morals, and religious notions of the various tribes, their manufactures, industries and trade, the products of the fields and forests, birds and beasts, and whatever new or useful information he gathers from conversation with the natives and Arab traders. His description of the gorillas or sokos, and their habits, is amusing—he calls them “handy-legged, pot-bellied, low-looking villains who would do well to stand for a picture of the devil!”

We all remember the lying story of his death, reported by the deserters; the excitement caused by his discovery in February, 1872, by Mr. Stanley, sent out by the New York Herald, of which Livingstone makes cordial acknowledgment. After Stanley’s departure the journal is but a mournful record of sickness and suffering, which ends only with his death. He died on his knees, in the act of prayer, Sept. 30, 1873. Thus ended a life as eventful and noble as has been lived on this earth, marked in all its phases by equal love of God and man; held up to the last, as his journal shows, by an unwavering trust in the One, and a fervent desire to elevate and save the other.
Nothing surpasses in interest the closing portion of this narrative — his struggle with disease, growing weaker day by day, till, unable to walk, he was carried on the shoulders of the men; still keeping up the entries in his journal until a day or two before his death, suffering untold agonies from fever, dysentery and other diseases; and at last utterly exhausted carried into Chitambo's village only to die in a manner so characteristic of the Christian and the martyr. It makes the heart ache to read this portion of the narrative — but what a lesson of fidelity, of self-sacrifice, and generous consecration to a high and holy purpose!

BOOK NOTES.


Parmenides, edited by Ralph Waldo Emerson. J. R. Osgood & Co. $4.00.

Problems of Life and Mind. By George Henry Lewes. The Foundation of a Creed. Vol. II. $3.00. [A brief review of this by an able contributor in our next.]

Hours in a Library. By Leslie Stephens. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. $1.75. [A critical and able dissertation of the characteristics, merits and demerits of the Novels of De Foe, Richardson, Walter Scott and Balzac; together with a review of Hawthorne and De Quincey, and a curious inquiry as to the moral theory of Pope, especially as set out in the famous "Essay on Man.]"

Appleton's International Scientific Series. The Doctrine of Descent and Darwinism. By Oscar Schmidt, Professor in the University of Strasburg. With Twenty-six Woodcuts. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50. [A learned and elaborate argument in support of Darwin's theory of Descent, in which the author arrays a large number of physiological facts, and organic harmonies between man and animals, in support of his theory. He is quite confident that he has swept away all arguments from the other side founded on Language, Free Will, Conscience and the Moral Sense. There is no knowledge but of the physical: spirit independent of matter, miracle, supernaturalism, are among the impossibilities. Man in his primitive condition, just struggling out of his baboonhood, is "a speechless animal," without consciousness of God, without conscience, without anything but an animal frame and nature.]

Astronomy. By I. Norman Lockyer, F. R. S. With Illustrations. D. Appleton & Co. 60 cts. [Another of those delightful Science Primers which should be in every home, as helps to familiar talks on scientific subjects. With these any parent of ordinary intelligence may fasten the attention and charm the fancy of his child, so as to make him feel that he has study and play, work and fun all in one. We keep them all at hand ready for use.]

Vick's Catalogues of Flowers, Vegetables, &c., are among the most beautifully printed and illustrated issues which come to our book table. If you wish to know all the wonders of divine work in flower land, and to gather them around you; if you wish to know how to lay out and ornament your grounds in the most picturesque and attractive manner, send for his "Floral Guides," (Rochester, N. Y.,) do as he tells you, and your wish will be realized.


This last and several of the above will receive attention hereafter.
The theory of the Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, when applied to the other books of the Pentateuch, does not admit of the same certainty, as in its application to Genesis. Though one may be convinced that the documents are followed to some extent in these books, in spirit if not literally, after having learned some of their peculiarities from Genesis; yet he will not be able to separate and define the passages with the same clearness and certainty. Here the documents, if used at all, are more mixed. Their separate peculiarities do not stand out so prominently in well defined paragraphs. The principal mark that distinguished them in Genesis fails after the revelation of the name “Jehovah.” De Wette endeavors to trace the passages in these books by the aid of other marks that distinguish them, but he is not eminently successful. His chief dependence for proof that the two documents are the basis of this history, is on those passages which he calls “contradictory.” These, such as they are, are very numerous, and hence the argument is urged with considerable confidence. He places Exodus xvi. 2-15, by the side of Numbers xi. 4-23, and regards them as varying records of the same event — one of them taken from the Elohim document, and the other from the Jehovist. Bleek treats them in the same way, so far at least as regarding them as different records of the same event.

The passages do not relate to the same event. The proof is, that they do not relate to the same period. One supply of quails was given at the same time with the manna; the other when the manna had been long in use, and the people had begun to loathe it. In the last instance, the supply of animal food was continued for a long time, while no hint is given of this in the first instance.

We are sorry to see in our author a disposition to magnify.
the differences which are found in various passages of the Pentateuch. We can hardly say that he ever sees mere diversities, they are all contradictions. He does indeed in a single instance speak, with a sort of irony, of the "antithesis" between two passages; but in apparent earnestness he does not use that kind of language. It should be observed, that the argument for the theory of documents requires only that passages differ in style, language, etc. It does not require that they be contradictory. But our author acts on the principle of "killing two birds with one stone"—proving his favorite theory, and proving Infidelity at the same time. To this length we cannot go with him. There is diversity in the passages which compose the book of Genesis, and to some extent the other books of the Pentateuch. In respect to Genesis, there is little chance to doubt that these passages were the product of two different authors. The diversity proves this; but diversity is not contradiction. But whether the other books of the Pentateuch were formed in the same way, is a matter of some doubt. The same general peculiarities are found in all the books; but not in the same form as in the first. In the first the passages can be clearly pointed out. The separate peculiarities are distinct and obvious; while in the other books they are greatly mixed, and are often found in the same paragraph, and even in the same verse; and with them, marks that belong to neither document. But if we relinquish the theory, as applied to these books, how shall we account for the forms of words and expressions in them, that distinguish the documents in the former book? How came they to be here at all, if not by a similar combination? The question can easily be answered.

If we regard the author of these books, as being familiar with the style and language of Genesis; and especially, if he copied and combined the documents as they are in that book, we shall have precisely such an author as wrote the other books in their present form. His style would be largely the same as that of the documents he had copied, but mixed, to some extent, with personal and original peculiarities. This is the
style of the books after Genesis. In some paragraphs, the Elohist style and phraseology preponderate; in others, the Jehovahic; and in others still, there is a preponderance of traits that seem to be original. The plan of Genesis did not allow much scope for these last; but not so the rest of the Pentateuch.

The fact that the same peculiarities, which we find in Genesis, with some new ones, characterize the other books of the Pentateuch, is convincing proof of the unity of authorship; and that implies the writing of it all nearly at the same time.

So far as the argument for the documentary hypothesis is based on alleged contradictions, it fails to convince. A few examples will suffice under this head. In Lev. xxv. 39 etc., the language is said to be opposed to that of Ex. xxi. 1 etc. "In Exodus it is permitted to buy a Hebrew slave; in Leviticus it is forbidden." It is not forbidden in either passage. In both, the right to buy and sell such slaves or servants, is recognized. The language of one is, "If thou buy a Hebrew servant," etc. The other, "If thy brother be waxen poor and be sold unto thee." In the last passage it is added, that a Hebrew servant is not to be treated as a slave, but rather as a hired servant; while the first passage goes on to define the regulations that must guide the transactions of the institution of Hebrew servitude.

Again, Num. x. 11-28 is ascribed to one document; and Ex. xiii. 21, 22 to another; because they are at variance. One passage, it is said, makes the cloud go before the people from the beginning; the other makes it commence doing this at a later period. The truth is, the "contradiction" is all in the imagination of the objector. The passage in Exodus says the cloud went before the people by day, and the fire by night. When the march was resumed from Sinai, (Num. x. 11,) the writer repeats the statement that had been made before, without the slightest hint that this had not been done till then.

Num. i. 1, etc., contains a command to number the people; but Ex. xxxviii. 25, etc., shows that the numbering had been accomplished. The command is obeyed before it is given.
These passages relate to two entirely different occasions. The first numbering had in view the procuring of money for the tabernacle service; the last contemplated an organization both for defense and for the convenience of marching to the promised land.

"There is a slight contradiction between Num. iv. 6, which supposes the staves taken out of the rings of the ark, and Ex. xxv. 15, which forbids their removal." The temporary removal of the staves, in order to cover the ark, preparatory to carrying it from place to place, was thought not to require stating in the prohibition. If our author should order his family not to remove certain books from the shelf of his bookcase, or from his table, he would not deem it necessary to add, "except when we move from one residence to another."

Num. x. 17, makes the Levites go with the ark before the people, while Num. ii. 17, makes them go in the midst of the people. Both passages make the Levites go in the midst of the people. The expression to set forward, in one passage, does not mean to go before the people; for the same expression is used when it is said expressly that the ark must be carried in the midst.

Num. xxii.-xxiv., and xxxi. 8, 16, are contradictory. One says the people slew Balaam; the other, that they were led astray by him. He led them astray, and afterwards they slew him for it. Strange contradiction!

The foregoing will serve as a specimen of the contradictions (!) pointed out by our author.¹

We will now proceed to the more direct testimonies of our authors, adduced to show the late origin of the Pentateuch. The passages of this kind from Genesis, having received sufficient attention, we will commence where we then left off.

Ex. xvi. 35 is offered as proof that the Pentateuch was not written till after the conquest of Canaan. "The children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders

¹ For the foregoing passages, and others similar, as treated of by De Wette, see in Vol. II. pp. 108, 127, 137, 148. The same and similar conflicting passages are noticed by Bleek. Vol. I. pp. 241-248.
of the land of Canaan." Surely such a passage as this need not be considered "un-Mosaic"; for Moses came "to the borders of the land" before he died; and it is clearly implied in the narrative, that he wrote a portion of this history in the last month of the forty years. If these words are understood as implying that the manna had already ceased, we remark that it did not actually cease till the people crossed the Jordan (Jos. v. 12); but as it was given expressly to serve them while passing through the wilderness, and the time had been definitely fixed as forty years, the author of this history had good reasons for using words that imply its termination in a short time; and this is all they do imply. Bleek, p. 232.

Num. xv. 32–36 has the following expression, "While the children of Israel were in the wilderness," etc., implying that they were no longer in the wilderness. It does imply this; and it was true, before the death of Moses, that they were no longer in the wilderness, but in "a land inhabited," on the borders of Canaan.

Deut. i. 1; ii. 12; iii. 14. The first of these passages is merely a heading to the rest of the book; and quite likely it was added after Moses' death. But does the title of a book, which anybody may add, afford any evidence against the book itself? Of course not. The next passage informs us that the Horim or Horites dwelt in Seir, in ancient times, which Moses doubtless knew and could properly record. It adds that Esau destroyed the Horites, as Israel did unto the land of his possession. These last words have strongly the appearance of being a gloss, added by a later hand. At the same time the Hebrew language, having no present historical tense, the past is often used in its place. If therefore we render this passage, "Which Israel is doing to the land of his possession," the words will express what we conceive to be the fact, allowing that Moses wrote them. If the phrase "land of his possession" is understood as implying actual settlement, we would concede this, if the people had not a sure promise, which was kept constantly before them, that Canaan was theirs. Moses had conquered the eastern tribes, and had settled in
their place two and a half of the tribes of Israel. Under the circumstances, we conceive it perfectly consistent to apply the language we are considering to the conquests already made, and the prospect of complete success in their future efforts.

In the 14th verse, there is an account of the conquests of Jair, of the tribe of Manasseh; which could have been written by Moses, except the words "unto this day," often added in other instances, and to be attributed to some copyist, or perhaps to the revision by Ezra.

The part of chap. iii. 11, that is considered "un-Mosaic," is the allusion to the bedstead of Og, king of Bashan. But as Moses had conquered Og, and knew of the giant's iron bed-stead, we see no reason for his not alluding to it.

Deut. xxxiii. 1, is deemed a "post Mosaic" passage. As it is merely the title to the words of the song that follows, it may be a later addition. But as Bleek applies the song itself to a later day, it is quite natural that he should make the same application of the heading over it. The strange thing is, that he should call the first verse a late addition, without saying the same of the rest, as we know he regards the whole as equally post-Mosaic. Here one cannot well refrain from pointing out the antagonism between the record here given and the theory of our author. The record says, that Moses pronounced this blessing; Bleek says that he did not do it, it is the work of an uncertain author. The record says, that this song was composed before the death of Moses; our author denies this, and says it was composed, he does not know when, but certainly several hundred years after Moses' day. So it is in other instances. Where our author asserts a "post-Mosaic" writing of a passage, the record gives us definitely to understand that the words were spoken or written by Moses or some one in his day.

The only passage claimed as un-Mosaic or post-Mosaic, that furnishes undoubted indications of being what is claimed, is the last chapter of the book. As that gives us an account of the death of the lawgiver, it was written by some one besides Moses, and after his death. It is thought by some, and that
seems most likely, that this chapter was once the first in the next book; and that by some means it became attached to Deuteronomy. As originally there was no division of chapters and verses, it is probable that the same was true of separate books. And when the division was made, the chapter was put in the wrong place. Bleek, Vol. I. pp. 232–236.

These same passages, with one or two exceptions, are used by De Wette in the same way. The latter, however, speaks of them in connection with the two documents, which he claims to be able to trace through all the five books.

That the Elohim document was written after the conquest of Canaan, is proved, he thinks, by Lev. xviii. 28. "That the land do not vomit you out, as it vomited out the nations which were before you." The whole context shows that the people had not yet arrived in Canaan. The author of these words, is laying before them what will be the consequences of their conduct, if they corrupt themselves, as the nations had done that were to be expelled. A rendering, therefore, that shall express the true sense of this passage, must be such as to accord with these circumstances. We would therefore change the words, "as it vomited out," so as to read, "as it will have vomited out." We cannot suppose the author, in one breath, would address the people as not yet being in the land; and in the next, as being actually there, and as having expelled the former corrupt inhabitants! De Wette, Vol. II. p. 146.

Again, in Num. xxxii. 41, Jair is mentioned, who lived, our author says, in the time of the Judges. Judges x. 4. It is rather amusing that any reader of these passages especially learned men like De Wette and Bleek should understand the same Jair to be alluded to in both. One of these men named Jair conquered the country, and called it after his name, Havoth-jair; the other was one of his descendants, and, as was natural, was called after his name; but he is expressly represented as the ruler of the country, and not its conqueror. Other circumstances show the two men to be entirely different. It is assumed that the country was named after the last, as well as the first; but the latter passage does not warrant any such assumption. See Bleek, p. 234, and De Wette, p. 171.
Num xxiv. 7 is a prediction of Balaam that Israel's king shall be higher than Agag, and is understood as referring to the time of Saul, who was "head and shoulders" higher than any of the people, and who was also the conqueror of Agag, the king of Amalek. See 1 Sam. xv. 2–8. The record says this language was spoken in the time of Moses; but if our author has the right view of it, the statement is false. This is not all. The author of this history meant to convey the impression that it was written in Moses' day; but betrays himself by alluding to circumstances known to belong to a much later period!

The passage has an appearance that is favorable to the theory it is used to sustain. But it fails to convince, for several reasons. One is, that Agag may be a name that is applied to a succession of kings, like Cæsar, Pharaoh, etc. In this case, the sense of the passage is simply, that Israel would sometime triumph over Amalek; for to be higher means to be more prosperous. This is all that can well be made out of this language.

The foregoing passages relate mainly to the history, that is contained in these books. Let us now see what our authors say of the laws. The following is from the orthodox Bleek, Vol. I. p. 212.

"There can be no doubt but that the laws, as they stand in these books, make as a whole one and the same claim to have proceeded from Moses. But it is possible, that these, or at least many of them, belonged to a later period; and that much was attributed to the first lawgiver, which had been gradually formed among the people, or at any rate, did not exist in a written shape till a later period. It is to be expected that records of this kind will always bear more or less traces of the time in which they were composed or written down."

If these laws make as a whole the same claim to have proceeded from Moses, and yet many of them belong to a later period, it follows of course that the claim is false. Indeed, this is confessed by our author; for he tells us, in another place, that none of these laws came from Moses, in the form
in which we now have them. And if they did not come from him in this form, then are we entirely in the dark as to what was their form. Again he says,

"When on the contrary we meet with laws in which this is not the case, (see former quotation), laws which refer in their whole tenor to a state of things utterly unknown in the period subsequent to Moses, and to circumstances existing in the Mosaic age and in that only, it is in the highest degree likely that these laws not only in their essential purport proceeded from Moses, but also that they were written down by Moses, or at least in the Mosaic age. Of these laws, which appear to carry with them such clear and exact traces of the Mosaic age, there are many occurring especially in Leviticus, and also in Numbers and Exodus; which laws relate to situations and surrounding circumstances, only existing whilst the people, as was the case in Moses' time, wandered in the Wilderness, and were dwellers in the close confinement of camps and tents."

This would be correct reasoning, if these laws were written by a good man, and not by an impostor and deceiver. But the latter character "is not to be believed, even when he speaks the truth."

All the circumstances named by Bleek as furnishing evidence of the Mosaic origin of certain laws, are such as a shrewd deceiver could easily manufacture. An impostor, who could counterfeit Moses as he appears before us in Deuteronomy (as our author believes), would have the ability to assume all the conditions and circumstances here described; and having strong motives for doing so, after having claimed a Mosaic origin for all the laws of the Pentateuch, it is most reasonable to conclude that he did so.

"We see therefore that an important part of the laws and ordinances of the Pentateuch is of such a nature that, judging from their purport and form, it is impossible they could belong to any other age than the Mosaic." p. 225. How is this to be reconciled with other quotations? "In all probability, neither Moses, nor any of his cotemporaries, wrote any continuous history of the events of that time, still less, one in which the whole legislation was interwoven, as is the case in the Pentateuch." p. 362.
In one of our quotations, the author mentions the Mosaic laws as being found in Leviticus, Exodus and Numbers; but neither of these is regarded as written by Moses.

"It may be maintained with certainty, that the laws contained in Leviticus, in the shape in which we now have them, were not as a whole issued or written down by Moses." p. 310.

"That the whole of Exodus, as we now have it, is not an independent work by one and the same author, either Moses or any historian cotemporary with the events, is a result arrived at from a consideration of the facts already noticed." p. 305. "There are several accounts in Exodus of something being written down by Moses, yet there is plainly nothing about them which by its whole internal character would show them to be genuinely Mosaic." p. 307.

This being so, of course there is a false claim, and no dependence at all can be placed on the record. But how is it with Numbers? Is there nothing there that is Mosaic?

"The book of Numbers, taken separately from the preceding books, affords in itself the clearest signs—for the most part previously alluded to—that in its present extent and form it cannot have proceeded from, nor have been composed by, Moses or a cotemporary author" p. 318.

There is no one of the books of the Pentateuch, that makes more direct and positive claims, to the authorship of Moses, than the book of Deuteronomy. Moses is about to be taken away, and he addresses the people for the last time. He repeats a portion of the laws, with a view to make some changes in them, and impress them with more than common force on the minds of the people. The author puts into his words a pathos that seems almost more than human. One who reads this book with care is made to feel that Moses is surely the author; as no one else could speak with such power and effect. According to Bleek all these wonderful speeches are counterfeited! They were composed several hundred years after Moses, and were palmed upon the great lawgiver, to give them effect. Speaking of Deuteronomy he says:

"The author, however, cannot well have been Moses."
p. 820. "We are justified in supposing that his longer discourses, together with the Deuteronomic legislation, in their present form, and consequently Deuteronomy itself, did not proceed from Moses, but are the work of another and later author." p. 321.

"As to the Deuteronomic legislation proper, it was in general, without doubt, first composed in its present form by the author of Deuteronomy himself, as well as the Mosaic discourses contained in it." p. 840. "This author's object was simply to recommend and enjoin most emphatically the legal worship of Jehovah, as the only true God, and the general observance of the Mosaic laws; and to enforce this by an intimation of the heavy punishment and divine curse, which the continued infringement and disobedience of them had already brought and would still continue to bring on the people. These judgments could only be averted by an earnest and exact compliance with the divine commands. The form adopted by the author for this purpose, is, to represent Moses himself immediately before his death, as referring in long discourses to the divine dealings with the people up to that time; and as repeating again, in a connected form, God's commandments to them, and delivering the most emphatic threatenings against their infringement." p. 364.

"The reign of Manasseh, king of Judah, in the first half of the seventh century, B. C., may most probably be assumed as the date of the composition of Deuteronomy, and the last revision of the whole work." (That is, the whole of the Pentateuch.) p. 365. "In any case we must assume a date before the 16th year of Josiah, B. C. 624, when the book of the law, found in the temple, was made use of by that king." p. 366. Comp. De Wette Vol. II. p. 153.

The laws that are considered most likely to be Mosaic are those found in Lev. i. 7. Also Lev. xvi. and some others. And the reason given is the allusion to circumstances that must have existed in the time of Moses, to the wilderness, to camps, tents, &c.; and also to Aaron and his sons, as if they were then living. It is very strange that our author should urge such evidence as this, after admitting a false and fraudulent authorship of these books. A man that could lie, and did lie, in numerous instances by asserting that Moses said this and that, would be likely to fabricate circumstances to favor his deception.
Some poetic passages are ascribed to Moses in the Pentateuch, the most remarkable of which are found in chapters 32d and 33d of Deuteronomy. Let us see what Bleek says of these. But first it will be well to notice the claim of the author of Deuteronomy concerning them. Moses is represented as saying,

"Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes, and your officers, that I may speak these words in their ears, and call heaven and earth to record against them. For I know that after my death, ye will utterly corrupt yourselves, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and evil will befall you in the latter days, because ye will do evil in the sight of the Lord to provoke him to anger through the work of your hands. And Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel the words of this song, until they were ended."

Then follows the song in the next chapter, the 32d. At the close the authorship of Moses is again asserted in the most positive terms;

"And Moses came and spake all the words of this song, in the ears of the people, he and Hoshea the son of Nun. And Moses made an end of speaking all these words to all Israel. And he said unto them, Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day, which you shall command your children to observe to do all the words of this law. For it is not a vain thing for you, because it is your life; and through this thing you shall prolong your days, in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it."

The song that is contained in the next chapter, called Moses' Blessing, is ascribed to Moses with equal explicitness. "And this is the Blessing, wherewith Moses, the man of God, blessed the children of Israel before his death." And yet our author tells us that these statements are untrue, that these songs were not composed by Moses, but by others several hundred years after his death. Of the first his words are, "In any case this song (ch. xxxii.) bears no appearance of having been composed with the intention of passing as Mosaic; and it can not therefore have been originally devised by the author of Deuteronomy himself in the name of Moses; but he having met with it, first gave it that application and assigned it a suitable place in his historical work." p. 337. How it happened that the author of Deuteronomy, who composed that book in the name of Moses, did not compose this song our author does not explain. Another thing is left equally in the dark. It is, that the author of Deuteronomy should ascribe to Moses, in the most direct manner, a song that has "no appearance of having been composed with the intention of passing as Mosaic."
The man who composed those marvelous speeches ascribed to Moses in Deuteronomy, which have been generally understood as possessing undoubted marks of genuineness, did not know what was proper to ascribe to Moses, and actually represented as his a song "that has 'no appearance' of belonging to him, or even of being composed at first in his name!" Of the other song Bleek says,

"The original composition of this song, (ch. xxxiii.) appears to have taken place in the period between Solomon's death and the beginning of the Assyrian exile, most probably about 800 B. C., when both kingdoms were ruled by powerful and energetic monarchs—Israel by Jeroboam II., Judah by Uzziah." p. 336.

"Per se we can quite well consider it possible, that these songs originated through a later writer of history, or some other author, composing them, by a pure poetical fiction, in the name of Moses, or his cotemporaries; and endeavoring to transplant himself into the circumstances of that earlier time. He might even have done it, without any intention to deceive; in a similar way as was customary among the ancient classical authors, when they composed copious orations in the name of the hero of whom they were writing. But in songs composed in this way, we can scarcely ever fail to find some references to the time of the composition and its circumstances." Vol. I. p. 226.

We are aware that such men as Bleek, De Wette, and the rest of that class, claim to see in these songs allusions to a later time than that of Moses; but we fail to detect any such allusions. And it would seem that none such were discovered by the author of Deuteronomy; for to assert as he does, that Moses delivered these songs to the people before his death, and then put into them references to a later day that would expose as false the claim so confidently made, would be absurd and foolish. It is perfectly safe to assert, that the author of Deuteronomy was not guilty of such inconsistency and folly.

We admit all that is claimed for the Mosaic authorship of the laws that are thought by our author to be his. It is entirely convincing. It is so, because we believe the record came from the hand of an honest man. But coming from an
impostor and deceiver, the evidence would not be entitled to any confidence. There is nothing that Bleek urges as evidence, that such an author would not have the strongest temptation to fabricate.

As might be shown by abundant quotations there is really no essential difference between the theory of De Wette and that of Bleek — the former a Rationalist and the latter "Orthodox."

If the authenticity and genuineness of the Pentateuch rested on no better foundation than the theory put forth by these men, we would never again speak or write a word, either to defend or illustrate that part of the Record. And here we remark that our purpose, in the present article, is not so much to present the evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, as to show the weakness and fallacy of the reasons urged on the other side. We are driven to this course, by the necessity of confining our discussion within much narrower limits than a full examination of the subject would require. One or two points more of some importance will be noticed, and then we will bring this discussion to a close. One of these topics is introduced by Bleek in the following words:

We obtain our earliest knowledge of Hebrew from the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament, and pretty nearly from these alone. But in the very earliest of these, we find the language in an advanced stage of perfection, both as regards its grammatical and lexicographical development and completeness of grammatical forms and their symmetrical use, and also its copiousness of words; so that in the later Scriptures there is no very important stage of superiority arrived at. And the very points in which they differ from the more ancient, appear rather as if they arose from a degeneracy in the language, viz., from a greater admixture with other Semitic dialects, particularly with the Aramaic, owing to their intercourse with the Aramean nations. We find the Hebrew the purest, in the very oldest Scriptures, and the separation from the Aramaic, which is implied in Gen. xxxi. 47, must have preceded the composition of the most ancient of them. Even at that time the language appears to have been so completely developed, that we may suppose that a considerable amount of literary exercise in it had already existed." Vol. I. pp. 81, 82.
De Wette alludes to the same subject thus:

"The Hebrew language makes its first appearance, in the sight of history, in its complete form. The oldest writers, the authors of the Pentateuch, of the first historical books, and the authors of the oldest Psalms and Proverbs, the earlier Prophets, write in the purest and most beautiful language. Toward the end of the Jewish state, during the exile and after, the influence of the Aramean language becomes visible, as well as other peculiarities in the usages of the Hebrew language itself, and in connection with a perverted taste." Again, "On the supposition that the Pentateuch was a production of the Mosaic age, we must place the terminus a quo much higher. But although this doctrine has found such learned defenders in the present age, it can scarcely be brought again before the bar of impartial criticism. If there were no historical arguments, the language with which we are now alone concerned would lie as a very important weight in the balance; for it is a fact that the language of the Pentateuch coincides perfectly with that of the other old historical books. If these writings are separated by nearly a thousand years from one another; if the former are to be ascribed to Moses, as some maintain, then we shall have a phenomenon before us that is without parallel in the whole history of languages, namely, that the living language and the circle of ideas of the people, remained unaltered during so long a period." Vol. I. p. 126, 438.

These quotations involve the question, whether the language and style of the Pentateuch are so different from the later books, as to indicate the required space of time between the former and latter, allowing the first to be written by Moses. The time that intervened between the earliest and latest books of the Bible, as here assumed, is over a thousand years. Did the Hebrew language make such changes, as would correspond with so long a period? The advocates of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch contend for the affirmative, while such men as Bleek, De Wette, &c., take the negative. It is a question that cannot be decided with certainty. It is not denied that the Hebrew language, at the time the Pentateuch was written, exhibits a condition of maturity and perfection not to be looked for in a language that is new or uncultivated.
It is admitted, too, that it shows low if any signs of improvement, from time to time, in the subsequent books. But if there were no change in this regard, the fact would not necessarily demonstrate the late writing of the Pentateuch, nor show that the different books are not as far apart as is commonly believed. If the people that use a language remain about the same through a period of a thousand years, or after a few generations go down to a lower plain, the same uniformity or degeneracy will be likely to characterize their language. There are changes in a language that indicate age besides those that attend its improved cultivation; and these may be expected to be found in books that are far separated by the time of writing. That there are fewer and less important changes in the language of the Pentateuch and the later books, than would occur in almost any language besides the Hebrew, or among any people besides the Hebrew people, will readily be admitted. The children of Israel were a peculiar people, in respect to their language, as well as their religion and social customs. They did not change in any respect, as other peoples and nations have changed. It is highly probable that their language changed in a thousand years as much as their social customs; many of which are the same now that they were in the patriarchal age.

The political and social institutions of the Hebrews were expressly devised and enforced, with a view to keep them separate from other nations. And though they frequently violated these regulations, and adopted forbidden practices, yet the judgment of God that followed close on their disobedience, soon brought them back, so that their language did not suffer material change. By a single regulation, affecting the possession of real estate, the commerce with foreign nations was thrown into the hands of foreigners that resided among them. No foreigner could own real estate except in the walled towns; and of course all such as were above the condition of servitude, and found it for their interest to live in the country of the Hebrews, would establish themselves in the “fenced cities.” The prohibition of interest on money, when both parties were
Hebrews, with its permission when the borrower was a Gentile, tended in the same direction. Lev. xxv. 30; Deut. xxiii. 20.

The perfection of the Hebrew language at the beginning, at least when the Pentateuch was written, excludes the idea of any great change by way of improvement in the subsequent books. And the idea that such change should take place, is based on the unwarranted assumption that the language was then in its infancy. That it was not in its infancy may not be susceptible of entire demonstration, but the opposite we think is still more difficult to prove. It is certain that Egypt, at the time the Israelites resided in that country was highly distinguished for its attainments in science, and in all the knowledge of the age. That Moses was educated "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," would be sufficiently evident from the system of laws and religion ascribed to him, if we had not an express declaration of an apostle to that effect. On this point Bleek concedes all that we claim:

"We must not forget the fact that the Hebrew language was not peculiar to the Israelites, the descendants of Abraham and of Jacob, but was also the language of the Canaanitish nations, and was adopted from the latter by the descendants of Abraham. We may thus very well imagine that the language, at the time the Israelites adopted it, was cultivated to no inconsiderable extent among these Canaanites, even by means of literary composition; and this cannot the least surprise us in the case of a people so given to trade as the Phœnicians especially were. The very same thing is pointed out by the ancient name, Kirjath-Sepher (city of books), for a Canaanitish city in the district which was afterwards the territory of the tribe of Judah, and was subsequently called Debir. Joshua xv. 15, 16; Judges i. 11, 12. The Israelites, therefore, not improbably found the Hebrew language, at the very first, in a definite and established state of development, even by means of literary composition." p. 83.

It must be remembered, also, that the Hebrews had spent certainly two hundred and fifteen years, and probably four hundred and thirty, in Egypt; nor does it appear that they were deprived of the means of literary cultivation and improve-
ment but a small part of the time. And dwelling in a community by themselves, they preserved the language they carried with them into that country; and there is no evidence that they did not improve it. This furnishes a good reason, why the language did not greatly change, by way of improvement, during the subsequent history.

It may be added, that the actual changes would not be likely to come down to us; for as the old peculiarities of the language became obsolete, and new ones came into use, the former would be dropped out and the latter adopted by the transcribers; and this process continuing from generation to generation, there would be a constant assimilation of the old books to the new. The language of both would be essentially the same. Nor is there the least evidence that any restriction was put upon transcribers in this regard, till the last days of the nation — surely not till the writing of the latest books of the Bible. This would give to all the books nearly the same language in respect to cultivation. The first books of the Bible would differ from the later ones at the present time, only so far as they differed when the rigid rules of transcription were adopted. What peculiarities had become nearly obsolete, but had not been expunged, would remain; and this implies some difference between the old and the new books, and probably all the difference that is found actually to exist at the present day. That it implies more than this, no one can prove.

A careful examination shows that there are words in the Pentateuch that are not found in the later books, and other words that are used in a different sense, though their form is the same and other words with other peculiarities. We cannot point them out to any great extent; but we will give a few examples, to show the nature of the argument. Instead of giving the words that are considered archaic, we will give a description of them.

Some words occur in the Pentateuch that are found seldom or never in the later books of the Bible. These are given by Keil, but we have no space for them here. Again, the mascu-
line pronoun for *he* is used for the feminine *she* 195 times in the Pentateuch, the latter being used but eleven times. And in perfect consistency with this usage is the use of the word for *boy* in the sense also of *girl*, there being but one exception (Deut. xxii. 19) in the whole Pentateuch. The form of the word for the demonstrative pronoun *this* or *that*, is changed after the time of the Pentateuch. For the later form, see Judges vi. 20; 1 Sam. xiv. 1; xvii. 26; 2 Kings iv. 25; xxiii. 17, etc.

Other words are used in the Pentateuch in historical narration, and afterwards used only by the poets and prophets.

The words introduced by Keil as *archaic* are very numerous, but our argument would not be materially strengthened if we were to give the whole list. These words are seldom if ever used in the same way, after the time of the Pentateuch; showing that a considerable period must have elapsed before the other books were written. Other words are used in the Pentateuch, which occur afterwards, but in a different sense. This is equivalent to their not occurring at all. For it is too apt to be overlooked that words having the same form, are often as distinct as if they had different forms. Words are no more the same for having the same form than men are for having the same name.

Again, there are some words in the Pentateuch, which occur afterwards in the same *sense*, but with a slight change in their *form*. It implies a considerable space of time for this change to occur.

Some of these are mentioned by De Wette and Bleek; and it is confessed by them that they have some force as showing the antiquity of the Pentateuch. We think the argument is a sound one. The changes here shown did not take place in a day. It required a long time to bring them about, and probably all the time demanded by the theory of the early writing of the Pentateuch.

There is, however, one difficulty that must necessarily attend all investigations pertaining to our present topic. The Bible history is brief, and many things existed that are not
noticed in the record. An item in the archaeology of the times may be passed in silence by the historians for centuries after it came into existence; and it may continue for centuries after they cease to notice it. It will not do to infer that it did not exist till mentioned; nor that it ceased to exist when mentioned no more. It is so with words. Words that are frequent in the Pentateuch may cease to be used in the subsequent history, though common among the people, and suitable to be used by the historian if he had occasion to use them. If the same idea is expressed in other terms, it does not follow that these terms have just come into use, and have supplanted the former; for both may be equally ancient, and the use of one rather than the other may be wholly accidental. After all, this uncertainty does not entirely invalidate the argument for the early writing of the Pentateuch. If a word is frequently used awhile, and then ceases to appear, when the same idea is repeatedly expressed by another word, the great probability is, that the former has gone out of use, or changed its meaning. This is true of many of the words that have been alluded to, and we insist that a long period must have elapsed to induce and authorize this change. How long a period, may admit of some doubt; and different opinions will be honestly entertained on the subject. We must conclude that the same laws essentially controlled the language of the Hebrews, which regulated their social customs. The latter we know changed very slowly, so slowly, indeed, that many of them are the same now that they were as far back as our sacred history reaches. The time covered by the writings of the Old Testament is scarcely one third of this period.

Another important consideration affecting the question before us, is that the Hebrews were eminently a religious people. Their principal reading was doubtless devoted to the books of the Bible—those that subsequently formed our Canon of Scripture. This must have been especially true of the writers of the later books. The numerous references in the later to the earlier books, are proof of this. The natural effect would be to make the early and later books of the Bible very much
alike in language, style, &c. Indeed, it appears to have been considered an excellency in the late writers of the Bible, to imitate the language of the early books. Hence there is a greater resemblance between the latest and the earliest, than is found in the intervening books. This tends to weaken the argument for the late writing of the Pentateuch drawn from the likeness of the later to the earlier books.

Also it is claimed that the early books of the Bible have, more or less, the peculiarities of the Syriac and Chaldee languages (both these languages being called Aramaic); and hence they must have been written after the time when the Hebrews were brought into close intimacy with the Syrians and Chaldees. This argument is very unreliable. In the first place, it is not claimed that the Pentateuch has many such peculiarities as are called Aramaic. And we know that the intercourse of the Hebrews with the Syrians and Chaldees belongs to a very early age. It is true that in the time of Moses, the Hebrews and the Aramaic nations are not known to have been intimate; but this intimacy is not necessary to account for the few instances of Aramisms in the Pentateuch. Abraham, the father of the Hebrews, was from Chaldee; and there was considerable intercourse between his immediate descendants and the people of Padan-aram or Mesopotamia—other names for Syria. Jacob spent twenty years in Syria; and his sons being born in that country, it would be very remarkable if some few peculiarities of the Syrian language should not adhere to the dialect of his descendants. De Wette quotes Movers as saying that "Aramaisms are proof of a very early or a very late origin." We would rather say that Aramaisms would be very apt to appear in the early books of the Hebrews, and in the later books, as the two languages are virtually one; and there was no time when they were not more or less brought into contact. The Egyptians held constant intercourse with the people of the East; and Moses was brought up and resided a long time in Egypt. What then should prevent his dialect from being affected somewhat with Aramaic peculiarities? Besides, it is a matter of doubt,
whether certain words called Aramaic are really so or not. The Hebrew, Syriac and Chaldee, being only dialects of one original language, it would naturally occur that they should have many things in common. It is very unsafe, therefore, to pronounce a positive judgment, as to what are, and what are not, Aramaisms in the Hebrew language.

We feel constrained to say, in conclusion, that the argument against the late writing of the Pentateuch, both from its Archaisms and its Aramaisms, is wholly destitute of force. We have endeavored to treat the subject fairly, and without partiality; and the result is a confirmed conviction in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and of its truth and accuracy.

ARTICLE XXII.

The Wrestling of Jacob.

The attention of the readers of the Quarterly, was directed, by an able article from the pen of Rev. J. O. Skinner, to the remarkable narrative contained in Genesis xxxii. That narrative is still a puzzling question to the Bible reader. Why should an angel (Heavenly Messenger) want to wrestle with Jacob? and if sent of God, and endowed with power to carry out his purpose, how could he be “prevailed over” by Jacob? If Jacob could prevail over him, how could the angel with a touch dislocate Jacob’s thigh? and if Jacob’s thigh was really dislocated, how could he so soon afterwards walk out to meet his brother, “and bow himself to the ground seven times”? Even with the most devout believer such questions as these will arise, and with them a wish for some clear and rational explanation or interpretation of the narrative. We must all admit that as it stands in the ordinary translation, there is something irrational, unnatural and repulsive in the account.

In examining authorities for light in this matter we referred
to a work entitled "The Holy Bible newly translated from the original Hebrew, with notes critical and explanatory, by John Bellamy, author of the History of all Religions." Printed by subscription in London, 1818. In it, we find the translation of, and notes upon, this chapter, portions of which are contained in this Article. We ask for it the most earnest attention of our Pastors and our Linguists. If it be ratified by other careful examiners, it will prove a most valuable commentary upon a passage that is sadly in need of some rational explanation. The translation here given contains a satisfactory elucidation; one that is consistent with the history of the two brothers, and in harmony with their characters, and the customs of their race and time. It goes back to first principles in its deductions. It takes for its basis this strong ground:

1st. That when a spiritual messenger, or "angel" is sent of God, it must be for a Divine purpose, and that purpose must be in harmony with the Divine nature. It must be good, and for good.

2d. That if it does not appear to be so in the narrative, then we should look for the error in the work of men, (the translation) rather than in God, or the Messenger, or his acts.

3d. It is strong in this: it falls back upon the original Hebrew, and in translating thence, gives no sense or meaning from it that is not found in the same original word in other portions of Scripture.

4th. It demands no miracle. It requires no unreasonable stretch of imagination, nor anything to be taken on faith alone. We ask therefore an earnest examination and searching criticism on the passages given; those which affect the meaning only, being herein transcribed.

Bellamy's Translations and Notes.

Genesis xxxii. 24, 25. Now Jacob remained only, when a man contended with him, until the ascending of dawn. When he saw that he prevailed not, against him, then he touched the hollow of his loin, thus he clasped the hand on the loin of Jacob after he had contended with him.

Notes on Verses 24 and 25. "There is no part of Scripture more vulnerable to the attacks of objectors, than the narrative concerning Jacob's wrestling with an angel. From the
early ages of the Christian church to the present day, commentators have been content to take the translation as it stood in the early versions: but as it is not possible to understand it literally as it is in all the European translations, many intelligent and learned men have rejected the translation of this part without however attempting to give a better. Abiding by the literal meaning of the original, I am constrained to reject the generally received opinion: nothing of this nature is recorded in the original; the error has been made by the first translators, who made the translation called the Septuagint, after the dispersion of the Jews: the first or real Septuagint having been destroyed when the Alexandrian library was burned.

"Objectors have said, 'Admitting the Hebrew lawgiver to have been a good man, is it possible to suppose that it was his intention to communicate such a circumstance, so obviously vicious, on the part of a person who was, according to popular opinion an angel? Can we admit that an angel had not power, or was not strong enough, to have overcome Jacob? And if he had, what good could have come from such a contest? But is it credible, that when the angel saw, as is stated in the translation, that he could not prevail against him by fair means, in order to throw him down, that he put his thigh out of joint? Were we to see two men striving, and that one of them finding he could not prevail against the other, took an opportunity to maim him, what should we think of such a man? Undoubtedly we should conclude that he merited the most severe punishment; surely then this could not be the conduct of an angel, sent, as is understood, from God.'

"Such questions have often been proposed by objectors; and it is much to be lamented that such a misapplication of the original should have been made by translators. However by attending to the true meaning of the words as applied by the sacred writer, also to the customs of that ancient people, and the phraseology of the language, we shall find that no objection can be brought against this part of Scripture in future.

"When Jacob, on his return to his own country, was drawing near to the possessions of Esau, he began to fear that the old quarrel might be renewed. He therefore sent a messenger to inform him that he was on his way; and Esau on his part was anxious to convince him that he had a right to the great personal property of his father; he therefore deputed the judge of the land to meet Jacob; for it is said, a man, not an angel, wrestled with him. It has been, I say, understood
that this wrestling was a contention as to bodily strength; but the word *abech*, rendered *wrestled*, means also to contend in argument. That this man contended with Jacob is sufficiently clear; the result was in favor of Jacob, as it is said, concerning the man, and *when he saw that he prevailed not against him*; which is enough to convince us that he was not an angel; but the passage expressly declares he was a *man*, viz., "and there contended *Ish*, A Man with him," a man in power among the Idumeans, over whom Esau then reigned, the principal messenger mentioned in the second verse, deputed on the part of Esau to convince Jacob that he had a right, as the eldest son, to the hereditary possessions of his Father. Now when Jacob had convinced this messenger that he was not come to dispute with Esau concerning his Father’s property, and that the birthright, which he claimed, as given by a solemn act of his father to him, had no respect to things of a temporal nature, but to the exercise of the priesthood as the head of the true church of God, he (the messenger) acknowledged the force of his argument, admitted his right, and said ‘For thou rulest before God, and before man hast thou prevailed.’ See 28th verse.”

25th verse. “The hollow of Jacob’s thigh was out of joint.” This has been understood to mean that the hollow cup, or acetabulum, wherein the head of the femur or thigh bone is received, was actually put out of joint by the angel while they were wrestling. In order to show that no such circumstance is recorded by the sacred writer, we only need to examine the original Hebrew; for here all the translations are lamentably defective, and the best of all reasons which can be assigned for this discrepancy is, that the translators, immediately after the dispersion of the Jews, knew little of the Hebrew language; it was only in the hands of the Jews, as we learn from Jerome, who was assisted by a Jew in his revision of the earlier translations. The first Christian translation was made by Symmachus, and Jerome, 200 years after him, attempted to correct the old Latin translations of the Septuagint. As to the European translators, they have followed the translation of Jerome, and the Vulgate, and did not resort to the Hebrew; that the present translations are but copies; and that no translation has been made expressly from the Hebrew for nearly 1700 years.1

1 This translation was made in 1818.

“*The translators, having principally followed the erroneous translations of Jerome and the Vulgate, have introduced views which the Sacred Writer never had,—have opened the*
of infidelity, and have laid the foundation for endless controversy.

"The first words which require our attention are in the last part of the first proposition, "vayigang bekaph yereekeo", he touched the hollow of his thigh; but bekaph means the hand, and with beth prefixed, with, or in the hand. Ezek. xxi. 24; Judges vi. 13; Isaiah lxii. 3. The word Yereekeo, which is rendered his thigh, when having reference to the Divine command, to be fruitful and multiply, is to be translated as it is in Exodus i. 5, the loins, viz., 'and all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob'; and in Gen. xlix. 26, "which came out of his loins;" and when the vau, which is prefixed to yigang, is noticed, (which is not in the old translations,) the clause containing the first proposition reads, 'When he saw that he prevailed not against him, then he touched his loins with his hand.'

"The second proposition in the original vateekang kaph yereeke, is thus translated in the authorized version, 'and the hollow of the thigh was out of joint,' but there are no words in the Hebrew of this passage for 'out of joint.' These words mean clap the hand: see Psalms xlvi. 1, tikgnon kaph, clap your hands, Nah. iii. 19, the same words similarly translated. So in the passage under consideration it alludes to the custom of settling an agreement, by an oath to perform anything, which was done by clapping the hand on the loin. Gen. xlvii. 29, 'And Abraham said, put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh'; xxiv. 9, 'And the servant put his hand under the thigh (loin) of Abraham his lord, and swear to him concerning the matter.' The verse will then read agreeably to the intention of the sacred writer, thus: 'And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his loin, yea, he clapped the hand upon the loin of Jacob after he had contended with him.' That is, he took the customary oath to perform what Jacob requested, viz., to justify him, that a reconciliation might be accomplished between him and his brother; for, Jacob having explained himself to the satisfaction of the Judge, concerning his claim, viz., that his birthright was for the succession of the priesthood, and not for the property of his father, we find that all animosity ceased, and reciprocal acts of kindness were experienced between them."

In order to connect the sense the comments on 31st and 32d verses are introduced here, leaving the intermediate verses to follow afterward.
32d verse. "Old Translation, 'And he halted upon his thigh.' New Translation, 'And he reclined upon his border.' I have endeavored to understand this passage in the translations, but how Jacob could halt upon his thigh, is not in any way intelligible, therefore I think it cannot be the meaning of the sacred writer. The same word Yereeko, rendered his thigh, means also the side of anything which projects from the main body of the thing mentioned, the extremity immediately connected with the main body; therefore it is applied to mean the coast, side, or border of a country, as is seen in Judges xix. 18; Gen. xlix. 13 his border; 2 Kings xix. 28; Psalms xlviii. 2; Isaiah xiv. 15, xxxvii. 24; Jer. xxv. 32, xxxi. 8; Jonas i. 5; Ezek. xxxviii. 6. The above words, 'he halted upon his thigh,' are applied by the sacred writer to the coast, or border of the country of Esau, bounded by the stream Jab-bok, which he had passed over in the night, verse 22, and where he halted or rested with his company, gnal yereeko, upon his (Esau's) border, that he might not be surprised in case Esau was hostile. The 24th to the 31st verse then informs us, that when the messengers arrived, and Jacob had made his case plain before the judge, viz., the man with whom he contended, at sun rising he passed over Penniel with his company, being now assured by the judgment of the judge, that Esau, who was ruler of that country, would now be reconciled, and they proceeded on their journey to meet him. Thus it appears evident that Jacob did not wrestle with an immortal being sent down from heaven,—a thing altogether impossible—that the narrative in the original is perfectly consistent with reason, and that the sacred writer had no other design than that of showing how, by the explanation which Jacob gave before the judge, the primogeniture, or birthright, the sacred office of the priesthood for the appearance of Messiah in his line, was that which was confirmed on him by the blessing of his Father. The 31st verse then will read properly translated, 'Now the sun rose upon him and he reclined (or rested) upon his border.'

32d verse. "The reason given in the translation, why the children of Israel did not eat of the relaxing sinew of the animal was, 'because the angel touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh,' and it is a weak one. Nothing more inconsistent with the intention of the sacred writer could have been introduced. "There is no ground for their having so great a veneration for a being who maimed the patriarch by such an unwarrantable action as putting his thigh out of joint, that he might
overcome him when he began to find Jacob too strong for him; I say there could be no veneration for a person who did this injury, which could induce the children of Israel not to eat of that part of the animal. Neither is there good reason for withholding them from eating it on account of Jacob, who according to the ordinary translation was so hurt that he had to stop there until he recovered. Looking at it in any shape as it stands in the translations, it is unworthy a place in the Sacred Scriptures; and is not only inconsistent with the original, but is also contradictory to other parts of Sacred History.

"That something of a different nature to that which has hitherto been understood, is meant here, is plain. The reader will remark that in the received translation of the 25th verse it is said of the person who wrestled with Jacob, ‘and when he saw that he prevailed not against him,’ while in the 28th verse it is said of this same supposed angel from Heaven, that Jacob prevailed: ‘And he said, Thy name shall be no more Jacob but Israel, for as a prince hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed.’ Now those who are determined to abide by the common translators, must admit that here is a plain contradiction in the narrative; for if the angel prevailed against Jacob as it is said in the 25th verse, then Jacob could not have prevailed against the angel as is said in the 28th verse. As to the manner of administering an oath, it differs from anything of the kind in use among us, but it was the custom of the Eastern people at that day. And it may appear equally strange to the Eastern people to-day, that the nations of the West confirm the most solemn of oaths by kissing the Bible.

"Among these most ancient people as we have shown, it was the custom, when they took a solemn oath, to clap the hand on the thigh (loins); but unless we attend to the origin of the custom, (as some reason must be assigned for it,) we shall still be in the dark concerning the meaning, and the propriety of the application to Jacob, by the person with whom he contended, agreeably to the intention of the Sacred writer. The custom of clapping the hand on the thigh (loins) among this ancient people when they had engaged to fulfil a contract was to ratify the agreement by an oath, and to show that they considered an oath taken before God as the most sacred of all engagements, for otherwise they called God to witness to a lie. The origin of this custom does not appear to be understood in modern times. If it had no other significance than merely clapping the hand on the thigh, it might with equal
propriety be clapped upon any other part of the body. This ancient custom evidently had its origin in Genesis i. 25, 'And God said to Adam, be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth.'

"This command concerning the generations of man, was handed down by the first men as a most sacred command. It was religiously observed by the true worshippers of God, and when confined to that order which God established at the beginning, is calculated to insure the peace and happiness of public as well as domestic society. Therefore, whatever may be the opinion of modern Jews, the ancient Hebrews ate not of the sinew which shrank or the relaxing sinew, not because of some supposed hurt to Jacob when the angel wrestled with him, nor of the angel's touch, but, they ate not of the spermatic vessels and organs of generation, which having their origin in the loins, are there placed by the Almighty Wisdom for the preservation of the human race. Therefore, to impress on the mind of men the sacred obligation they were under, virtuously to obey this command because it was a Divine command, those great holy men, the ancient Hebrews, were instructed in all their solemn engagements to place their hand under the loin on this most sacred part of the body. This signifies to them that they would as faithfully fulfil their engagement, as the Divine command would be by them. This is not altogether new; the learned Rabbi Solomon Isaac in his commentary on Chapter xxiv. 2, respecting the oath which Abraham required of Eleazer says, 'He that taketh an oath, ought to put his hand on what has relation to a sacred command.'

28th verse. "'For as a prince thou hast power with God,' This is not the sense of the original; in which there is no authority for the words as, hast, power, it is indefinite; but the Hebrew informs us concerning the nature of the office filled by Jacob at that time, (the priesthood); for it does not follow that because a man is a prince, that he has power to prevail with God, which is evidently the meaning in the vulgar version.

"The word sarith, rendered prince, means a ruler. See Ezra x. 14, our rulers; Exodus xviii. 21; I Kings ix. 22, rulers. But a man may be a ruler, or a chief, and yet not a prince, which was the case. Gnism is rendered by with: it has this signification but not with this construction, as it does not give the sense of the original. It therefore requires the same rendering as in 1 Samuel ii. 21, 'And the child Samuel grew
Before the Lord.' The sacred writer informs us, that the person who contended with Jacob, referred to the office of Jacob who was the successor to the priesthood, the chief, or ruler in that department. The clause truly reads, 'For thou rulest Before God, and before man thou hast prevailed.'

30th verse. "'For I have seen God face to face.' This is in direct conflict with Exodus xxxiii. 20-23, 'Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me and live;' 'but my face shall not be seen.' Raaithi is rendered 'I have seen.' Whenever the word is connected with Elohim, God, as describing the Infinite and Incomprehensible Jehovah as having been seen by finite man, it is clearly an erroneous translation. The word means to converse, to respect, to reverence with awful respect, as in Job xx. 7, They who have seen (reverenced) him: for Job was a priest reverenced by the people, and Zophar applies the word to him: and in Isaiah xxvi. 10, 'and will not behold (i.e. revere) the majesty of Jehovah.' This gives us the true meaning. Jacob called the place Peniel, for there he had reverenced God face to face, i.e. in prayerful communion, and God had delivered his soul."

Thus ends the new translation of the chapter. Here we would add by way of explanation, that there appears now to have been no cause of hostility between the two. Jacob feared that Esau, being the oldest son, would by virtue thereof seek to deprive him of the primacy in the priesthood, conferred upon him by the blessing of his father; and remembering the deceit practised to procure it, he fears Esau's anger and vengeance. Esau on the other hand appears to have been influenced solely by the fear that Jacob came, (depending on his father's blessing for the authority) to claim the property of their father. Actuated by this fear he sends one of his judges or rulers to contend, or argue, or debate, or plead the case with Jacob; and Jacob halts upon the border of Esau's territory until he knows how he is to be received. The argument (contention of words) takes place, a mutual pledge is agreed upon, and that ratified by the most solemn oath of that day, by placing the hand under the thigh, and the messenger departs, and Jacob, relieved of his great anxiety, reverences God and gives Him the glory.
Now is this not all much more consistent with other Scripture and with God’s nature and works, than the idea of his sending an angel, a Heavenly being to hold a wrestling match (physical) with a mortal? And then (when the mortal prevailed over the immortal) for the messenger of the all loving, wise and powerful Jehovah, to put the mortal’s thigh out of joint, and leave him there to recover as best he could?

It does away too with the miracle which is required in the recovery of Jacob, who in so short a time was enabled to walk forward and bow himself seven times to the earth to meet Esau. With this rendering, every act is in accord with the customs of the times, with what seems a rational and natural feeling and action on the part of the two brothers; and in perfect accord with the rest of the narrative. It brings no reproach upon the nature or workings of Deity, and it leaves us with a satisfactory, reasonable explanation of a passage that has long been a stumbling block to the Christian, and a loop hole for attack to the infidel.

ARTICLE XXIII.

The Present Condition of Mahometanism.

The position which Islamism occupies in Persia, as presented in our last paper, is precisely the one towards which it tends in every part of its domains. In the orthodox countries, the movement is slower and more obscure but none the less constant. Even the revival serves as an indication of this fact. As we turn from the dominions of the Shah to those of the Sultan, we shall find the current of religious orthodoxy running with greater strength than it has done for many generations. But whither does it tend?

One movement alone—that going on among the Wahabees in Arabian Nejd—seems to be something like a revival of the primitive energies of Islam. In its aggressive spirit, its in-
tense horror of all sacerdotal superstitions, its vehement mono-
theism which looks with bitter hatred upon the faintest lean-
ing towards pantheistic speculations, we see the breathings of
the self-same spirit which inspired Mahomet and his early fol-
lowers. But this is a local movement and one fiercely anath-
ematised by the great body of the faithful. The Wahabees—
isolated from the sympathies of the orthodox and bitterly
hostile to the political organization of the Ottoman Empire—
form only a little beleaguered band of provincial heretics.
And yet if the "Revival" was a real rejuvenescence of the
old-time religion, these Puritans of the desert could not but
be recognized as its leaders and choicest spirits. But in fact,
the main movement has nothing in common with the local
one. Spreading over a far wider extent of country, it lacks
the moral depth of the latter. It has its origin in material,
not in spiritual causes—in things which lie upon the political
surface in the Empire of the Osmanlis, rather than in any
sudden bursting forth of a long dormant impulse, from the
depths of the past. These causes, or rather the chief of them,
we wish to describe.

Throughout the Ottoman empire, for the last thirty or forty
years, there have been going on very marked political changes,
rendered necessary, perhaps, by the altered relations of the
Turkish government to the rest of the world, but for all that,
very distasteful to a large portion of the people. The proud
Osmanli no longer stands facing all Christendom in an attitude
of grim defiance; nor even is he permitted—thanks to the
brazen-faced intrusiveness of this nineteenth century—to jog
along on his slow peaceful way, unnoticed by his Christian
neighbors. Involuntarily—whether for weal or woe, we say
not—he has been drawn into the vortex of European politics,
or at least circles, in painful uncertainty, about its outer edge.
This change of external relations has necessitated a radical
change within. Under such circumstances, it would be simply
suicidal for the Porte to rely upon such defences as the irregu-
lar hosts, raised, equipped and officered after the feudal style,
that once thundered about the gates of Vienna. The first es-
sential of intercourse with Christendom, upon any thing like fair terms, is a standing army. With his standing army, the Turk has gained its inevitable concomitants, centralization of power, annual conscriptions, new forms of taxation, an immense civil service and all the minor evils of bureaucracy. With these have come other changes, brought about by the spirit of "reform" that has been rife, of late years, at Constantinople. Chief among these, is the loss of power and wealth which has overtaken the provincial nobility. The Beg, who once possessed the immunities and privileges of a feudal baron, — who was practically a sovereign over his own domain, owing hardly any obligation to the power at Stambool except to follow the green banner, in time of war, with his body of retainers — now finds himself dispossessed of all his ancient rights. He is a nobleman, now, only by courtesy; his feudal powers were all taken away in the process of centralization; even his lands were resumed by the government and sold off to the first buyers; and in compensation for all these losses, some beggarly pittance was granted him which, long since, was lost or squandered. To make the matter still worse, by some freak on the part of the central power, the old nobility are systematically excluded from any share in the government. On the muster-rolls of the Civil Service, one very rarely finds the name of a Beg. "With exceptions far too few to be of any weight," we quote from Palgrave, "the officials of the government are all men of yesterday, raised by favour, by money, by intrigue, by what you will (birth and hereditary estate excepted) to their present position. The son of a grandvizier or of a musheer-pasha, who was himself, perhaps, the son of a house-servant or a coffee-slop-keeper, is a very Stanley or Vere de Vere among them." And while democracy lords it thus grandly at the capital, the Beg dispossessed of his power and his estates, lives a surly poverty-stricken existence amid the ruins of his former grandeur.

Strangely too,—at least, according to our Western notions,—the peasantry share the discontent of their ancient lords. Too stupid to feel any democratic glow over their emancipation.
from serfage, they see only that their material condition has been made worse by the change. The annual conscription, and, above all, the constantly increasing burdens of taxation imposed by a spendthrift government, make the new yoke seem far heavier than the old. In place of the one piastre which they formerly paid to a resident lord who spent among them what he received from them, the peasants now pay ten to an official clique in the distant capital and receive not a single benefit in return. And so the people are as thoroughly dissatisfied as their ancient masters. The whole rural population, high and low, is in a state of discontent that would be rebellion in any land where submission was not, at once, the watchword of religion and the ruling impulse of the people.

And it is among these rural malcontents, that the Mahometan revival has its chief stronghold. Dissatisfied with the present, they look upon Islam as the chief figure in a golden past. Islam is the magic word that recalls the “good old times,” when taxes were almost unheard of and when the victorious Crescent needed no army of conscripts for its defence. And the clique of office-holders, the upstart rulers of the present day, are regarded as nothing less than traitors to the old religion — men who have sold themselves, body and soul to the Christians, or at least, men so utterly lost to the old instincts of Islanmité pride, as to ape the fashions and the follies of the Infidel. Thus the discontented Beys and peasants have become the chosen champions of Islam,—fierce in their zeal for the Koran and its precepts, for the five daily prayers, for Ramadam, for the pilgrimage to Mecca, for the Unity of God, for every rite and formula of a faith which, in their minds, is inseparably linked with the deeply regretted past. In a word, the strongholds of political discontent have become the citadels of religious orthodoxy. It is an outburst of Toryism rather than of religious feeling, which just now is fanning the smouldering Mahometan fires into a blaze.

The revival has now spread from the rural districts to the cities and its power is felt, more or less keenly, by all classes in the Ottoman Empire, excepting the office-holders. But
everywhere the movement bears the character we have described. It is a protest of the conservative spirit against new tendencies, against the strange methods of taxation and the policy of centralization introduced by the Government. Zeal for Islam means zeal for an established religion whose traditions are closely associated with the recollections of national glory and which now seems to stand as the sole bulwark against the new ideas and influences that are flooding the empire. And thus Mahometanism is slowly coming to be for the orthodox Turks what it is for the heretical Persians—a religion whose strength lies in its political and patriotic relations, rather than in the power which its original ideas maintain over the popular life. In fact, when one passes from the glow of politico-religious feeling, to ideas, he finds the whole current setting in opposition to the first principles of Mahomet. Of this there are many indications; but here we can only mention two.

First of all, there are the dervishes. Plainly enough the existence of this large body of monkish ascetics is entirely opposed to the spirit of the primitive religion. These preposterous devotees, with their pantheistic superstitions, their affected poverty, their absurd austerities, their charms and emulets, are the ideal embodiment of that monkery which the Prophet strove to banish from Islam. And yet the dervishes are the main support of the "Revival." Comparatively unheeded in the towns, they are the chief sources of spiritual influence in the country, where, as we have seen, the glow of Mahometan zeal is at its fiercest. They are, almost universally, the guardians of those innumerable tombs of the saints, which form the foci of rustic fanaticism. Their charms and amulets are eagerly sought for; their mad antics are looked upon as supernatural attestations of the true faith. Surely, these half-naked ascetics, these revellers in the lowest depths of theosophic superstition, are strange beings to be the leaders in a movement for the revival of the severe Monotheism of Mahomet.

The popular literature, also, serves to indicate the peculiar
drift of the religious current now running so fiercely through the Levant. Here, for instance are some lines—for the translation of which we are indebted to Palgrave—from a lyric of Ebu-Faird's, the most popular of Mahometan didactic poets:

"In One the All contemplates me, and I that am contemplated am the All.
And contemplating I behold it to be myself, and in my light is light and bliss.
In me the moon wanes not, and the sun never sets.
And in me center all the starry mazes in merrying order.
Mine is all Fact and all Energy of whatever lives and is;
I am the ordainer and the ordinance of effect in all space and time.
And were it not for the screen of Existence, the splendor of my Essence
Had consumed and annihilated the appearances of its own manifestations."

Such utterances have the true ring of Hindoo pantheism: one would not be surprised to find them in the Bhagavad-Gita itself. Found where they are, they serve to show how thoroughly Islamite monotheism has been mastered by opposing tendencies, not peculiar to India, but everywhere dominant in Oriental thought. For, these utterances, let it be remembered, fall under no ban of heresy; on the contrary, they accord with all that is characteristic in the orthodoxy of the Ottoman Empire in the present day. There seems a wide difference between the strict monotheism of the Koran and the pantheism of the Indian Puranas, but in some way, modern Mahometan theology has managed to bridge the chasm.

"But of what importance," queries some practical spirit, "are these proofs of Islamite degeneracy in matters of faith? Is it not the tendency of all religions to drift away from their primitive convictions and impulses? Are the doctrines of Father Newman or of the Evangelical Alliance, absolutely identical with the teachings of the Galilean and his apostles? Does the superstitious polytheism of the modern Buddhist precisely correspond with the skeptical and almost atheistic system of Sakyamuni?" Without pretending to answer all these questions, we still insist that it is of great importance to understand what this wide-spread and growing Mahometan revival means. If it means a revival of the primitive energies of Islam,—a new outburst of the monotheistic zeal, the fierce hatred of monkery; the contempt for theosophic dreams and priestly superstitions which animated Mahomet and his first fol-
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lowers—that is one thing, of no trifling importance, assuredly. But if it is, for the most part, a merely political movement, if it means simply conservative zeal for the old established religion—
a zeal which clings to the formalities of the ancient faith while drifting farther and farther away from its primitive spirit—that is quite another thing. In the latter case, the revival however permanent and successful, would be an event of no deep significance for the future of the East. Mahometanism would be strengthened in its position; but that position would be compatible with almost every revolution that might take place in the social and intellectual life of its people. It would be a religion established as an institution of state, strengthened by the patriotic sentiment and the conservative instincts of the people; but at the same time, a religion whose dogmas have so utterly lost their original force, have become so vague and indefinite, as to permit of almost every variety of opinion within its pale. Already this result is partially attained. Already the wildest Magian and Hindoo heresies, the ones most thoroughly opposed to the primitive spirit of Islam, have gained undisputed shelter within its most orthodox communion. It is equally easy for a new influx of ideas from the West to find lodgment beneath the same vague indefinite system of faith. Sooner or later, the forces of modern civilization must take possession of the Islamite world. Either by the free consent of the people or by Russian conquest, the most sweeping reforms will be introduced and the whole face of Western Asia be changed: and yet Mahometanism may still remain the established religion,—a filmy expansive reach of religious sentiment stretching over the new order of things as it has done over the old.

We had intended to dwell somewhat minutely upon the condition of Mahometanism in India. But having already consumed so much space, we are forced to content ourselves with two leading thoughts.

Nowhere has Mahometanism yielded so much to extra-Islamite superstition as in India. This might naturally be expected: for here it is brought face to face and dwells in con-
stant contact with the most perfectly developed system of theosophic and sacerdotal superstition that the world has ever seen. And still one can hardly repress a feeling of surprise at some features of this degeneracy. The Indo-Mahometans, for instance, are not content with saint worship—a practice to which even their brethren in the orthodox Levant are addicted; they consent to worship the saints of the Hindoo calendar! Very often they are found participating in the public festivals of the Brahminic religion: and their own fêtes are surcharged with pagan ceremonies drawn from the idolatrous ritual of their neighbors. More than that, it is no uncommon sight to see Mussulmen, all ardor in their enthusiasm for Islam, bowing down and offering oblations to Hindoo idols. In a word, "the Faithful" beyond the Indus have surrendered almost everything of their religion except its letter.

Secondly, the Mahometan "revival" in India has precisely the same characteristics as in Persia or the Ottoman Empire. It is, essentially, a political, not a religious movement. It has its main-spring in the profound discontent, just now felt by all classes, Mahometan or otherwise, over certain hardships or wrongs of British rule. Chief among these causes of discontent is the legal question, that most troublesome problem of Indian policy and one altogether too intricate to be more than briefly mentioned here. Suffice it, that this and cognate troubles form the smouldering fires from which the heat of the revival radiates. Once the proud rulers of the land, now subjects of an infidel power,—smarting under the thought of their losses and their wrongs—the Mussulmans turn to their religion as the one precious thing left them amid the wreck of their fortunes. Their numbers are being constantly increased by recruits drawn from the ranks of Brahmanism: for, the latter faith is too yielding, too apathetic, too much depressed by centuries of Buddhist, Mahometan and Christian domination to form a rallying-point for the present resistance; and therefore there is a constant tendency to desert its standards for those of its sturdier and more militant rival. Thus Islam

1 Garcin de Tassy. *De la Religion Musulmane dans l’Inde.* 8, 21, 22.
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grows in zeal and in numbers. The Koran, more and more, is becoming the favorite text-book of political dissent in India; the mosques are the chief centres of "the opposition." And this opposition, in our opinion, is a healthy and righteous one; it contains no real menace to the British Empire or to that modern civilization which is beginning to make itself so benefici-ently felt in the land of the Vedas. Let the Christian rulers of India practice the precepts of their own religion, let them do judgment and justice to all, and they will have no reason to doubt the loyalty and good sense of their Islamite subjects. Even amid the sudden madness of the Sepoy Rebellion, the Mahometan soldiery, outside of the panic-stricken district, proved that their sense of honor and fair dealing was superior to their religious fanaticism. Once convinced that the rebellion was founded upon a misunderstanding, they became— as Major General Macleod, in his frank and soldierly book, has shown— the staunchest defenders of the Government: "many a brave Sepoy of the South laid down his life in crushing the mistaken zeal and fury of his brethren in the North, and thousands who had not the opportunity afforded them of evincing such loyalty, were ready to follow their example." And universally, if Christianity in India proves itself to be what it claims to be everywhere, the zeal of Islam will do it no real harm. Nothing is more desirable in a state, than vigorous, intrepid and yet loyal opposition to the ruling power; and the Mahometan revival need amount to nothing more than that, to the Christian rulers of India.

And so ends our survey of the present condition of Mahometanism. We have had proofs enough that the great "Revival" is no myth; its footsteps are too plainly visible in Bokhara, in Persia, India, the Ottoman Empire— everywhere throughout the Islamite world. And yet this fact need give no uneasiness to those who are eager for the advance of European ideas and influences throughout the East. For, the Mahometanism of the present day is too vague and indefinite a system of faith to seriously interfere with so irresistible a movement as that of modern civilization. Within its present do-
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 mains, it will in all probability, remain the established religion; its easy service and its calm tolerance of every variety of opinion, make its position a very secure one. But it will remain only as a sort of religious firmament overarching with vague dogma and cloudy superstition, that busy life of reform and progress which, sooner or later, must take possession of the East.

---------------------

ARTICLE XXIV.

Nirvana.

Le Bouddha et sa Religion; par I. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire.
Du Nirvana Bouddhique, en réponse A. M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire; par I. B. F. Obry.
Oriental Religions, and their Relation to Universal Religion; by Samuel Johnson: India.

In the Quarterly for July, 1874, we expressed the conviction that the attainment of Nirvana, according to the system of S'ha'kyamuni, was the attainment of a personal and absolute immortality. This conviction was not derived from "a year's study of a hand-book," nor from superficial gropings in public libraries, but from a critical examination of recognized authorities, and psycho-historical studies of the nature and development of the human soul. A year's further research has only served to confirm and deepen the conviction then expressed. We have found no reason that leads us to believe that one third — three hundred and fifty or four hundred millions — of the human race are both atheists and annihilationists; that the asserted intuition of the soul, which forecasts immortality, is a myth. On the contrary, we have found much to sustain the opinion, entertained by the ablest thinkers and scholars, that belief in a future state and personal immortality has always been, and is to-day, the common property of mankind.

The unanimity of opinion upon this point, among those whose intellectual and scholastic attainments are entitled to our re-
garden, is truly surprising. Theodore Parker, an accomplished scholar and critic, in his first published work predicates belief in God, and in immortality, on the basis of a universal intuition. "The doctrine," he says, "that man lives forever seems as general as belief in God. Like that it comes naturally from an eternal desire in the heart. In the rudest nations and the most civilized, this doctrine appears. . . It seems we have by nature a sentiment of immortality; an instinctive belief therein. Rude nations, in whom this instinct seems to predominate, trust the spontaneous belief. . . It may be considered as pretty well fixed, that all nations of the earth believe this doctrine; at least, the exceptions are so rare, that they only confirm the rule."  

Ten years later, and Mr. Parker's opinions had undergone no change. In a powerful sermon on "Immortal Life," he said: "The doctrine of eternal life is always popular. If you were to poll the world to-day and get the eyes and noes of all mankind, nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand would give their vote for immortality. Yet few have ever reasoned about it much, and demonstrated their immortality. Most men think they take it on trust from the mouth of their priest, or from revelation. But it is not so; we do not take it on trust from man. Like what else comes from the primitive instincts of the human heart, we take it on trust from the Father; from no less authority."  

"The rudest and the most polished; the simplest and the most learned," says Alger, "unite in the expectation—i. e., of immortality—and cling to it through everything."  

Morell classes belief in God and immortality among the fixed instincts of the soul. Referring to the death of Wieland, the great Goethe,—himself adjudged a skeptic—said: "The destruction of such high powers is something which can never, and under no circumstances, even come into question." It would seem, indeed, beyond dispute, that human nature, say-
age or civilized, revolts at annihilation, and instinctively rejects it as false. Deniers of the Bible are numerous enough; deniers of immortality are few. Even Saint-Hilaire, after having made out, apparently to his great satisfaction, that Buddhists are both atheists and annihilationists, is forced to exclaim: "It is a hideous system we confess!" "It is hard to kick against the pricks." Belief in immortality is destiny. Who can withstand it? Only here and there an unfortunate whose moral and intellectual equipment is minus the spiritual faculty.

It is not, therefore, to be believed that one third of the human race reject, instinctively, the doctrine of a future life. All history is against it. Common sense is against it. We are more or less conscious of immortality; and that fact is against it. Nor is it to be believed that belief in annihilation, on a scale so large as that alleged, has been reached through the agency of education, or of hereditary descent. To a certain extent education "forms the common mind"; but education has never overcome, much less eradicated, instinct and consciousness. Of this fact the history of the doctrine of endless misery affords a striking illustration. Educated in belief of it, saturated with it for centuries, and yet the popular mind revolts at it to-day. It has been imposed upon the people, but it cannot be forced into the people. The people draw nigh unto it with their lips, but their hearts are far from it. So the popular mind, the world over, revolts at atheism and annihilation. So strong is the sense of revolt and of repugnance in the mind of Saint-Hilaire, he is quite unable to conceal it. Throughout his life of Bouddha it breaks out in such exclamations as, — "deplorable abysses of atheism," etc.; and at every stage of his argument he seems aware that he is "kicking against the pricks." Near the close of the chapter in which he discusses Nirvana, he draws back from the result that he has striven to attain, and exclaims: "It is a horrible faith without doubt!" So men argue for the doctrine of endless misery, feeling all the while an instinctive repugnance to
it; and in the sequel, horrified with the result, they turn away exclaiming, “It is a horrible faith without doubt!”

It does not seem to have occurred to Saint-Hilaire that, the three hundred and fifty millions of people, whom he charges with belief in Atheism and annihilation, are men like himself; possessed of similar instincts, feelings, and affections; cheered by similar hopes and aspirations. Among them are many fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters; and we know, by experience, how deathless is love, how enduring is affection. Death cannot extinguish them; they are superior to both accident and change. Shall we deliberately separate and set aside one third of the human race, and then say, of all those souls, that they have neither deathless affection nor enduring love? that they are devoid of all the finer instincts and feelings which a good God has so graciously accorded to the remaining two thirds? Or shall we say that two thirds of our race are mocked, misled, and deceived by instincts and aspirations that lead to nothing, and take hold on nothing? The absurdity in either case is manifest.

But granted that three hundred and fifty millions of people believe in annihilation; is not then the question a fair one: From whom did they derive such belief? From Buddha? But is there a parallel instance in history where, for a period of two thousand five hundred years, belief in annihilation has been transmitted from parent to child, unimpaired and in full vigor, through all that long line of generations? For a few years, a man like Buddha might impress a really abhorrent dogma on a limited number of people; but it is safe to say that it would be certain to lose its hold and disappear before the expiration of a century. Sects live; but dogmas change and perish. The Buddhist sect might survive for centuries; but Buddhist dogmas, abhorrent to the popular heart, would be certain to change, and ultimately disappear. Freedom may be transmitted from sire to son; because freedom has a basis in the human soul. Has the doctrine of annihilation such a basis? Then should it be universal: the rule and
not the exception. But the truth, historically, is precisely the reverse.

The difficulty becomes still more formidable when we reflect on the practices of Buddhists in order to attain to Nirvana. Tortures, often of the most frightful character, penances, and manifold mortifications are believed to be indispensable to the soul's purification, and a necessary means to the attainment of what — annihilation? M. Obry thoroughly appreciates the absurdity here, when he imagines Buddha to have said: "My dear disciples, the fates condemn you to an eternal roule in the circle of transmigrations, which you dread. Very well; I will deliver you; but, this will be your annihilation. And what is more, you will obtain this exemption on one condition: that you practice all your life the virtues, the penances, the mortifications which I recommend!" Continues Mr. Obry, "The Buddhists of the Asiatic world compose to-day a third of humanity. Do they adore nothing? — aspire to nothing? — and place in nothing their hopes against the evils of life? Is this the doctrine they received from their masters twenty centuries ago, and which they justify by the subtleties of metaphysics the most refined, and confess in tortures the most frightful, and in austerities, homicides, and a blind fanaticism? Is Buddhism a spiritualism without a soul, a virtue without duty, a moral without liberty, a charity without love, a world without nature and without God?"6 We need not enlarge. The position of the nihilists is thus easily reduced to an absurdity. On the general grounds of historical development, consciousness, and reason, the argument is, likewise, unanswerable. In the face of all this the nihilist can sustain his position only by textual proofs of the most unquestionable and conclusive character. Let us next inquire, are there such proofs?

Before entering upon this part of our subject, in order to properly prepare the reader to pronounce upon the evidence presented, it seems to be necessary to briefly photograph the parties engaged in this discussion. The nihilistic side is rep-

6 Nirvana Bouddhique.
resented by German and French scholars of the highest repute; but, evidently, more or less in sympathy with nihilism. Christian missionaries, with few exceptions, pronounce squarely for nihilism. To blacken Buddhists with the charge of being atheists and annihilationists, may have seemed to them the easiest and most effective method of putting Buddhism down and getting rid of it. "It appears," says Müller, "that certain people had only permitted themselves to be liberal in their praise of Buddha and Buddhism, because they could in the end, condemn a religion which, in spite of all its merits, culminated in Atheism and Nihilism." Thus we are told by Bishop Bigandet "that no philosophico-religious system has ever upheld to an equal degree the notion of a Saviour and deliverer, and the necessity of his mission for procuring the salvation of men, in a Buddhist sense. . . But by a deplorable and inexplicable eccentricity, the pretended saviour, after having taught man the way to deliver himself from the tyranny of his passions, leads him, after all, into the bottomless gulf of total annihilation!" Here, too, may be included those more recent writers — some of them, at least, of pronounced skeptical tendencies — who have read much, thought little, and weighed less; in a word, superficial persons, easily blinded and led astray by the beautiful periods and the intensity of such writers as Saint-Hilaire. The non-nihilistic party is represented by French, German, and English scholars of repute equal to that of their antagonists. It is enough to name Colebrook, Stanislaus Julien, and Max Müller. M. Obry, indeed, classes Müller with the annihilation party; but since M. Obry wrote his Nirvana Bouddhique, Müller has gone stoutly over to the other side. It seems that he revolted at the idea of a self-imposed, or instinctive nihilism, and felt compelled to acknowledge that, to the extent charged, it is not in harmony with human nature, nor with the Buddhistic text. Colebrook and his confréres seem not to have been biased by an antecedent prejudice towards either side. Obry was a pupil of Burnouf, but he has not hesitated to take sides against his master. Such, in brief, are the parties in this
famous dispute. We are now prepared to investigate the proofs. We will begin with the word Nirvana.

Colebrook—who most scholars style "the giant of Sanscrit literature," "the illustrious Colebrook"—says that "most Indian sects propose, as the grand object of attainment, a final happy state from which there is no return. All concur in assigning to its attainment the same term, with some shades of difference in the interpretation, viz., mūcita, or mūcika. Many other terms are also in use as synonymous with it; such as amrita, immortality; apovarga, conclusion, or abandonment; s'réyas, excellence; niha'sréyasā, assured perfection; caivalya, singleness; nisarana, exit, departure. But the word that the Buddhists most affect is Nirvana. In its ordinary acceptation it is an adjective. Its etymology is from va, to blow as wind, with the proposition nir used in a negative sense. It means calm and unruffled, perfect apathy—a condition of unmixed tranquil happiness or ecstacy. Johnson, referring to Burnouf's Sanscrit Dictionary, says, "etymology fails to bear out the confident assurances of Burnouf, Kœpen, Weber, and others, that its 'extinction of the lamp of existence' means absolute annihilation. Nirvana is from nir, separation from, and va, wind. The simplest and most natural meaning seems to be, not 'blown out,' but 'no more wavering,' as from presence of wind; no more restlessness and change." Saint-Hilaire gives a similar definition of the word, and appends, what we cannot but regard as a singular illustration, in view of the fact of his strongly pronounced nihilism. He says that Nirvana "is composed of nir, which expresses negation, and the radical va, which signifies to blow. Nirvana is extinction; that is to say, the state of a thing that no more is extinguished or blown beyond. The comparison is frequent in Buddhist books of a lamp extinguished and no more to be re-illumined;" but he explicitly says that "this comparison rests on the surface of things, and although a sufficient repre-
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8 Oriental Religions. While dissenting from certain of Mr. Johnson's conclusions, we would cordially recommend his book to students as the best we know on this subject in the English language.
sensation of death, it says nothing of the state that follows, according to the system of S’hâkyamuni.”

So far then as the etymology of the word is concerned, it yields nothing that can be construed as decisive of nihilism; on the contrary, it seems to assert the attainment of a state where, delivered from the body, “there shall be no more death,” no more return to this material state and its belongings, and where the most perfect liberty shall be enjoyed. Buddhist devotees, accordingly, seek Nirvana as “the further shore;” “the port beyond the ocean;” “the medicine that cures all diseases;” “the water that quenches all thirst;” “complete fruition and salvation;” “the city reached by the path of universal knowledge, blessedness, and peace.” Figurative as these expressions are, Nirvana thus defined “has allured the affections, aroused the moral sense, stimulated to an incessant watch over the passions; planted, builded, and civilized, in missions that are miracles of zeal and toil.”

But, notwithstanding the etymology of the word yields nothing, necessarily, to support the notion of annihilation, the metaphor of a lamp extinguished, and no more to be re-illumined — very common in the writings of Buddhists — has, undoubtedly, helped to strengthen, and finally confirm, in certain instances, the nihilistic interpretation. The illustration with which Saint-Hilaire follows his definition of the word, is an instance in point. We have no doubt that, in order of time, the illustration was father of the definition. Here it is: “When Buddha died at Koucinagara, his cousin Anourouddha, who with Ananda accompanied him, pronounced this stanza, celebrated in tradition: ‘With a spirit that quailed not, he suffered the agonies of death; like the extinction of a lamp, he thus attained the enfranchisement of his intelligence.’”

We imagine it would be difficult to point out the precise support this illustration yields to the nihilistic theory; on the contrary it looks very like the Christian doctrine of death and immortality. It is the human Buddha that is extinguished like a lamp, but his intelligent part, his spirit attains libera-

---
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tion — is "liberated from the bondage of corruption," and attains a "glorious liberty;" in other words, enters Nirvana. In the Parinirvana Sutra a man in old age is compared to a lamp which gives light so long as the oil lasts, but when that is gone he falls into decay. That the extinguishment of the lamp applies only to the death of the animal body, we feel certain. In this Sutra, Nirvana is spoken of as having four characteristics, viz.: permanence, purity, joy, and personality. Sena inquires of Buddha what he meant by speaking of Nirvana as permanent, full of joy, personal, and pure. Buddha said: "Illustrious youth, I do not say that the six external and internal organs, or the various species of knowledge, are permanent; but what I say is that that is permanent, full of joy, personal and pure, which is left after the six organs, and the six objects of sense, and the various kinds of knowledge are all destroyed. Illustrious youth, when the world, weary of sorrow, turns away and separates itself from the cause of all this sorrow, then, by this voluntary rejection of it, there remains that which I call the true self; and it is of this I plainly declare the formula, that it is full of joy, personal and pure!" 11 Buddha may, or may not have spoken these words — that is not in question — but it is certain that millions of Buddhists receive them implicitly as the words of Buddha, 12 and therefore as authoritative inspiration. This fact is conclusive as to the interpretation the mass of Buddhists put upon Nirvana.

It is singular that Saint-Hilaire should plead, in the face of testimony so explicit, and a multiplicity of facts equally conclusive, that Buddha left his idea of Nirvana in almost complete obscurity. He affirms that one cannot cite a single Soutra in which it is definitely defined. 13 But would not this assertion, even if strictly true, hold equally with respect to our Christian word, Heaven? Is it anywhere said in the Bible that heaven is not final annihilation? — that it is the continuation of personal being eternally? Did Christ any where define the future life in precise and definite terms with

respect to duration? Is it said that the word *immortality* is frequently, in the Bible, applied to the future state of the soul, and to the future life? True; but it will appear in the sequel that the same word is often, in Buddhist's books, applied to Nirvana. We do not hesitate to affirm that, taking the two records, and resting the proof upon special texts, the soul's immortal personality cannot be more clearly and positively made out from the Christian than from the Buddhist. Max Müller put this point very forcibly in his Introduction to the *Dhammapada*: "If Buddha had said, like St. Paul, that 'what no eye had seen, nor ear heard, neither has it entered into the heart of man to conceive,' was prepared in Nirvana for those who had advanced to the highest degree of spiritual perfection, such expressions would have been quite sufficient to serve as proof to the philosophers, by profession, that this Nirvana could be nothing more nor less than Nothing!" Such nihilists as Saint-Hilaire may properly enough stand for this portrait. The "philosophers by profession" seem to be simply an illustration of unbelief blindly groping about seeking countenance and support.

It must not, however, be assumed that the position of the nihilist party is wholly without color of proof. Such an allegation would not be becoming, to say the least, when urged against such scholars as Burnouf, Lassen, Saint-Hilaire, etc. This, nevertheless, may be safely said; that very learned men have not always been remarkable for strong reason and sound judgment. The conclusions of the profound scholar cannot always be safely accepted upon the ground of profound scholarship. The followers of Buddha, like those of Christ, are divided. The common people hold one view of Nirvana, and the philosophers another. It is not singular that nominal Christian philosophers, misled by sympathy, should fraternize with Buddhist philosophers, and receive as accepted dogma the dictum of a single school. In our opinion the nihilists have been thus misled. It is not necessary to impeach their scholarship that we may account for their conclusions. They have based their opinions chiefly on the so-called Abhidharma,
which defines Nirvana as state of absolute annihilation. The Abhidharma is one of the three divisions of the Buddhist canon; but does not, as a whole, belong to the primitive period of Buddhism. Burnouf bases his charge of nihilism on the Abhidharma; but he candidly admits that it does not appear in the first and second parts, in the Sutras, the sermons, the Vinaya, the ethics, which together bear the name of Dharma, or Law. To these two limitations Müller adds a third, viz.: "I maintain that sayings of Buddha occur in the Dharmapada which are in open contradiction to this Buddhist nihilism." The metaphysical school, like most metaphysical schools, whether in China or Thibet, in Ceylon, or elsewhere, is simply destructive. It denies the very idea of individuality; denies the existence of a separate ego, a self, and consistently, therefore, sees the highest boon of mankind in the total annihilation of all forms of existence. It also deals destructively with all historical facts, and with every positive dogma. To this school, all is māya, or illusion. Like seekers; philosopher fraternizes with philosopher; sceptic coalesces with sceptic. But would it be just to explain the Christian sense of Heaven — the sense entertained by the great majority of Christians — by an appeal to Positivists, Rationalists, Sceptics? No more is it just to predicate a statement of Nirvana, as understood by the common people, upon the speculations of the metaphysists of Buddhism. If a definition of Christianity were demanded, we would hardly cite the inquirer to Compt, Huxley, Tyndall, or Ralph Waldo Emerson. Whether the Heaven of Christians, or the Nirvana of Buddhists, the force, the true meaning of the word, must be gathered from general consent. Says Beal, in his Catena of Buddhist Scriptures — a work, by the way, of great value — "and so we find that there is a general consent respecting the Nirvana of the Buddhists in their own works, viz., that it signifies a condition of rest and peace." Max Müller has recently expressed a similar opinion. "The popular view of

---

Nirvana — as representing the entrance of the soul into rest; a subduing of all wishes and desires; indifference to joy and pain, to good and evil, etc., — was, in my opinion, the conception of Buddha and his disciples. 18 Henry Alabaster, for many years resident in Siam, says the Siamese always refer to Nirvana as a "place of comfort, where there is no care. Lovely is the glorious realm of Nirvana." They describe it as the "jewelled realm of happiness; the immortal Nirvana." 19 There can, indeed, be no sort of question as to how Nirvana is regarded by the great majority of Buddhist people.

Let us now turn to the proofs that justify this popular conception of Nirvana. We shall speedily see by what sort of evidence the anti-nihilistic party is sustained. Regarding, as we do, Max Müller as among the first and most candid of authorities upon the subject, we will begin with extracts from his translation of the Dhammapada, to which he so confidently refers. The Dhammapada is supposed to be the oldest record of Buddhist faith. It is believed to contain the utterances of Buddha himself; at least what was believed by the members of the council under Asoka, 246 B. C., to have been the utterances of the founder of their religion. We can hardly ever expect, says Müller, to get nearer to Buddha himself and to his personal teachings. 20 This oldest and best of witnesses proves that, to the ancient Buddhists, Nirvana was deliverance from every earthly besetment of evil; was personal elevation and blessedness; perpetual ecstasy and immortality:

18 As soon as he has considered the origin and destruction of the elements of the body, he finds happiness and joy which belong to those who know the immortal (Nirvana).
19 He who knows his former abodes, who seeks heaven and hell, has reached the end of births. (Nirvana) is perfect in knowledge and a sage.
20 Reflection is the path to immortality, thoughtlessness the path of death.
21 The virtuous man is happy in this world, and he is happy in the next; he is happy in both.
22 Those wise people, meditative and steady, always possessed of strong powers, attain to Nirvana, the highest happiness.
23 He who lives a hundred years, not seeing the immortal place, a life of one day is better if a man sees the immortal place.
24 Evil doers go to hell; righteous people go to heaven; those who are free from all worldly desires enter Nirvana.
25 He who for his own sake does not punish or kill beings longing for happiness, will find happiness after death.
26 If, like a trumpet trampled under foot, thou utter not, thou hast reached Nirvana.
27 The virtuous live happily in this world and in the next.

18 Introduction to Dhammapada.
19 Wheel of the Law.
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"Patience is the highest Nirvana; this is the word of the Buddhas."

"Hunger is the worst disease; embodiment the greatest pain; to know this is Nirvana, the highest joy."

"The sages who injure nobody, and who always control their body, they will go to the unchangeable place, (Nirvana), where if they have gone, they will suffer no more."

"For on these trained animals does no man reach the untrodden country (Nirvana), where a tamed man goes on a tamed animal, namely on his own tamed self."

"He who has given up pleasure and pain, who is without ground for new birth (that is, by faith, or in reality has entered Nirvana) who has overcome all worlds, him I call a Brahmana."

"He who has no interests, and when he has understood (the truth) does not say How, how?—he who can dive into the Immortal, him I call indeed a Brahmana." 21

The language here used is not only inconsistent with the notion of annihilation, but it is certain that no ingenuity can reconcile it with that notion. It asserts that men live after death; that the good and pure live happily; that they, at least, are immortal. This is Nirvana! Judge this language as we judge language in our own Scriptures, and the conclusion is unavoidable.

In the Mahabharata is a story of a sage named Mudgala, who lived a life of poverty, self-restraint, and piety. After many severe trials, which he bore with the greatest fortitude, a messenger of the gods arrived in a celestial car, and called upon him to ascend to a state of complete perfection. The sage, however, prudently desired first to learn the advantages and drawbacks of the heavenly state. On learning that the drawbacks were decidedly serious, and by no means counterbalanced by advantages, he declared he would have nothing to do with a state of happiness which is vitiated by so great defects. He then asks the celestial messenger what other sphere there is which is free from defects. The messenger replies that there is such a sphere; but that those only attain it whose senses are under restraint, and who fix their minds on deity. The sage then dismisses the messenger of the gods, and begins the practice of the ascetic virtues; becoming indifferent to praise or blame, regarding cloths, stones, and gold alike. Pure knowledge led to fixed contemplation; that again imparted strength and complete comprehension, whereby he attained supreme eternal perfection, in the nature of quietude (Nirvana). 22

Here, indubitably, the use of the word is inconsistent with any other sense than that of personal, continued,—"eternal"—being.

21 Dhammapada. 22 Muir's Sanscrit Texts. Vol. V.
M. Obry cites the Hindu translator of the *Lalita Vistara*, as saying, in his preface to that work, that Nirvana is equivalent to eternal felicity, and that, positively, it implies nothing of annihilation.\textsuperscript{23}

The *Buddha-Bhagavat* mentions several Nirvanas; that is to say, several stages or degrees of happiness proportioned to the several degrees of intelligence, virtue, and perfection: the Nirvana simple, or inferior, for the *Cavrakas*, or hearers; the Nirvana complete for the *Pratyeka-Bouddhas*, or Buddhhas who are occupied with their salvation; the grand Nirvana complete for Buddhhas who constantly labor for the salvation of others. One is reminded of the words of the Master: “In my Father’s house are many mansions.” \textsuperscript{24}

Hsiouen-Thsang, a Chinese traveller in India in the 7th century, cites a Buddhist legend to the effect, that when Buddha had ceased converting men, “he plunged into the joys of Nirvana.” \textsuperscript{26}

In the Pali sacred books it is said “The King of Ságal said to Nágaséna, ‘Is the joy of Nirvana unmixed, or is it associated with sorrow?’ The priest replied that it is unmixed satisfaction, entirely free from sorrow.”

In the *Maha-Parinirvana-Sutra* it is said: “The deliverance complete is a solid essence; as for example, the Khadira, the Sandal, and the Agarvu, which are solids. The deliverance complete is parallel; its essence is solid and durable.” In the same Sutra it is said that the deliverance complete is “void not void;” that is to say, it is Something, but it surpasses our comprehension. Again it is said: “The deliverance complete is like a little vase that encounters a cause of destruction; with this difference; the vase is broken, but the deliverance complete is indestructible. Indestructibility — that is the deliverance complete!” \textsuperscript{25}

To a disciple, who desired to go out as a missionary to convert a tribe of savages, Buddha addressed these words: “It is well, Pourna, thou art worthy of this work. Go then. Having delivered thyself, deliver others; having reached the other

\textsuperscript{23} Nirvana Bouddhique. \textsuperscript{24} Ibid. \textsuperscript{25} Ibid. \textsuperscript{26} Nirvana Bouddhique.
shore, bring others thither; having arrived at complete Nirvana, cause others to arrive there like thyself.” 27 If annihilated in Nirvana, how could Pourni cause others to arise there “like himself?”

The Lotus of the Good Law tells of saints who have not only entered Nirvana in the present life, but reappeared in after ages to listen to the preaching of its tidings, and to interfere in behalf of the faithful. 28 The legends, too, represent Buddha as rejoicing at having attained the extinction of desire, and afterwards travelling from place to place, needing no other food than “the fruition of Nirvana.” 29 Even the nihilist Bishop Bigandet, says of the Burmese: “No one openly admits in practice that neibban (Nirvana) and annihilation are synonymous terms. The perfected being is believed to retain his individuality, but is merged as it were in the abstract truth, in which he lives and rests forever!”

These proofs seem to be unanswerable and conclusive. For the present, therefore, we pause here. The truth, at least in outline, is now before the reader, and it does not seem to be necessary that we should go further. The Buddhist religion is a vast subject, and perhaps no foreigner lives who is capable of fathoming it, acquainting himself with all parts, and becoming practically familiar with its workings. But this is certain: the annihilation theory has no sufficient and satisfactory support. It has nowhere in any Buddhistic country met with popular acceptance. Of the speculations of the Abhidharma and its school, the common people know little or nothing. The dogma of a paradise in the West represents the Nirvana of the common people. This dogma, tradition asserts, was transmitted by Shāriputra, one of the greatest disciples of S’hâkyamuni. In that paradise of the West, it is said, with its millions of Buddhas distributed over the country according to the eight points of the compass, there is one there discoursing on religion. His name is Amitâbha. He is so called because he is substantially light. He is also of boundless age, immortal, and

29 Johnson’s Oriental Religions.
all his people are likewise enjoying immortality. This paradise of the West, situated beyond the confines of our miserable world, contains four precious things or wonders. It the first place it is a kingdom of extreme happiness. There is there fulness of life, and no pain nor sorrow mixed with it; no need of being born again. In the second place there is there a seven-fold row of railings or balustrades. Thirdly, a seven-fold row of silken nets; and lastly a seven-fold row of trees hedging in the whole country. In the midst of it are seven precious ponds, the water of which possesses all of the eight qualities which the best water can have, viz.: it is still, it is pure and cold, it is sweet and agreeable, it is light and soft, it is fresh and rich, it tranquillizes, it removes hunger and thirst, and finally it nourishes all roots. The bottom of these ponds are coved with gold sand, and around about are pavements constructed of precious stones and metals; and many two-storied pavilions built of richly-colored transparent jewels. On the surface of the water, there are beautiful lotus-flowers floating, each as big as a carriage wheel, displaying the most dazzling colors and expressing the most fragrant aroma. There are also beautiful birds there, which make delicious and enchanting music, and at every breath of wind the very trees, on which those birds are resting, join in the chorus, shaking their leaves in trembling accents of sweetest harmony. Those silken nets also, which environ the whole paradise, chime in. This music is like Lieder que sorte; its melodies speak to the heart; but they discourse on Buddha, Dharma, and Samgha, and wake an echo in every breast; so that all the immortals that live in this happy land, instinctively join in hymns of praise. And so the story goes on, transplanting to this paradise in the West everything that an Asiatic considers beautiful and charming.20

In the eloquent words of Müller, this is the language, intelligible to the poor and suffering, that has endeared Buddhism to the hearts of millions,—not the silly metaphysical phantas-magorias of worlds of gods and worlds of Brahma, or the final

20 Eitel's Third Lecture.
dissolution of the soul in Nirvana,—no, the beautiful, the
tender, the humanly true, which like pure gold lies buried in
all religious, even in the sand of the Buddhist Canon.  

ARTICLE XXV.

Universalist Conventions and Creeds.

FIFTH PAPER.

THE CONVENTION OF 1798.

In opposition to the commonly received opinion that our
present General Convention grew out of the continuous exist-
ence of the Association of 1785, we have already stated the
grounds of belief that the Association held no session after
1787, and have quoted from the original records the request
of the Boston Church to the Philadelphia Convention in 1792,
for permission to organize a Convention in New England, and
the favorable response to the petition. In further confirma-
tion of the fact that the New England Convention begun its
existence in 1798, the following may be considered: For eight-
teen years the Convention had no Standing Clerk, and no
Book of Records. The Proceedings, or a Circular Letter, and
sometimes both, were uniformly published at the close of each
session, the session for 1798 being perhaps the only exception,
as nothing with reference to that year has been found. At
the session in 1811, the following action was taken:

"The Convention being convinced of the utility of a Stand-
ing Clerk, appointed brother Abner Kneeland to that office,
which he is to hold during the pleasure of the Convention."

Buddhist Nihilism.

3 Mr. Kneeland held the office until 1815. His successors have been Revs. Edward
Turner, 1815-1834; Howe Ballon, 2d, 1824-1839; John M. Austin, 1839-1859; Richard
Eddy, 1859-1867; E. G. Brooks, D.D., 1867-1869; James M. Pullman, the present in-
cumbent, elected 1869.
He is to collect, if possible, all the Proceedings of the Convention since that body has existed; also the Circular Letters annually issued, and to record the whole, and from year to year to make record of all such transactions in a suitable book, to be purchased at the charge of the Convention."

In 1813, the following was passed:

"Voted, That the Standing Clerk be allowed thirteen dollars and seventy-five cents in full for his account for procuring a blank book of six quires, and for Recording the Minutes and Circulars of the General Convention from its first organization up to the present time, being twenty years, and that the same be paid out of the treasury."

The Circular Letter of that year also speaks of its

"Being the twentieth Anniversary of this Conventional body, which has in each returning year joyfully assembled under the Auspices of Him who is good unto all."

Comparing the records made by Mr. Kneeland with the published papers issued prior to 1813, the copying is found to be full and accurate, with only two or three exceptions. The most important of these will be noted when we come to speak of the adoption of the Profession of Faith, in 1803.

Of the first session of this Convention, we have nothing on record except the Circular Letter, a brief and quaintly expressed document. As it is probable that it has never been reproduced in print, it is worthy of a permanent place on these pages, as an indication of the progress which had been made up to this time, the number of towns in which Universalism had obtained a foothold, and the spirit of the men who represented the interests of our cause. It is generally supposed to have come from the pen of Rev. John Murray, but it reads more like the letters of Rev. George Richards, and is quite identical in style,—being taken almost literally from the Scriptures,—with the Circular for 1800, which is known to have been written by him.

*Nearly a full set of these papers is in the Library of Tufts College.*
CIRCULAR.

"The Ministers, Elders and Messengers appointed by the Universal Churches and Societies, in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and New York, to represent said Churches and Societies in General Convention at Oxford, Massachusetts, September 4th, 1793,


"Dearly Beloved in Jesus, who is Lord of All! — The Great Master of Assemblies having graciously permitted us to assemble, not only in the peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding, but also in the peace of man, having none to make us afraid, we therefore conceive it our bounden duty to offer the unfeigned tribute of thanksgiving to that most worthy name unto which every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess; and earnestly we beseech our fellow-heirs and of the same body in Christ, to be like minded in humbly acknowledging all the goodness of the Lord, which He hath caused to pass before us, as all His glory.

"Being met together with one accord, for the edification of the Church in love, and having sought His blessing, who blesseth and it is blessed forever, we are thereby enabled to commune by Epistle with your spirits in the power and spirit of the Gospel.

"It is mutual cause of rejoicing and consolation, that so many of our dear brethren are coming up from the wilderness of time, leaning on the beloved in whom they are accepted, and who is made of God unto them wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. In this confidence and hope, which maketh not ashamed; in this glorying which neither angels, nor principalities, things present, nor things to come, can make void; in this faith, where the eye is single towards
the Great Shepherd of the sheep, the one Lord of the one fold, we devoutly pray that each one may finish his course with joy, holding fast the word of life eternal unto the end; passing through the valley of the shadow of death by the guidance of the rod and the staff of Jehovah; and in the morn of the resurrection, beholding Jesus as he is, be like unto him, changed from glory unto glory, in the express image of Immanuel, of whom the whole family in the heavens and the earth is named.

"And to the doctrine of the Saviour God, which hath appeared and bringeth Salvation unto all men, we fervently supplicate mercies from above, that ye may be enabled through grace, to add the adorning of that doctrine by denying ungodliness, and living soberly, righteously and godly; walking together as children of the light, in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace; having no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but counting the time past to more than suffice in which ye have had your conversation according to the course of this world. And therefore, we most affectionately entreat, that as members in religious connection, ye bear one another's burdens by an equality, and so fulfill the royal law; as fathers or mothers, bring up your offspring in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; as children, render obedience in all good conscience unto your parents; as husbands, love ye your wives, even as Christ loved the Church; as wives, win your husbands by the chastity of your conversation; as masters, remember that ye have one master who giveth things which are equal; as servants, yield service not as unto men, but as faithful in the sight of God; as subjects, unto the powers that are give honor to whom honor is due, tribute to whom tribute belongeth, and keep not back from Caesar that which is his. Finally, brethren, may the influence of divine love, shed abroad in your hearts by the operation of the holy spirit, add unto your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness that charity which suffereth long and is kind, and hath its abiding in the perfect day of Jesus, when faith is swallowed up in the vision of the Lord, and hope lost in the fruition of eternal and unchangeable bliss, even in that joy which is unspeakable and full of glory.

"And now, dearly beloved, we solemnly commend you to the grace of God, which alone is able to settle, establish, strengthen and build up; and in the only name given under heaven whereby men must be saved, we bid you farewell."
“Signed for and in behalf of the Ministers, Elders and Messengers, by 
Test. GEORGE RICHARDS, Clerk.”

The above gives no information as to the number of places represented in the Convention, nor, with the exception of the two who signed the Circular, does it tell us who attended the session. Of course we are not to suppose that Societies or Churches existed in all the thirty-six places named in the Circular; and it is impossible now to designate, with few exceptions, which of them had organizations.6

The next year, 1794, thirty-eight new places are named in the Circular Letter, and Alstead and Ballston, are omitted from the list. The additions were:


Even if the number of believers in any of the above named places was small, it is evident that many towns had been visited and much labor performed in them, since the previous session. It was the year of Rev. Elhanan Winchester’s return from England, and of his extensive travels in Massachusetts,

6 It is very certain that there were organizations at this time, in addition to any yet named in this series of Articles. In the Free Universal Magazine, Vol. I. p. 119, there is a letter from Rev. J.—a Bailey, written June 16, 1793, at “Lincoln County, Kentucky, Rush Branch Meeting House,” in which is the following: “It is now about nineteen months since we (William Bledsoe and myself) were expelled from our former society (the Separate Baptists) for the belief of the doctrine of the final restoration of all things to a union with, and enjoyment of God in Christ Jesus; and we have had to bear up under a storm of slander, prejudice, ignorance and ill-will. Notwithstanding all this, the universal cause yet gains ground. We have four Churches constituted in this country, five ordained ministers, and several young gifts. We hold Conferences twice a year by messengers from the Churches. The number of members now in Society in Kentucky, is about two hundred, we hope all walking in love; besides many other Christians in different societies who believe in the universal love of God, who have not joined with us in society yet, for reasons best known to themselves.”
preaching wherever he went, to large and attentive congregations; particularly in Brookline, his native place, in Boston, Roxbury, Cambridge, Newton, Hingham, Hull, Milford, Dudley, Charlton, Grafton, Oxford, and in various parts of Connecticut. The meeting houses of different denominations were thrown open to him, and where these could not be had, the people assembled in orchards and in private dwellings. "I never saw," he wrote, "the country so open to me as it is now. I preached twenty-five sermons in the month of September, which, considering my state of weakness, is as much as could be expected. If I had the health and strength now which I had twenty-four years ago, when I first began to preach, I could labor to far greater advantage and better purpose than I ever did." Rev. John Murray had been itinerating extensively in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, since his removal from Gloucester to Boston, a year before; and Rev. Hosea Ballou, who was ordained at this session of the Convention, was "travelling almost incessantly in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut," preaching as he went. It is probable that all the Preachers of our faith, at that time, occupied more or less extensive Missionary fields, and it is certain that the results of their labors were highly gratifying.

Rev. Elhanan Winchester was Moderator of the session, and Rev. Joab Young, Clerk. The Circular Letter was penned by the former, and the Proceedings of the Convention were incorporated in it. Four of the seven items of business relate to the organization and adjournment; the remaining three were these:

"Fourth. Chose a Committee to compose a short piece, simplifying a system of religion adapted to the capacity of children, to instruct them in the first rudiments of the Gospel of Christ."

Who the members of this Committee were, does not appear, nor is there any record of their making report of their doings.

---

*Stone's Life of Winchester, p. 216.
A Catechism was published that year, however, by the writer, Shippie Townsend, a prominent member of the Universalist Church in Boston. He wrote it, he says, "having been requested by some worthy friends to endeavor to put into their hands something in this way as an assistant in instructing their children." It is not improbable that the request mentioned may mean the vote of the Convention. This Catechism presents the Bellyan theory of Universalism.

"Fifth. Adopted the Philadelphia Platform of Articles of Faith, and Form of Church Government; and recommended that the same be observed by the Churches and Societies forming this Convention."

These Articles, and a synopsis of the Form of Church Government, have been given on pp. 15–17 of this volume of the Quarterly. Attention is here called to the fact that nine years before adopting what is known as "The Winchester Confession," the Universalists of New England and New York had voluntarily adopted a Written Creed,—a fact that is generally ignored, and often denied.

The remaining item of business was:

"Sixth. Chose Elders Michael Coffin, and Joab Young, Missionaries, to go forth in a circuitous manner and preach the Everlasting Gospel to the inhabitants of the above mentioned states for the space of one year."

9 "Scripture Truths and Precepts. A Short Catechism, with Proofs; designed for the assistance of such persons as wish to search the Scriptures for a consistent view of the Doctrines and Duties contained in them. With an Appendix concerning Baptism; and a concluding Remark on the Lord's Supper." 81 pp. Bound in volume entitled 'Gospel News,' &c., &c. By Shippie Townsend, Boston, 1784. I think it probable that the manuscript of this Catechism was submitted to the Philadelphia Convention, for in a letter of Mr. Murray to a Philadelphia friend, under date of Jan. 7, 1781, he says: "Mr. Townsend inquires as to the fate of his Catechism, which I left with you, or with Mr. McLean."

9 In a letter from Mr. George M. Perry, published in the Christian Ambassador, Feb. 11th, 1860, an account is given of Early Universalist preaching in Duchess Co., N. Y. Several families friendly to Universalism, resident in Amenia, are mentioned, and it is said, "These people were visited by a Universalist Clergyman, whose name is not now remembered, but who preached in the house of Samuel Swift, as early as 1768." May not this have been one of the results of the above mentioned Missionary appointment? I know of no other mention of the preaching of our faith in New York about that time, although it is certain, (as see p. 201 of this volume) that the interior parts of
The only record made of the business done in 1795, is that "Brother John Murray was chosen Moderator, Brother Hosea Ballou, Clerk;" and, "Examined and approved the credentials of the several attendant Messengers, and transacted all such special business as came before the Convention."

From this time till the session of 1800, there are no items of business recorded, the Circular Letter for each year, with the exception of the year 1798, as before mentioned, being all that is preserved; with this addition, only, that appended to the Circular for 1797, is the following:

"As a further recommendation we propose that when our Elders are called to travel to places where they are not known, some Society or brethren give them a line to signify that they are received by us as Preachers of the Gospel, and persons of a good moral character."

It may not be presuming too much to infer from this that up to this time, the Convention had not issued Letters of Fellowship. Indeed, the Philadelphia Plan of Government which had been adopted, delegated this power, as also that of Ordination, to the Churches. The full text of the provision on this subject, is as follows:

"Such persons as possess those qualifications and gifts which the Scriptures prescribe for a Bishop, and who wish to devote themselves to God in the ministry, shall be invited to preach before the members of the Church; and if, after trial, they shall appear to be under the influence of the spirit of the Gospel, and to possess such endowments as are requisite for the profitable exercise of the duty of a Bishop or Minister, the Church shall solemnly set apart and ordain such persons; and a certificate of such appointment shall be to them a sufficient ordination to preach the Gospel, and to administer such Ordinances herein after mentioned, as to them may seem proper, wherever they may be called by Divine Providence.

the state had been visited by Universalist preachers as early as 1793, and that Rev. Samuel Smith was then a resident of Nobletown, a settlement in Hillsdale, Columbia County. Rev. Michael Coffin, according to Rev. Mr. Whittmoe’s "Memoir of the Universalist Society in Oxford, Mass.," published in Universalist Miscellany, Vol. VI. pp. 318-321, was received as a "delegated from the several Universalist Societies in the State of New York," at the Convention in 1798.
"And as the great design of forms in ordaining Ministers, is to prevent weak and immoral persons from exercising the ministerial office, we admit Ordination by any Church in which such forms have been observed, to be valid, and when persons so Ordained shall apply to become members of any of our Churches, they shall (if otherwise qualified) be admitted not only as Members, but Ministers also."

In 1800, the Convention took the matter of License, Fellowship, Ordination and Discipline into its own hands. Possibly it may have done this before, but we have no means of knowing. The Ordination of Rev. Hosea Ballou, at the session in 1794, was no instance of it, as that seems to have been an impromptu and wholly unpremeditated act, instigated solely by Rev. Elhanan Winchester, at the close of a fervid discourse. But the minutes of the session of 1800 show that seven of the nine votes passed on that occasion were on this subject. They stand in the following order:

"That the well beloved Joab Young, Caleb Rich and William Farwell, ministers of the gospel of peace, be the ordaining Council, for and in behalf of their brethren, to ordain the approved Brother Walter Ferris on the 1st Thursday in January, A. D. C., 1801, over the united Societies of Charlotte, Hinesburg and Monkton, Vermont.

"That the well beloved Hosea Ballou, Zephaniah Lathe and Caleb Rich, ministers of the Gospel of peace, do attend the ordination of the approved Brother Edward Turner, at such time and place as the Society, Council and Candidate may appoint.

"That the well beloved Hosea Ballou, Edward Turner, and Ebenezer Paine, be the standing Committee of this Convention, to examine the credentials of applicants for ordination, and to ordain if so requested, in the recess of the Convention; and if circumstances possibly admit that Brother Miles Treadwell Wooley be gratified in his request for ordination, when accompanied by proper testimonials from the Connecticut Societies.

"That the Moderator of this Convention, in the name thereof, expedite a Letter testimonial of License to preach, and grant the same to Brothers Miles T. Wooley, Edward Turner, Joshua Flagg, and Edwin Ferriss, Fellow Laborers in the Gospel."
"That Brother George Richards present the fellowship of this Convention, in the bond of the one spirit of charity, to Brothers Edmund Pillsbury, John Foster, and Samuel Mead, and may their hands be made strong by the hand of the mighty God, the Everlasting Father and the Prince of Peace.

"That the well beloved Hosea Ballou, Edward Turner, and Ebenezer Paine, be and they hereby are entreated to repair to New Marlboro', Massachusetts, and faithfully to examine the complaint of the Society in that place against a brother in the ministry, and if he is found faulty they are directed to deal with him in the spirit and power of discipline, to exhort, reprove or rebuke, and if need be, they are to deny him the fellowship of this Convention.

"That the Ministers, Elders and Messengers of this Convention, solemnly impressed with the necessity of adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour, are pained at the very heart, that another of their brethren in the Ministry has not walked circumspectly as became his profession, do hereby withhold from him all present fellowship in his public character. A tender, a fraternal regard for his possibly wounded spirit, the remembrance of a family whose interested feelings are dear to our souls; and a deep sense of our own personal manifold infirmities influence the members of this Convention not to inscribe the name of our offending Brother on this lasting record: and most fervent are the united prayers of the body that henceforth he may walk more worthy of the high and holy vocation of glory and virtue; and finally, that his light may so shine before men, that they beholding his good works may glorify the Father in Heaven."

The eighth vote passed at this session was one instructing the Moderator, Rev. George Richards, to "correspond with the Societies to the Southward, and also with the Eastern Association, Massachusetts." The first named Societies were no doubt those composing the Philadelphia Convention. The "Eastern Association," had been organized in 1799, in what was then the District of Maine.

The Convention also adopted seven "recommendations: " that Societies not then represented send Messengers to the next Convention, and also forward a particular account of their condition; that all Messengers be chosen annually on
the first Sabbath in June; " that all Societies not favored with constant preaching, do nevertheless constantly assemble on the first day of the week, and if they have no other gift among them, that they attend to the reading of the Scriptures;" that all Societies "pay peculiar solemnized attention to regularity and discipline;" that the Societies "consider whether the Ordinances of the New Testament are not the commandments of the Lord, the Saviour;" that members of the Convention "assemble on the evening of the day previous to their regular meeting," that delays in the morning session may be avoided; "that the Council of the Convention do assemble in future at the private house of a brother or sister, as it becometh us to abstain from the appearance of evil."

It is a fair inference from this last recommendation, that some session or sessions had been held in a public house; and if, as is most probable, "the appearance of evil" arose from the fact that intoxicating liquors were sold at all such places, may not this have been the early action of the Convention against intemperance, of which we are sometimes told? Certainly there is no record of any other vote on this subject, until we reach the session of 1829. Action was taken, however, as we are assured by one who participated in it, in 1814. The evil at which the cation on this last named date

10 Rev. S. R. Smith published an article in the Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate, March 17, 1846, in which he said: "I was present at the session of the General Convention at Westmoreland, N. H., in 1814,—when a resolution was introduced and passed, to the amount, that, Societies be requested Nor to furnish liquor at the subsequent meetings of that body. This resolution, I think, passed in full council, a short time before the adjournment—but whether it was made matter of record, is not known as the minutes of the Session never reached me." I find by the Records, that a resolution "designed to discontinue the improper use of ardent spirits," was introduced at the session of 1829; but "as there was not sufficient time to mature the subject according to its importance," its further consideration was postponed to the next session. Nothing further on the subject appears till 1829, when "The following preamble and Resolution were adopted:

"Whereas, This Convention views the cause of Temperance as highly deserving the cordial approbation of all philanthropists—as expressed many years since by the General Convention of Universalists, Therefore,

"Resolved, That this Convention earnestly recommends to the several State Conventions, composing this body, and through them to the denomination generally, to continue their laudable exertions for the suppression of Intemperance in all its forms."

Since the date of this action, the Convention has frequently expressed itself on this subject.
was aimed, prevailed at that time among all the sects, especially at Associations, Dedications and Ordinations; the bills for the liquors furnished being often the largest item in the expenses of such occasions. This disapproval of the custom by our General Convention, was probably the earliest action of the kind taken by any Ecclesiastical body, as it was not till thirteen years after this that even Temperance Societies advocated total abstinence, and the publication of Dr. Beecher’s Lectures on Intemperance, induced religious bodies to discuss the subject and to pass resolves on it.

In 1801, the Convention ordained Rev. Miles T. Woolsey, and Edwin Ferris, who were the first, so far as the Records show, to receive, by vote of the Council, Ordination during a session of the Convention. It appointed special Committees to attend to the Ordination of Revs. Thomas Barns, and Solomon Glover; and a committee, consisting of “Brothers Hosea Ballou, Edward Turner, and Ebenezer Paine, to examine the credentials of all applicants for Ordination, and to Ordain, if need be, in the recess of the Convention.” It also appointed as Committee of Discipline, for the year: “Elder Zebulon Streeter, Caleb Rich, Joab Young, Edward Turner, Hosea Ballou and Joshua Flagg.” Letters of License and Fellowship were granted to Revs. “Solomon Glover, Cornelius Grey Parsons [Person], and James Babbit. In the Circular Letter for this year the Convention published, for the first time, a list of Preachers in fellowship.

“Brethren, as we conceive that it may be the means of furthering the cause, by extending the usefulness of those who are favored with gifts unto edification, we therefore embrace the present opportunity of inscribing their names on this last record, that as opportunity presents, ye may receive benefit therefrom. Our approved Ministers and Elders are: John Murray, Boston, Mass.; Joab Young, Strafford, Vt.; Edward Turner, Starbridge; Hosea Ballou, Dana; Caleb Rich, Warwick, Mass.; Zebulon Streeter, Surry; David Ballou, Richmond, N. H.; Ebenezer Paine, Williamsburg, Mass.; Miles Treadwell Woolsey —— Conn.; Solomon Glover, Newtown, Conn.; Thomas Barns, Poland, District of Maine; Ed-
mundo Pillsbury, Northwood, N. H.; James Babbit, Dana, Mass.; Cornelius Gray Parsons [Person], Windsor, Vt.; John Foster, Taunton; Zephaniah Lathe, Grafton, Mass.; William Farewell, Barre, Vt.; Edwin Ferris, Walter Ferris, Paulings-town, N. Y.; Samuel Smith, Salisbury, Conn.; Joshua Flagg,—Mass.; George Richards, Portsmouth, N. H. The far greater part of the above have received regular ordination. A few of them are settled with particular Churches; and many still remain without any special engagements, ready to attend the Macedonian cry, ‘Come hither and help us.’ Thus far, by grace, these few witnesses have maintained a life and conversation which becometh the gospel; and our prayers are that they may persevere unto the end, shining brighter and brighter as they approach nearer and nearer to the perfect day.”

The last action of the Convention this year, was a vote

“That a fund be raised by such ways and means as may hereafter be devised; the amount [object] of which fund is, to supply the wants of Brethren sent forth to preach; to aid in the printing of any useful works; and to answer all such charitable purposes as the Convention may judge proper. That it is expedient to have a Treasurer, to take care of said fund; and that brother David Ballou, of Richmond, Massa-chusetts, [New Hampshire] be, and hereby is appointed Treasurer of this Convention.”

The ways and means subsequently recommended were: a collection from all the Churches, one day in the year; and the solicitation of private donations.

In 1802, the Convention having had no response on this subject, renewed their recommendation, and issued a special

Address to the Universal Churches and Societies on the sub-

11 In 1818 the Convention again published its list of preachers, amounting then to forty. Of the twenty-two named in 1808, Messrs. Barne, Flagg, Farewell, Glover, Lathie, Murray, Person, Rich, Turner, David and Hosea Ballou, and Edwin Ferris are also named in 1818. In 1821, the list is again published, and contains seventy-nine names, among which are those of Messrs. Flagg, Farewell, Glover, Lathie, Person, Rich, Turner, David and Hosea Ballou, Edwin Ferris, and James Babbit; the latter unintentionally omitted, no doubt, in the list of 1818.

12 The other Treasurers have been: Revs. Zebulon Stroeker, 1802—1808; George Richards, 1806, 9; Abner Kneeland, 1809—1815; Edward Turner, 1815—1824. The Convention had no Treasurer from 1825 till 1836, when E. W. Crowell, Esq., was elected, who was succeeded in 1839, by D. L. Bolden, Esq., the present incumbent.
ject of the proposed Conventional Fund.” The Address took notice of the following objections to the project:

“First, We remonstrate against banking money for defraying travelling expenses; Second, We see something in the plan that looks a little like ecclesiastical revenue; Third, By raising a pretty good fund of money we might obtain additional laborers, but we are strongly suspicious of their faithfulness.”

After protesting against the injustice of such insinuations, the Address said:

“The limits of our utmost expectations were, that as upwards of Forty Societies hold fellowship with this Convention, that their many members might possibly contribute from fifty to sixty dollars per year. That if a sermon was annually printed that one half of this must be expended on printing the few copies sent to the Churches; that another part would probably go to the impression of the Circular Letters; that some faithful brother might need a portion of the rest to help him on a mission whither he might be sent of the Lord, or the Convention; and that possibly some lorn widow, some destitute child of a deceased faithful brother, might sue, most humbly sue, in the tattered robe of poverty and woe, for the little remainder.”

The next year thirty-two dollars and three cents were reported as received from thirteen sources; but there is no record of any response in subsequent years.

The same year, 1802, on representation that “Brother Elhanan Winchester rests in the grave without a monument to mark the spot,” Rev. George Richards was requested to attend to the procuring of grave stones, with a suitable inscription. This he faithfully attended to, submitting at the following session an inscription which he had prepared, and an estimate of

13 “The Contributions of the several Churches and Societies being called for in support of the proposed Conventional Funds, the Messengers of the Churches deposited the following sums: Portsmouth $7.00, West Britton $1.87, Tyringham $1.50, Goshen $1.50, Newtown $9.00, Andover $1.64, Canaan $1.60, Windsor $2.50, Grafton $1.50. Balston, Croyden, Turner, New Haven, each $1.00. Total $23.085.” Convention Records.
the cost of erecting the monument. The report was approved, and the work was continued and completed by him.  

But by far the most important items of business brought before the session of 1802, were the following:

"On motion of Brother Walter Ferris, and the Churches of Charlotte, Hinesburg and Monkton, a committee was appointed to form a plan of fellowship in faith and practice, for the edifying of the body, and building it up together. Brothers Z. Streeter, G. Richards, H. Ballou, W. Ferris and Z. Lathe were chosen, and are to report at the next Convention, provided life be spared.

"Christopher Erskine, of Claremont, sued for the non-payment of Congregational Ministerial Taxes, prayed Counsel. The Convention directed Bro. G. Richards to Memorialize the Honorable the Judges of the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire, and if possible to obtain a reconsideration of a late decision which has pronounced that Congregationalists and Universalists are the same people; at least so far as this, that the latter ought to pay taxes to the former: It being thus written of man that the younger shall serve the Elder, not by love but cash."

These items of business were brought up and attended to in the order in which they stand above, the question on the appointment of a Committee to draft the "Plan of fellowship," being decided before Christopher Erskine's case was acted on or mentioned.

[To be continued.]

ARTICLE XXVI.

The Grounds of Endless Punishment Considered.

ALL the various grounds on which the doctrine of endless

16"Brother George Richards reported that he had prepared, and now submitted, an inscription for Brother Elihaman Wincheater's Monument; and that the cost of erecting said Monument would be thirty-five dollars. The Convention accepted said report, and twenty-three dollars being instantly collected, Brother G. Richards was authorised to draw on the Treasurer for the remaining twelve dollars, and to proceed in the completion of said Monument." Convention Records.
punishment is by its advocates finally made to rest, may be conveniently grouped, we think, under four general heads, as follows: Either sin is in its very nature infinite, and therefore justly deserves an infinite punishment; or men will continue to sin forever, and hence should be forever punished: or sin, when carried to a certain extent, exhausts or paralyzes the forces of our moral nature, and so subjects the soul to a kind of decay that renders all return to virtue and godliness impossible; or, finally, God by an arbitrary decree sets a limit to the allotted day of salvation, beyond which he withdraws all offers of grace, and turns a deaf ear to all cries for mercy.

Having already considered at some length the first three of these assumptions,¹ and shown, as we think, how absurd the first is, and how every way untenable are the second and third, we propose in the present article to examine with some degree of care the fourth and last, which is by far the most popular of them all, and also enjoys the singular honor of being made to do service in connection with some or perhaps all of the others. And yet were we asked what we regard as at once the most unreasonable and the most mischievous doctrine of our prevalent orthodoxy — its πρότερον προϊσταμένον — we should answer without hesitation, This very doctrine of Probation, as it is called, which is almost everywhere preached and almost everywhere believed — the doctrine which admits of no salvation after death, and consequently confines the mercy of God and the redeeming power of Christ to this little spot of earth and this moment of time!

It is unnecessary to enter upon any special statement of this popular doctrine. Every reader must be acquainted with it. Yet for a doctrine so familiar and widely accepted, and especially for one that makes such work with the character and government of God, and the condition and prospects of mankind, it seems to us to have secured less attention and commanded less thought than almost any other of equal importance in theology. It is one of those old heirlooms which have come down from father to son through the ages, and

¹See Univ. Quarterly for April 1872, and July 1874.
come unchallenged, without inquiry or consideration. Even those who have professedly written upon it, appear to have accepted it rather than examined or attempted to prove it. Dr. Pond, of the Bangor Theological Seminary some years ago favored the world with a treatise on *Probation*, which in a small volume now lies before us. In it he develops the common theory as if it were the perfection of wisdom and beauty, and shows himself utterly blind to its real character and indifferent to its consequences. We shall have frequent occasion to refer to this authority.

The position, or state of trial, under which the human race is now living, let it be remembered, is the second condition of the kind with which man has been favored. The first was enjoyed only by our first parents, and for a very short time. As soon as they were created, they were placed in a state of probation. The object was, not to inform God as to their dispositions and conduct, but, as Dr. Pond expresses it, "to see, if in a world of temptation they would hold on their way, maintain their integrity, and persevere in holiness." The prize they were to win by obedience was "everlasting life," and this was to be "the reward of their deeds." Hence this is called "the covenant of works." The penalty of disobedience was "eternal death," or endless torments in hell-fire. How long this probation would have lasted had our first parents not sinned, we do not know, though Dr. Pond tells us that "a state of trial is never a permanent one. Nor is it ordinarily of long duration." He thinks "it is not likely that the angels were long on trial, before a part of them apostatized and went to their own place, and the remainder were confirmed in their allegiance forever. And it is certain that our first parents were on their original probation but a little while, before by an act of transgression, they finished it."

It must be particularly noticed that our first parents acted, under this covenant of works, not only for themselves but also for their posterity. "Had they overcome these temptations," says Dr. Pond, "and persevered in holiness to the end of their trial, they then would have been confirmed in holiness, and
they and their posterity would have been holy forever." But alas, instead of overcoming they themselves were overcome, and fell; and all the evils they incurred by their transgression passed over as an inheritance to their children. Why the Almighty, who is abundant in wisdom and goodness, did not execute the dread penalty of the law upon the sinning pair, and on the very day of transgression, before they had begun to people the earth with a race of totally depraved, hell-deserving sinners, is one of those problems which our orthodox neighbors solve very easily, but which others, on orthodox principles, and under the light of common sense and common humanity, cannot solve at all. Contrary to alleged justice, and the express words of the threatening, they were permitted to live for centuries, as if on purpose to propagate their species, and multiply subjects of the divine wrath,—fuel for fire. But Dr. Pond and the whole orthodox school are pleased to take a more hopeful view of the case.

"God, who is rich in mercy," says he, "was pleased not to leave them in their state of sin, and treat them according to their deservings. Instead of casting them off utterly and executing upon them the penalty of the law, he was pleased to provide and open a way in which he could put them and their posterity on a new and better trial, and afford them another opportunity of securing everlasting life. And this is the trial on which the human family are now placed and on the issue of which is depending the eternal destiny of their souls."

On examination it will be found that, except in name, this is essentially the same trial over again under new conditions. The prize set before us is the same as that which was to attract the eyes of our first parents. The forfeit in case of failure is the same. The means necessary to win are the same. Dr. Pond says this second trial rests on another foundation. Our first parents were to attain eternal life on the ground of their own works; but we on the ground of the atonement. They were on trial to see if they would persevere in holiness; we to see if we will exercise repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. In both cases, however, we have some-
thing to do, and unless we do what is required we are lost. The only practical difference we see, is, that the first season of probation was immediately followed by a second, but this second one is final. Here in the present life we are to determine our destiny for the endless future. On our conduct here depends our everlasting weal or woe. Beyond the grave there will be no opportunity to work out our salvation. This life is one of probation; the next is one of unending retribution. "Those alone who have here received the salvation of their souls and continued faithful unto the end," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "shall have a resurrection to everlasting glory; not every believer, but every loving, obedient believer, shall enter into the paradise of God." In the words of Dr. Watts,

"Life is the time to serve the Lord,
The time t' insure the great reward;"

and by necessary implication the only time to serve the Lord to any purpose, or secure any reward.

It would seem to require no very extensive or profound examination to satisfy any candid mind, that popular as this doctrine may be, it is not obviously reasonable, or to convince the most prejudiced in its favor that it is exposed on every side to grave and unanswerable objections. It is in the first place wholly arbitrary. It cannot be reconciled with any tolerable notion of the divine justice, while it is clearly opposed to every conception of divine goodness, and especially to that impartial goodness which Christianity ascribes to our heavenly Father. It contradicts our fundamental ideas of human nature. It is a total misconception or rather perversion of probation as it exists in a moral scheme; while in its practical workings it leads to results, which, by the confession of its advocates, are absolutely appalling, and which few of its warmest friends can contemplate without horror. Hence it happens that although almost universally preached broadly and without qualification, it is left in practice to receive a thousand benevolent modifications, some of which are of such character and extent as to be a virtual denial of the doctrine itself. Every rule it is said has its exceptions, but when in the mul-
tipicility of exceptions the rule is fairly lost, it ceases to have any merit and had better be dismissed. The doctrine of probation, as generally preached and believed, serves no purpose only when we are treating of those in whose welfare we take no interest; when applied to the fate of those we love, it becomes at once on its dark side intolerable. "We are all Universalists," said a pious, evangelical lady, "when we lose our friends!" And if Christianity required us to love only those who love us, that narrow kind of Universalism would meet the wants of the Christian soul.

Let us spend a few moments in briefly considering some of these general, and, as they may seem, harsh accusations against a doctrine so largely professed and deemed so important. And in the first place, we wish to say,

1. That such an ordering of the divine government as this doctrine implies, must be purely arbitrary, resting on no obvious necessity, and is commended to the human understanding and conscience by no assignable reasons. What is there in death that should render it a line of demarcation between states so opposite as one of trial and one in which the moral being is "confirmed" in sin or in holiness? It can not be pretended that the mere act of dying, in itself considered, works any moral change in the soul. A good man is not the better, a bad man is not the worse, for having passed through this crisis, this transition, from one mode of being to another. "In my Father's house," said the divine Master, "are many mansions." This world is one of those mansions, the first and lowest, we may feel assured. But in passing from this world to the next, we do not leave our Father's house: we only pass, as it were, from one room to another.

Still less can it be supposed that our death produces any change in God. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. He exists, as we all believe, quite independent of the little relations of time, which seem so important to us. The distinctions we make between time and eternity can have no existence with him. He must be, then, on the other side of that imaginary line which separates what we call these two
worlds, precisely what he is on this. From everlasting to everlasting he is God, neither better nor worse; neither more benevolent nor more just. As long as he exists, and human souls exist, he must be their Creator, and they his creatures; he their Father and they his children; he the source of their happiness and they recipients at his hand of every good and perfect gift they enjoy. Nor can we conceive how death is to disturb these great relations, or in any way modify their influence.

But this is not all. Not only can no reason be assigned for such a change of the divine administration as this doctrine supposes, but it necessarily leads to consequences the most astonishing in reference to God himself. Reflect a moment. So long as the soul lingers on this side of death, it is generally represented as an object of the divine solicitude and love. God cares for it, watches over it, and is anxious for its return and salvation. "It results from the moral perfection of God," says Dr. Pond, "that he must earnestly desire the salvation of sinners;" and he thinks that whatever else we may doubt, we are never to doubt the sincerity of these benevolent desires. But according to the doctrine of probation these benevolent desires in the bosom of God are singularly short-lived. They go up to the moment of the sinner's death, and then pass away like the morning dew. The soul that he loved so intensely a moment ago, he loves no longer; the salvation of that soul which a moment ago he so earnestly desired, he desires no longer. A moment ago he was waiting to be gracious; waiting the prodigal's return, with a father's forgiveness and a father's blessing; but all that has passed in a moment. Love has changed to hate; mercy itself has turned to vengeance! He now loads with curses the soul that a moment ago he so loved. He now damns to the torments of an endless hell the soul that a moment ago he would have clasped to his bosom and taken to the joys of heaven! We confess our inability to apprehend this. We have seen hard, coarse men, who pursued an enemy with hatred while he lived, give place to gentle and forgiving thoughts, when death had set its seal upon his
brow. It is not so with God. The death of the sinner trans-
forms a kind and loving Father into a monster of revenge and
cruelty. We hear it very often said that "there is no change
after death." But if there is none for man, this doctrine an-
nounces one for God, that completely overwhelms us. As our
orthodox neighbors used to sing, and should still sing,

For mercy knows th' appointed bound
And turns to vengeance there!

Some theologians of Dr. Thompson's "Love and Penalty"
school, will perhaps tell us that this sudden and unaccountable
change in God, this instantaneous transformation not only of
the divine character, but also of the divine nature, is but a
new and more striking instance of God's great love! In their
theology love builds a hell as it makes a heaven. Love con-
signs its objects to endless torments. Love holds them in ex-
istence merely to make them suffer: and it can never cause
them to suffer enough, though it torments them through all
eternity.

2. In the second place we beg our readers to consider the
awful disparity existing between the duration of our state of
trial, our season of probation, and that of the consequences
depending upon it. In other words, let them consider that
the probation is very short and the retribution immensely
long. Indeed, we have here the finite and the infinite stand-
ing face to face—an ordinary life-time and endless ages, a
moment set over against eternity! We have no language, of
course, to shadow forth the fearful contrast. Human thought
cannot apprehend it; imagination itself in its boldest flight
sinks exhausted by the mere attempt to grasp it. A single
drop of water bears an infinitesimal proportion to all the
waters on the face of the globe; the diameter of the tiniest
spider's thread bears a certain proportion to the circumference
of the earth, the distance of the sun, or the remotest star
whose light has ever travelled down to our little planet; but
between the longest human life and eternity there is no pro-
portion whatever. Here all comparison fails.

In all ages the shortness of life has been a subject of com-
plaint. Inspired men spoke of it as but "a hand's breadth," and compared the rapidity of its flight to the swiftness of the weaver's shuttle. Though the days of our years are three score years and ten, as the Psalmist speaks, yet they are as a tale that is told, for they are soon cut off and we fly away. But of all that are born how small is the number who reach the goal of three score years and ten! The average length of human life is less than half that period. And yet within the limit of these few years, according to this doctrine of probation, the vast concerns of the immortal soul, concerns for eternity, are to be settled! Dr. Emmons says it is estimated that one half the human race die under eight years of age, and consequently one half the human race determines its eternal destiny within eight years from their birth! No allowance, it seems, is to be made for the weakness of infancy, the ignorance of childhood, or the inexperience and waywardness of youth. Nor is the consideration of human circumstances — the struggle the great mass of mankind is forced to make for bread, the cares and anxieties of this work-day world, the temptations and trials, the sufferings and sorrows of life — permitted to enter at all into this dread account. The simple question is whether they have properly repented of their sins, and in the orthodox way believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. If they have, then they are prepared "to stand in the judgment," as Dr. Pond says; if they have not, there is no further probation; their doom is fixed.

Were we told of a wise and good king, who had suspended the temporal fortunes of his little son of three years old upon his conduct for half a week or half a day, — placing, on one side, a throne with all its accompaniments of riches, power, and glory, and, on the other, disgrace, poverty and all the evils that royal malice and cruelty could inflict, — we should hardly know which first or most to call in question, this king's boasted wisdom or goodness, in a measure that equally betrayed the utter want of both. Yet such a probation might be regarded as the perfection of wisdom and benevolence compared with that which God, in the riches of his mercy, is said
to vouchsafe to the human race. It is not surprising, there-
fore, that some of the most earnest friends and advocates of
this formidable doctrine, have been compelled by the mere
thought of it, to wail out their amazement and horror in pious
or impious song. Let us give two or three specimens selected
from much of a similar kind, found in evangelical Hymn
Books, and seriously intended to be said or sung in the wor-
ship and to the honor of God!

Eternal bliss, eternal woe,
Hangs on this inch of time below,
On this precarious breath.

Again:

Lo! on this narrow neck of land,
'Twixt two unbounded seas I stand,
Yet how insensible!
A point of time, a moment's space,
Removes me to yon heavenly place,
Or shuts me up in hell!

Dr. Pond fortunately does not sympathize with this kind of
feeling and utterance. On the contrary the very shortness of
life seems to him a mighty argument in favor of this being a
probationary, and the only probationary, state. "The world,"
he says, "in which we live, the influences which here beset
us, the changes that pass over us, and the means and privi-
leges which we enjoy, are all adapted to the circumstances of
beings on probation, and on just such a probation as has been
described. In showing this, it may be remarked in general,
that our abode on earth is short. We are here but a little
while before the stroke of death arrests us, and we are sum-
mmoned into the eternal state. In this respect our condition
is fitted to be one of trial. A state of trial is never a perma-
nent state. Nor is it ordinarily of long continuance. We
sometimes take things into our possession on trial; but we do
not retain them till they are worn out and destroyed. We
use them until they have been sufficiently proved, and then
either return them or make them permanently our own."

Of some doctrines it is well said that their simple statement
is their best refutation; and we certainly know none that
have so good a claim to take their place in the first rank of this ignoble class as the one under consideration.

No doubt every day and every hour of human activity makes its impress not only on our character, but also throws its influence forward over the next hour and the next day, and in some degree over succeeding ones, on and on perhaps through months and years, and even ages, if you please; but that the character of our immortal existence is wholly determined and fixed by this short life, in this infancy of our being, and fixed beyond the power of our own will and endeavor to amend it, and even beyond the reach of God’s love and grace, is a proposition so monstrous, if not profane, as to defy all rational belief. We see the Creator employing hundreds of years in raising an oak, and thousands in building up one of the great trees of California, and are we to think it strange were he to spend a century, or more if necessary, in making a man,—an intelligent and moral being, whose “chief end is to glorify God and enjoy him forever?” Is not an immortal soul worth as much time and care as a tree of the forest?

8. In the next place, will the reader reflect a moment on the great inequality in the length of this always short season of probation, as it is accorded to different individuals of the race. Remember the stake is the same to all. “Eternal bliss, eternal woe”—heaven with its infinite beatitudes on one side, and hell with its unimaginable torments on the other, are laid in the scales before us. We are warned to shun hell; we are invited to win heaven; and for this great purpose a day of probation is granted us, and opportunities afforded, and means and incitements provided. Yet see how unequal is the time allotted for the accomplishment of this great work, this real business of our present life, this end of our existence! One man’s probation is extended through a hundred years, while another’s ends at three score and ten, and another’s at fifty, and so down to the infant that lives not a single hour! Are God’s ways equal, then? One man is smitten down in a moment, and passes without warning from a state of apparent health, and the prospect of long life, to the invisible world.
To another death comes only after protracted illness, and after the shadows of death with monitory fingers have been gathering about his bed for months or years. Are God's ways equal?

But there are innumerable cases of a far more startling character. Here is a young woman of amiable dispositions and blameless life, but "without religion," as the phrase goes, who dies instantly under the hand of an assassin. She has no time for repentance, or even one cry to heaven for mercy. What her future destiny, according to the doctrine we are considering, must be, admits of no doubt. Dying without repentance or faith in Christ, her soul is inevitably lost. It is in vain that we say she was amiable, or that she had lived such a life as endeared her to her friends and made her a blessing and a joy as far as she was known. Her soul was the seat of our inherited depravity that made her spiritually averse to all good and inclined to all evil, and rendered her an object of God's wrath and curse. The destiny of her murderer is widely, nay infinitely different. Arrested for his crime he is convicted and receives the sentence of death. But human law, more merciful than the murderer, and more merciful, let us add, than the God of probation, allows even this guilty wretch space for repentance. He is visited by the ministers of religion, is converted and finally passes from the gallows to immortal glory. It is a fact, we believe, singular as it may seem, that of those who die on the scaffold, a much larger proportion are "fitted for the great day of account," than of those who live respectable and useful lives, and die at last surrounded by their weeping families and friends upon their beds! It is in this way the moral man is represented as standing on slippery places, and occupying a position more dangerous to his soul than the greatest sinner's. But what an illustration we have here of the beauty of probation! An amiable and innocent young woman is suddenly murdered and goes to an endless hell: while her murderer, with her blood upon his hands, and a thousand sins upon his soul, swings from the scaffold into the eternal felicities of heaven! And if Dr. Edwards may be believed, this murderer's happiness...
will be forever increased by beholding the ceaseless torments of the victim of his own guilt. We wish we could ask the question, whether it is possible for any sane man, and especially any Christian, to entertain such an opinion of the government of God. It would seem that a mercy rich enough to save the murderer, might find out some means by which it could reach the murdered. If not, we would thank some man learned in the law to demonstrate to us that the ways of God are equal, and as the Psalmist says, that "the Lord is good to all."

4. Then, we would have the reader consider the vastly unequal opportunities enjoyed by men for forming such a character as will fit them, "to stand in the judgment." Nothing can be more manifest or striking than the disparity of human conditions, both in respect to intellectual and moral development, and especially the growth of that Christian character which the gospel everywhere demands. It it is not merely that one lives a century and another dies in infancy; it is not that one dies suddenly and another only after protracted disease; this diversity extends to all the conditions and circumstances of human life. In the same country, under the same civil institutions, and the same religion, we mark great differences in external condition and in the religious opportunities and privileges of men. In the same village one child is born in a respectable family, of comfortable fortune, good education, and fine Christian culture. This child is not left to suffer want, receives the best education the neighborhood affords, and is brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Another child comes into the world in a family at once poor, vicious, and thriftless. His education is neglected, he is surrounded by bad influences and bad examples from his infancy, and grows up, as might be expected, ignorant, wayward, and vicious; and the doctrine we are considering proposes to end the business by taking the fortunate child to heaven and sending the unfortunate one to hell. This vindicates the goodness and the justice of God! We read in the Gospel of one who had received "his good things" in this life
and in the next was tormented, while another who had received "evil things" here, was there comforted.

Then look for a moment at communities. Contrast many of our Southern States as they existed a quarter of a century ago, under the reign of slavery, with our happier New England. Here every town and every village had its schools and its churches. Education was almost universal, and no one was necessarily beyond the privileges and blessings of the Christian religion. There, from the very conditions of society, common schools for all the children were impossible, and churches must be distant from each other and not easily reached by the mass of the community; and worst of all the spirit of slavery had poisoned all the springs of social, moral and spiritual life. Look again at different nations. Compare England with Spain; or Protestant Germany with Catholic Italy or Austria. Can it be pretended that Romanism is as favorable to intelligence, to morality, and the growth of Christian character as Protestantism? Now the doctrine of probation overlooks all these diversities of condition, and subjects every soul to one uniform action. It matters not where one is born, or under what unfavorable circumstances he may have been placed. His probation ends with his life here, and his destiny for heaven or hell is determined by answering the question whether he has properly exercised repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

But we have not yet seen all the beauty and moral glory of this doctrine. Turn your eyes a moment to the heathen world, with its teeming millions, who never heard of a Saviour, in whose ears the very names of Christ and God,—the only true and living God,—were never sounded. And these millions are, as Dr. Pond says, "on probation for the judgment." This probation he tells us is to furnish them with such an opportunity for the formation and development of moral character, as will best prepare them to stand in the judgment. The reader need not be reminded that, as all Christians believe, there is no other name than that of Jesus under heaven, given among men by which we can be saved. Still these hun-
dreds of millions of immortal souls, have never heard nor is it likely ever will hear in this world, of him by whom alone salvation is possible! What then is their "opportunity" to believe and be saved?

5. We have hitherto spoken of probation as extending to the moment of our natural death. As Dr. Watts sang,

Life is the time to serve the Lord,
The time t' assure the great reward;  
And while the lamp holds out to burn,  
The vilest sinner may return.

But though all the advocates of probation agree that there can be no repentance and no salvation beyond the hour of death, others, more careful of the interests of morality and religion, take frequent occasion to remind us that we are not to count on its continuance even to that soon-coming moment. Dr. Pond tells us what revivalists frequently find singularly useful in their work, that "sinners often virtually finish their period of trial long before they leave this world. This is the case of those who have committed the unpardonable sin. This, too, is the case with the more numerous class, who have finally grieved away the Holy Spirit and are judicially abandoned of God. Such were a majority of the ten tribes of Israel in the days of the prophet Hosea." It is not true, then, as Dr. Watts teaches that

While the lamp holds out to burn  
The vilest sinner may return,

which is a doctrine fraught with all the mischievous consequences that are charged upon a future state of moral government and possible reformation. The interests of our fashionable religion require that this probationary state should be regarded as wholly arbitrary. God makes it long or short just as he pleases. He renders its conditions favorable or unfavorable; he closes it at his sovereign option, suddenly and without warning, or after many and protracted premonitions; he continues it to the end of bad men's lives, and terminates it with relatively good men suddenly and midway of their journey from the cradle to the grave. Our orthodox neighbors agree, however, in the belief that he never terminates this probation
to any soul that he wishes to save, till that salvation is attained. All his elect are certain to be brought in. Dr. Pond assures us that in the results of probation God "displays the sovereignty of his grace, showing that ' he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy and whom he will he hardeneth.'" And Dr. Emmons tells us plainly that "all the elect are brought, in this life, by the influences of the divine spirit, to repentance and faith."

6. Finally, while the advocates of this theory have much to say of forming and developing a character, and of being rewarded according to "the deeds done in the body," a very slight examination of its working will show that neither deeds nor character have much to do with our future destiny. The great question will be found to be, not how one has lived, but rather how he died. Here is a man who has led a life of sterling worth; industrious, honest, benevolent; the friend of all good causes and the promoter of every public interest. But he had no religion, that is, he belonged to no church, had never been converted, and died without giving evidence, beyond his upright life, of having made his peace with God. What is to become of him, is, under the doctrine of probation, no mystery. His next door neighbor lived a different life, formed a different character, and enjoys a different destiny. He was idle, irreligious, profane, and every way vicious; but on his death bed he was led to repentance and Christian faith, and without doubt is now in glory. What had life and character to do in the final conditions of these two men? How was the honest man rewarded and the vicious man punished? Is it not obvious that in the end, on this theory, "the deeds done in the body," are of very little account, and that this whole doctrine of probation, which assumes such imposing proportions in the outset, dwindles at last to a point and loses all practical significance?

We have thus exhibited some of the peculiarities of the doctrine of probation, and incidentally suggested some of the results to which it leads. But since it is always the end that crowns the work, and since the value of every form of govern-
ment, institution, or doctrine, must be determined by its practical working, and ultimate consequences, we wish to dwell a moment on the grand issues of probation, as it is held and its principles enforced by its advocates. A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, and we can not readily believe that the moral government of a wise and benevolent God, is to end in wide-spread and all but universal disaster and ruin.

Among intelligent Christians there is no difference of opinion, we suppose, in reference to the fact that Christ is the only Mediator between God and men, and that it is through him alone that we hope to be saved. And however the ultimate grounds of our acceptance with God may be explained, it still remains true that the sole condition of our salvation is faith in Christ, as the Son of God, and corresponding tempers and life. "By grace are ye saved through faith," says the Apostle. Without faith, then, there is no salvation; and this faith, we hardly need add, is a personal act, and never done by proxy. As Dr. Pond says, "the great question on which is suspended the eternal destiny of our souls, is one to be decided by ourselves. No other being in the universe can decide it for us." Repent and believe the gospel, is the old lesson, and is always new. It is what St. Paul preached, "testifying to both Jews and Greeks repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." Consider, then,

1. The condition and prospects of the heathen world to-day, under the light of this doctrine. That the heathen are sinners and need salvation no one denies. Yet they know neither God nor Christ. They have gods many and lords many, it may be, and still the apostle did not hesitate to say that they were without God — atheists — and without hope in the world. Thus in sin and ignorance they live and die. How then can they be saved? Obviously their salvation is impossible; and so orthodoxy constantly teaches. The American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, a few years ago, used the following language: "To send the gospel to the heathen is a work of great exigency. Within the last thirty years a whole generation of five hundred millions, for ought we can see in
their character, or in the word of God, have gone down to eternal death!" This estimate is now known to be altogether too low. It should have been seven hundred millions, and, including two hundred million Mahometans nine hundred millions, instead of five. China alone embraces four hundred millions; and contrasting our own country with that immense empire, the Rev. David Abeel, a returned missionary, said, "Here there are few to be saved; there crowds are lying in hopeless, helpless wretchedness. None of these are obliged to sink into hell—none of those, we fear, can rise to heaven. They know no Saviour." Dr. Pond also, to quote no more authorities, adopts the same opinion, demanded alike by his theory of probation, and his general scheme of religion. To the objection urged by some that the heathen at least ought to have an opportunity to hear the gospel and be made acquainted with the Saviour's love, before being sent to hell forever, the Doctor replies, "Whose fault is it that the heathen have not the gospel? Is God to blame in this matter? Or does the blame attach entirely to men?" Without stopping to discuss the cause of their ignorance, the fact is too patent to be called in question. If the fault is men's, it must in large degree be that of the Christian world. In the time of the apostles, while it is affirmed that "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," the question was still asked, "How, then, shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" But the Doctor adds, curiously enough, "The heathen are on probation to see, not whether they will embrace a Saviour, of whom they have no knowledge, but whether they will love and serve God, the evidence of whose existence and perfections shines out before them from the whole face of nature." We must beg the good Doctor's pardon, but neither his doctrine of probation, nor the gospel itself, proposes anything of the kind. Does he believe the heathen are to be saved without a Saviour? Is the gospel of Christ, then, become of no effect? The fact is, Dr. Pond himself is ashamed to maintain that a poor heathen is to be damned, for not believing in Christ, or
whom he never heard; and he, therefore, attempts to turn attention to another point which has nothing to do with the subject.

But passing all this, let it not be forgotten that according to the orthodox doctrine of probation, the heathen are inevitably lost! They exercise neither repentance toward God, nor faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. In this condition of impenitence and unbelief they live and die, and as there are no offers of grace beyond the grave, their case becomes absolutely hopeless. And thus has it been for more than eighteen centuries! If five hundred millions, to take this low estimate, "go down to eternal death every thirty years," our orthodox neighbors can easily calculate the magnitude of the host that has sunk into hell since the angels sang so mistakenly the glad tidings of a Saviour's birth.

2. As it has been with the heathen since the advent of Christ, so it must have been during the much longer period before his coming. Of all who lived and died during those four thousand years how small the number, who enjoyed the opportunity to prepare themselves to stand in the judgment! All the great empires of the ancient world—Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, etc., etc.—were wholly given to idolatry. They were ignorant of the true God, worshipped stocks and stones, and of the Saviour never so much as heard. They were wicked, impenitent, and utterly without saving faith. Can Dr. Pond suggest any possible way by which they could have been saved? Thus the pagan world, always making far the larger part of our race, from the earliest times to the present day, must be inevitably lost.

3. How has it been with the people of God? In all ages there have been some who knew his name and put their trust in him. In the earlier history of our race there were a few whose piety and obedience distinguished them in unbelieving and gainsaying generations. But after the seed of Abraham became a people,—the only people on the face of the earth who maintained the knowledge and worship of the one living and true God,—how many lapses they made, into how many
idolatries they fell, and how many of them perished under the just judgments of God. From that favored people, small as it was among the nations, we must therefore exclude great numbers as utterly unworthy of the grace of God, and wholly unprepared to stand in the judgment. Down to the birth of Christ the human family was little better than a ruin, and on orthodox principles, men seem to have been born only to be damned. Since that auspicious event the gospel has been operating like leaven, and the kingdom of God growing like a mustard seed, and now Christendom embraces, say, four hundred millions of souls, or perhaps something more. But let us not assume that all these millions are heirs of the kingdom. We need only to look over Christian lands to see that the work of redemption is by no means perfected, even in the most enlightened and virtuous portions of Christendom. Many are Christians only in name. Many hardly profess even to bear the Christian name. One half of Christendom is Papistical, in which the masses are deplorably ignorant and superstitious, and their lives hardly better than their education. On every hand there are multitudes to be converted and saved. It is not the heathen in foreign lands alone, who need the gospel, but every Christian country demands persistent evangelizing labors. And if there is no salvation beyond the grave, then, at the present hour a vast majority of the human race must be regarded in a condition absolutely hopeless.

4. But the saddest view we have to take, is that of infants dying in infancy. How large their number is, we hardly need say. Every neighborhood, almost every family, has occasion to note and to deplore the loss of little children. We have already quoted the remark of Dr. Emmons that one half of the human family die before they reach the age of eight years. And of these, very few, under the doctrine of probation, can be saved! They are born sinners, and deserve to be damned everlastinglgy. Their age and their ignorance forbid their properly repenting of their sin, or believing on Christ. They seem born to die, and die to be damned. We very well know how distasteful this doctrine is to our orthodox neighbors; but if
they will be consistent with themselves, and honestly follow out their own favorite theories, they will have the comfort of believing that all infants dying in infancy will be inevitably lost. Romanists now believe this of all unbaptized infants; and where do they learn that baptizing an infant, unconscious of the act or its meaning, works such a change in its nature or its state, as to convert an heir of hell into an heir of heaven? The Westminster Assembly met the difficulty by asserting that "elect infants" dying in infancy, are converted and saved by the Holy Spirit, "who worketh, when and where, and how he pleaseth." They might as well have said that elect infants are to be sanctified and saved in the world to come, since they are incapable of repentance or faith in this. Poor Dr. Pond is greatly exercised about them. "They are sinners," he says, "and need saving: and my hope is that by the washing of regeneration and sprinkling of the blood of Christ they will be found at last among the saved." We hope so, too, but we beg the Doctor not to be deluded by any glittering generalities, but to look at the case of dying infants, in the light of his own doctrines, and allow them to be damned as well as the heathen. Orthodoxy, Papist or Protestant, can not save them.

It would be amusing, were not the subject so grave, to hear Dr. Pond seriously talk of the riches of God's mercy in sparing our first parents, and providing a way in which he could put them and their posterity on "a new and better trial," and so affording them another opportunity of securing everlasting life. In point of fact it was hardly new, and as to its being better, it only amazes us that any one could pretend it. Our first parents, according to the Doctor and orthodoxy, were not only sinless but "perfectly holy." Yet we know how they were tempted and fell. Their posterity are born totally depraved, "made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil;" and still, according to the Doctor's theological dreaming, they are in a better condition to secure everlasting life, than our first parents were to enjoy it! So we suppose Dr. Pond would think a soldier, disarmed, crippled in every
limb, and utterly demoralized, better prepared to fight battles and win victories, than one with health and spirits, and in full panoply. But look at the results of this new and better trial, and tell us if it would not have been a thousand times better, upon his theory, if our first parents had perished on the day of their sin, and their posterity never existed. Why, he himself is overwhelmed by the mere thought of the measureless ruin entailed upon the human family by God's experiment of grace. "None, who believe that heaven is a holy place, and that without holiness no man shall see the Lord," says he, "can resist the conviction, in view of the present moral aspect of the world, that a vast majority of its adult inhabitants are not saved." The Doctor is indeed looking for better days, when the earth shall teem with people and all shall be taught of God; but he reminds us that "we must not indulge hopes relative to the salvation of men, in past ages or at the present time, which are forbidden alike by Scripture and by plain matters of fact." Even in the Christian world, according to Dr. Adam Clarke, "there are few who find the way to heaven; fewer yet who abide any time in it; fewer still who walk in it; and fewest of all who persever unto the end." In the hopes and guesses of these learned men, we are ready to exclaim, How happy infants, who die in infancy, and how blessed the men who shall be born in the millennial day when the knowledge of God shall cover the earth and "all shall be righteous!" Yet we somewhere read that God's ways are equal, and we hope in the end his ways will be seen to be alike wise and good to every child of Adam.

Before closing this article, already too long, we beg to call attention to the purely commercial character of probation, as generally held. Dr. Pond looks on our moral trial as one looks upon the trial of a horse, or a mowing machine he is proposing to purchase. "We sometimes take things into our possession on trial," says he, with a simplicity that is perfectly charming, "but we do not retain them till they are worn out and destroyed. We use them until they have been sufficiently proved, and then either return them, or make them perma-
ently our own." And God, he would have us infer, is dealing with his moral creatures as we do with a patent churn or rat trap. He tries us, and if we answer his purpose he keeps us, if not he gives us over to the eternal fire!

Whether this doctrine of probation helps our religious neighbors to a stable ground on which to rest the tremendous doctrine of endless punishment, we must leave our readers to decide. It seems to us that instead of solving any of the difficulties which gather about that formidable dogma, it presents far more of its own, than its friends and advocates have the power to explain or remove. We do not doubt the benevolent intentions of its advocates. They mean to promote the great interests of morality and religion, and only mistake the way. They think the world must be frightened into piety and the worship of God, and imagine the only means to make men true and good, is to appeal to their selfishness, and move them by hopes of happiness or fears of misery. What Christians this process turns out, the history of the Church for these last twelve or fifteen centuries will show.

In conclusion, let us say that we, too, believe in probation, but not precisely of the orthodox, commercial kind. We have thought that in the benign government of God, the probation of his moral creatures would not be altogether unlike that employed by a wise and good parent, who proposes to educate and train his children to knowledge and virtue; who, at once patient and just, makes their probation a discipline, and has no thought of ending it till the object he has in mind is attained. That God exhausts his resources for the salvation of his children in a human lifetime, and above all in the course of a few months or years, would be profane, if it were not ridiculous; and that he is about to order the circumstances of our future life so as to "confirm" the wicked in their wickedness, and thus perpetuate at once their rebellion and their punishment, as Dr. Poud believes, would be a refinement of malignity that would do honor to the Devil, but would disgrace any earthly parent, and is simply blasphemous when ascribed to God. The sinner's prayer, like that of unclean spirits in the
Gospel, and our Southern neighbors in their rebellion, always is, "Let us alone;" but the prayers of such persons are not heard. God will not let them alone. There is no peace to the wicked, and there never can be, till they turn from wickedness, and learn the wisdom of the just.

---

**GENERAL REVIEW.**


The phraseology here given is regarded as important in its relations to the question of human destiny, because of the use made of it by Paul in 2 Thess. i. 9: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." We have thought therefore that a few pages might be profitably devoted to an inquiry touching the origin and scriptural usage of these and similar forms of speech.¹

The expression "presence of God" and its equivalents are of frequent occurrence in the sacred text, with various shades of meaning. Sometimes it refers to that presence of God, or peculiar manifestation of himself, which belongs to the immortal state. "For Christ has entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix. Sometimes also it represents any display of Divine power, whether of mercy or judgment. "Even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of the Lord—for he cometh to judge [rule] the earth." 1 Chron. xvi. But the meaning with which we have specially to do in this article is the following:

**The manifestation of God's power and glory in the Temple at Jerusalem, and in its splendid ritual.**

The following passages will show the authority on which the Jews believed the presence and glory of God to be specially manifested in their tabernacle and temple. The directions are from God to Moses:

¹The substance of this article was printed many years ago, but its reproduction may help to show the advantage of making the Bible its own interpreter.
“Thou shalt make two cherubim of gold, in the two ends of the mercy-seat. And thou shalt put the mercy-seat above the ark, and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim, which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all the things which I will give thee in commandment with the children of Israel.” Exod. xxv. 18–22. So in the instructions respecting the morning and evening sacrifices. The Lord says, “This shall be a continual burnt-offering throughout your generations, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, before the Lord, where I will meet you, to speak there unto you. And there will I meet with the children of Israel, and the tabernacle shall be sanctified by my glory. . . And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and I will be their God.” Exod. xxix. 42–45. These passages show very clearly the origin of the Jewish belief respecting the presence and glory of God in the tabernacle, and their authority for such belief.

In perfect accordance with this, we are told that, at the dedication of the temple, which took the place of the tabernacle, “when the priests were come out of the holy place, . . . . The glory of the Lord filled the place.” 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. v. 14. The whole account of the dedicatory services is a continued commentary upon the phraseology in review. Hence we find that, from these public declarations of Jehovah in behalf of the tabernacle and temple, it came to be a fixed opinion, justified by the facts, and by the word of God, that the divine presence and glory were displayed in a special manner in the temple and its splendid rites, and that the Holy One dwelt peculiarly in the Holy of holies between the cherubim.

This truth appears constantly in the language of the Scriptures, and enters into the daily speech of the Jews. “The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble! He sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved.” Ps. xcix. “Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth.” Ps. lxxx. “Serve the Lord with gladness; come before his presence with singing.—enter into his courts with praise, and come before his presence with thanksgiving.” Ps. xcvi., c. So the Levites are said to “stand before the Lord.” Deut. xviii. 7. And in relation to the three annual festivals at which all the Jews were to visit Jerusalem and the temple, it is written, “Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God.” Exod. xxiii. 14–17. See also 2 Chron. xx. 8, 9. “Afterward he brought me to the gate that
looketh to the east; and behold the glory of the God of Israel,—the glory of the Lord came into the house. So the spirit took me up, and brought me into the inner court; and behold the glory of the Lord filled the house. And I heard Him speaking to me out of the house. And He said unto me, Son of man, the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I dwell in the midst of the children of Israel forever,” &c. Ezek. xliii. 1-7; also chap. x. 18, 19. So the Psalmist says, “My soul thirsteth for thee,—to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary.” Ixiii. And in like manner Christ says, “Whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by Him that dwelleth therein.” Matt. xxiii. 21. And in John ii. 16, he calls the temple “my Father’s house.”

These passages are sufficient to show the common speech of the Jews respecting the presence of God, and the glory of his power, in their temple. A single passage from Josephus will illustrate the familiar manner in which the strongest phraseology was used in common language and records in regard to this subject. Speaking of the great wickedness of the Jews, he says, “For this reason, it seems to me, that God, detesting their impiety, forsook our city, and not esteeming the temple any longer a pure habitation for him, brought the Romans against us,” &c.²

It was the firm belief of the Jews that God’s presence and glory were in the temple of Jerusalem, which led them, always when they prayed, to turn toward it. Hence Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the temple: “If thy people go out to battle, or are captives, and turn unto thee with all their heart, and pray unto thee toward the land which thou gavest unto their fathers, and toward the city which thou hast chosen, and toward the house which I have built for thy name,” &c. 1 Kings viii. 44, 48. Accordingly we are told that Daniel, when he “knew that the writing was signed, went into his house, and his windows being opened in his chamber towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees and prayed.” Dan. vi. 10.

And even to this day, so strong is the feeling that God is present in Judea and Jerusalem as he is present in no other place, that the same custom prevails among the modern Jews. Jowett, in his Researches, has given us a touching and beautiful illustration of this practice. Speaking of an aged Jew with whom he tarried at Tiberias, he says: “Towards evening we witnessed the scene of his whole household performing prayers. It was very affecting at one place, to

²Antiq. B. xx. chap. viii. 6.
see them turning their faces towards Jerusalem, bowing and lifting up their voices in fervent petition."

Having ascertained that the presence of the Lord and his glory were displayed in the temple, and in its magnificent and solemn services were peculiarly manifested to the people, we shall readily understand what is meant by being banished from his presence and the glory of his power. It was considered a great evil, a serious calamity, to be driven from the worship of God, to be deprived of the privileges of the temple service. Hence the Psalmist says, "Cast me not away from thy presence," li. 11; that is, says Dr. Clarke, "Banish me not from Thy house and ordinances." 4

Hence the phrases "punished from the presence of the Lord," "cast out from the presence of God," "banished from the glory of his power," &c., came to be applied to the judgments inflicted by God upon the Jews, especially to those great destructions which resulted in the overthrow of the city and temple and the breaking up of the ceremonial service, where the presence and glory of God were particularly displayed. In relation to the oppressions of Hazael, king of Syria, it is recorded, "And the Lord was gracious unto them . . . and would not destroy them, neither cast he them from his presence as yet." 2 Kings xiii. 23; Jer. lii. 3. In chapter xxiv. 20, we have the following: "For through the anger of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon."

Here the casting out from the presence of God refers to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the burning of the temple, the abolition of the ceremonial worship, and the carrying of the Jews into captivity at Babylon, all which is described in the next chapter. So what is meant here by the presence of the Lord, and being banished from it with destruction, is obvious enough, and is in perfect keeping with the common use of the phraseology among the Jewish people.

In a prophecy which is supposed by some to foretell the second destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by the Romans, and the final breaking up and removal of the ceremonial worship, we find the fol-

4 Christians have adopted similar phraseology in their worship. Ministers frequently open their prayers with such expressions as "We enter thy presence," "all who are in divine presence," &c., which seem to be of Jewish origin, and to have grown out of the fact that God's presence was especially in the temple, and that in entering the temple, therefore, they entered more immediately into his presence.
lowing graphic language: "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence, and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." Jer. xxiii. 39, 40. The exact value and import of the phraseology here are too clear and intelligible to require anything in the way of exposition. The city, as we know, was forsaken and destroyed, and the Jews are still suffering the "everlasting reproach" and "perpetual shame" brought upon them in judgment for their sins.

Alluding to the same event, which was approaching at the time he wrote, the apostle says they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i. 9. Here the apostle, as the servant of God, repeats the announcement of judgment, which God, by the prophet, declared directly, in the first person. He employs the same sort of phraseology, the signification of which was perfectly familiar to the Jews, from the constant use made of it in their sacred writings; and sets forth that they will be punished by the ruin of their city, the destruction of the temple, the entire abolition of its ordinances and ritual, and the rejection of their nation as a chosen people, and the scattering of it abroad in bondage, degradation, and suffering.

Though the object of this article is only to inquire into the origin and usage of the phraseology under examination, it may be proper to consider one or two objections to the application of the last passage quoted. It may be asked: "What had this destruction to do with the church at Thessalonica? What interest could the Christians of this city have in the overthrow and ruin of the Jewish nation and religion? How could the judgment so affect them, that Paul should find it necessary to mention it in writing to them?" In reply to these questions, justly asked, note,

1st. The Thessalonian Christians were suffering persecutions, and the apostle seeks to comfort them with the assurance that their persecutors will soon be deprived of the power to injure them, inasmuch as the time of their own judgment is at hand. See the language of the context, (vs. 3–10), "patience and faith in all your persecutions which ye endure;" "which ye also suffer;" "them that trouble you;" "you who are troubled," &c.

2d. The Jews were the leaders in these, as in all other, persecutions; active themselves, and stirring up the Gentiles. See Acta xvii. where we are told that Paul and Silas preached at Thessalonica.
and many believed, “But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city in an uproar,” &c. And when the apostles departed to Berea, and by their preaching converted many, we are told that “the Jews of Thessalonica came thither also, and stirred up the people.”* xvii. 11–13. This testimony shows clearly enough who were the persecutors of the Christians of Thessalonica, and who Paul means when he says they “shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,” &c.

3d. The apostle, as we have said, encourages the suffering Christians with the assurance that the power of their persecutors would soon be destroyed, while they would have rest, insomuch as these persecutors, the Jews, would be wholly occupied with their own calamities and sufferings, when the Lord Jesus should be revealed in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them for their wickedness and cruelty. Now if this refers to their destruction some thousands of years hence, in the future world, what comfort could it be to the Christians under the persecutions they were then suffering? What evidence that those persecutions would soon end, and they have rest?

But if applied to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and the bringing the whole Jewish people (who, wherever they were, acted as one man) under the vengeance of the Roman government, we see at once the point and propriety of the apostle’s language. The Jews would then surely have trouble enough of their own, without troubling the Christians. Punished with destruction from the glorious presence of the Lord; in other words, their temple demolished, deprived of its ordinances and splendid worship, and more than a million of the people destroyed, those who survived would be sufficiently occupied in mourning over their own desolation, without persecuting others.

4th. The correspondence of the language of the apostle, in other particulars, with portions of Scripture allowed to be descriptive of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and the banishment of the Jews from God’s presence as there displayed. The coming “with mighty angels,” Matt. xvi. 27, 28; “revealed from heaven,” Luke xvii. 30, 31; Matt. xxiv. 30, 31; “tribulation” and “vengeance,” Matt. xxiv. 21; Luke xxi. 20–24, &c.

* See them also engaged in the same business at Antioch, Acts xiii.; at Iconium and Lystra, xiv.; at Corinth, xviii.; and at Ephesus, xix. Note also how the Jews of Jerusalem hunted Paul, following him from place to place, and accusing him before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa, xxiv–xxvi.
5th. Any difficulty founded on the "everlasting destruction" of the
apostle, may be removed by reference to the "everlasting reproach" and
"perpetual shame" of the prophet, when speaking of the same
event. Jer. xxiii. 40. Both refer to judgments inflicted in the earth, and
both are bounded by the declaration of the apostle himself, that
when "the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, all Israel shall be saved:
as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall
turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is my covenant unto them
when I shall take away their sins." Rom. xi. The extent of mean-
ing given to the term "everlasting," and similar phraseology, may be
further illustrated by another passage quoted above from Ezekiel xliii.
where God says he "will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel
forever." Yet he has long ago ceased to dwell in their midst; and,
as we have seen, deserted and destroyed their city and temple, and
cast them out from his presence! — showing beyond dispute that the
terms "everlasting," "eternal," "forever," etc., are not to be under-
stood in the sense of endless, otherwise the word and promise of God
fail of fulfilment!

This, then, is the sum of our inquiry into the meaning and usage of
the phraseology in review, under the third head. God, in the begin-
ning of the Law dispensation, promised to meet his servants at the
mercy-seat, in the place of his worship; to manifest his presence and
glory in the temple and its imposing service, and even to dwell in the
midst of the children of Israel forever. The Jewish people, in conse-
quence of this promise of God, and its actual fulfilment in the display
of his presence and glory thenceforth, were accustomed familiarly to
speak of Him as being present there in his glorious power and majesty,
of his dwelling between the cherubim, etc. And, when engaged in
the services of the sanctuary, they called it entering into his presence;
and to be deprived of the privileges of his house and ordinances, was
to be cast out of his presence and glory. And this form of expres-
sion we find specially applied to the judgments which resulted in the
destruction of the holy city, and temple, and hundreds of thousands
of the people, by Nebuchadnezzar and the Romans; and the scatter-
ing of the rest abroad over the earth captives and slaves. Truly, by
these judgments they were cast out and punished from the presence
of the Lord and the glory of his power, brought into everlasting de-
struction and reproach, and the word of God fulfilled to the uttermost
in the recompense of their iniquities.
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Ancient Roman Paganism and Christianity.

The first volume of a work which promises to be of great value and interest to Christian scholars and students, has recently appeared in Paris with the title of La Religion Romaine, d'Auguste aux Antonins. Par Gaston Boissier—"The Religion of Rome, from Augustus to the Antonines." It is warmly praised by Pessessé in the Revue Chrétienne, and, judging from some extracts from the work in the "Christian Quarterly," we think the praise well bestowed. We have not room for passages discussing the general subject treated, but we give place to a few paragraphs bearing directly on the title we have given to this article.

The author says in his Preface that one who should suddenly pass from a study of Cicero to those of Marcus Aurelius, would find himself in a new world. In two centuries Roman society is entirely changed from unbelief to devotion. While religion has little or no place in the epistles which the great Roman orator and his friends write to each other, those of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, and his teacher, abound in religious sentiments, the name of some god or other occurring at almost every line. What then has happened during this interval, that can explain the change? What events and what influences have urged Rome into this new way of thinking and feeling? By what steps did it come up from unbelief to religious faith? In the days of Cicero and Augustus it was generally regarded as an established fact that the philosophers did not believe in the gods; but in the time of the Antonines, in the second century of Christianity, the philosophers are almost all believers, and even superstitious. Marcus Aurelius thanks the gods with great fervency that they had communicated to him in his dreams efficacious remedies for his maladies! Now whence this change? What has brought about this revolution among the educated classes? These are the questions which our author undertakes to answer.

In discussing the belief of the ancient Romans in a life beyond death, we have the following passage, somewhat in conflict with the theory that the moral and religious elements are the product of development and education,

"The belief that life continues after death is not one of those that grow up late with a people, and which are the fruit of study and reflection. The ancients had remarked that on the contrary this belief seemed more profoundly rooted among certain barbarous nations.
The Gauls, for example, hesitated not to lend money on the single condition that it should be repaid to them in the other life; so certain were they of meeting again there! Nor did the Romans wait to know Pythagoras and Plato, to be assured that man does not die altogether. Cicero tells us that however far we ascend Roman history, we shall always find traces of this belief; that it existed already when the most ancient civil and religious regulations were enacted, and that without it we could not understand the ceremonies at funerals, and the prescribed rule of the pontiffs concerning tombs. The origin of it is the same in all countries: It is born everywhere from the repugnance which men feel to the idea of absolute annihilation. It is, therefore, at first but an instinct—an invincible instinct—which other reasons afterward do not fail to fortify."

A good deal has been written in regard to the broad and catholic toleration of ancient Rome toward all foreign religions; and Gibbon, as our readers know, speaks of this in strong language, and improves the opportunity to make a comparison, emphasized with his usual sneer, between the hospitable charity with which Rome welcomed within her walls the gods and worship of conquered nations, and the narrow bigotry and intolerant spirit with which the Christians rejected and denounced all gods and religions but their own. On this head we have the following from Boissier's book:

"The Romans took great care not to destroy the temples, nor to proscribe the gods of the conquered nations. And it was not only through moderation that they acted thus; their religious scruples made it their duty to do so. The gods, if they maltreated them, might do them injury. Doubtless they regarded them as inferior to those of Rome, since their help did not save the people that had placed itself under their protection; but they still might become dangerous if driven to extremities, and prudence counselled that they should be respectfully treated. During the siege of Veii the Romans conceived great respect for Juno Regina, guardian of the besieged city, and who had enabled her worshippers to resist the power of Rome for ten years. Livy relates that, after the city was taken, some of the victors approaching reverently the statue of the goddess, asked her if she was willing to follow them, and, as she seemed to make a sign of consent, she was joyfully taken to Rome."

We come now to consider the reasons for excluding from this general tolerance the religions of Moses and Jesus; or rather, to state it more correctly, to inquire into the causes which led the Roman government and people to persecute the Jews and Christians. The extract given below does not state the case as fully as we could wish, and so we enlarge a little.
The Jews and Christians believing in the one only living and true God, who is a Spirit, and to be worshipped in spirit and truth, could not take part in the popular festivals in which sacrifices were made to the national gods, and praises chanted to them for benefits bestowed. They could not enter the temples and join their fellow citizens in offerings made to their deities. They could have no part in their idolatries, and so on all occasions of public rejoicing when the temples were crowded, and the idols were decorated and the gods honored and glorified, they stood apart from the multitude, from their friends, and even from their own kindred and families who remained in the bonds of heathenism. They refused to join in the festivities. They brought no offerings; they would not cast even a few grains of incense into the fires burning on the public altars, but freely expressed their horror and hatred of these pagan abominations.

All this of course attracted the attention of the multitude, and especially of the priests and magistrates, and excited their wonder, their suspicion and dislike. It seemed to them a want both of piety and patriotism. They counted the Christians as a cold, sullen, undevout, unbelieving, and perhaps treasonable and dangerous people. These suspicions gradually spread among the people, became the subject of common remark, were commented upon with severity and bitter feeling, and by and by attracted the serious attention of the government.

At first the imperial powers were disposed to treat Judaism and Christianity with the usual tolerance, to place them on the same footing with other “foreign superstitions”; but this was a proposition which neither Jews nor Christians would accept. They admitted no equality between the gods of the Gentiles and the God of Moses and Jesus; and they refused with scorn the pagan hospitality which would welcome Him to the Pantheon. The Lord Jehovah was the one and only God — the gods of Rome were idols, demons, devils! Hence the wrath of Rome, the final exclusion of the Law and the Gospel from the legal religions and worship, and the savage persecutions of their believers. But we trespass here upon the extract which we proposed giving from M. Bossier’s book. After speaking of the policy by which Rome had made herself the home of all the gods and religions of the earth, the religious as well as political center and capital of the world, he says:

“Two religions alone were excluded from this accord that had been established between all the others — Judaism and Christianity. The fathers of the Church seemed very much surprised at this exception,
and bitterly complained of it. It is nevertheless easily understood. We have seen that it was by making mutual concessions that all these religions were able to live in harmony. The Jews and Christians alone, by the nature of their faith, could not accept this compromise. As they kept themselves outside of this common good understanding, they had no share in the general tolerance. It can nevertheless be said that peace was offered them on the same conditions as to the others, and that the pagans made the first advances to a good understanding with them. When they understood the religion of the Jews, they were struck with meeting a religion that believed in one God alone, and worshipped him without images; but, faithful to their habit of finding again everywhere their own gods in all the divinities of the foreigners, they thought they recognized in Jehovah, either Jupiter or Bacchus. It was a manner of attaching this new worship to their religion; from that day forth they did not scruple to borrow from it its usages. 'There is no longer any city,' said Josephus, 'among the Greeks and the barbarians, there is no longer in the world any nation where the rest of the seventh day is not respected, where lamps are not lighted to the honor of God, and that does not observe the fasts and the abstinences commanded among us.' The religion of the Jews, if they had desired it, could, therefore, have been received into the Roman religion on the same condition as those of Egypt and of Syria; their chapels would have been freely opened in the city, the great lords of Rome would have come to pray there, without abandoning for that their own beliefs; the emperors themselves would have figured in their feasts, as they were seen afterward present at those of Isis and of Cybele.

'There was among the Jews a party that would not have been grieved at it. It was composed of those who were acquainted with Greek culture; who were delighted with it, and desired to have a part in it. Herod notably gave himself a good deal of trouble to put an end to this isolation of the Jews, and to unite them to the rest of the world. He built in Cesarea theatres and sanctuaries in honor of Augustus; he had constructed at his expense the temple of Apollo, at Delphi, and contributed money for the celebration of the Olympic games. In Jerusalem itself he wished to accustom the Jews to the habits of other nations, and contrary to the prescriptions of the law, he placed a golden eagle over the gate of the temple. This eagle disappeared in a popular tumult. The obstinacy of this people in repelling the religious faiths of foreigners, in keeping its own without admixture, and in saying that their faith alone was true, caused at first a great surprise, and excited afterward against them a furious anger in the Greek and Roman world. The Jews were denounced everywhere as an impious race, who regarded it a glory to despise the gods, and terrible persecutions broke out against them. The inhabitants of Antioch burned all who refused to abjure their faith; fifty thousand of them were killed at Alexandria, and ten thousand at Damascus.
"The Christians were treated like the Jews, and for the same reasons. . . . Efforts were made, in process of time, to induce the Christian God to come to a good understanding with the others. The oracle of Apollo even affected to eulogize him; and the philosopher, Porphyry, although a zealous pagan, made no difficulty of recognizing the divinity of Christ. We know that Alexander Severus had his statue placed by the side of Orpheus and Apollonius in his private chapel, whither he went every morning to pray to his Lares. But this intermixture excited horror among the Christians. . . . The objection against the Christians was not that they were introducing a new god into Rome—that had been done for two centuries—but the amazement and astonishment was, that their God refused to take his place among the rest in the vast pantheon where they had been united."

The two or three citations we have given will furnish our readers a taste of the work, which Pressensé pronounces "one of the most remarkable that have honored French science for many years"—remarkable for the study of original authorities, for its use of discoveries among contemporaneous inscriptions, for sound and extensive erudition, and for its thorough survey of the whole field of inquiry. It is to be hoped that some of our enterprising publishers will give us an English translation.

"I Myself."

Every one has a sense of individuality, a personal consciousness, a living unalterable memory of self, which survives even the loss of ordinary intellectual memory, and the destruction of reason itself.

This "I myself" holds itself apart from these changes and accidents; it stands behind memory, and reason, and all the ordinary operations of the mind, and regrets the loss and derangement of these; and labors to repair the injury, and restore them to order and action. It uses these as servants or agents for executing its purposes, or doing its biding; but it is outside and above them, and is never entangled with them, never in danger of confounding itself with them, or losing its identity or distinct individuality.

1st. This self-hood, or personality, is independent of the regular action of the mental faculties, independent of the will, the emotions and impulses.

We shall pay no attention to the distribution by metaphysical writers of man's faculties and attributes into passions, sentiments, will, &c.; but, avoiding the niceties of mere speculation, we shall speak of
what lies within the experience of all who have taken any note of the processes of their own physical and mental constitutions.

For example: I resolve, for a certain reason, to extend my right arm. I have only to act on this resolution, or, as some would phrase it, I have only to will to extend my arm; and, if it is in a healthy condition, if the magnetic battery of the brain, and the wires or nerves of the arm, are all in working order, the act is accomplished, and the arm is extended.

But it will be said, perhaps, This is only an act of the will. Well, what light is thrown upon the subject by this statement? How much more is understood than before? Has the will any individuality, or personality separate from the other intellectual faculties? If it has not then nothing is gained, no new principle is evolved, by saying the extending of my arm is an act of the will. If it has, then it is the same thing which we call the Self; under another name.

But suppose we allow the expression, or the word "will," all the force claimed for it; even then it does not affect our argument. A close thinker, say, the most careless in the use of language, when his attention is called to it, will readily discover the distinction we are endeavoring to illustrate. Look at the phrases, "I will to extend my hand," "it is only an act of your will," &c. Analyzing the sentences, we find three separate elements. The arm, the will, and the "I"; and it is plain enough that the "I myself" is not confounded with the will, any more than with the arm. We see at once that the will, if anything different from "I myself," is only the agent which it employs to extend the arm, or the instrument through which it operates upon the nerves and muscles. And the objection itself unconsciously makes the same distinction — "it is only an act of your will." Who is this "your," that is the owner of the will? How obvious the distinction between the will and the personality of the power which directs it. The will may constitute a part of this personality, as a private is part of a regiment, or a corps part of the grand army; but it is subject to the commander-in-chief, the Self, who is above all, and over all.

The same distinction is seen in another direction: Who has not driven from him disagreeable thoughts, or unpleasant memories, when making an effort to this end? Every man knows the success with which the attempt is made; and having done it, the close observer of this phenomenon asks what it is that thus, at will, lords it over the mind, and dictates to it what guests it shall entertain, and what it
shall dismiss. What is this royal power, throned above our thoughts and imaginations, which, with such unhesitating self-confidence, says to this troublesome memory, "Vanish," and to that pleasing thought, "Come," and straightway is obeyed?

Illustrative of the same fact, is the well-known and common circumstance of forbidding or silencing thought when we desire to give reserve to mind and body. We lie awake after retiring — the body is worn with toil, the mind tired and fatigued with much study and thought — they need rest — but the mind still keeps at work, thought is still busy with the labor of the day. We feel that it is weary and needs the refreshment of sleep — and at last, refusing to indulge it longer, this inner power, this "I myself," either directly commands it to desist — or else in a milder mood, lures the thoughts in another direction, calls them into an easier and pleasanter path, and at last cheats mind and body into slumber; and then leaves them to rest, and to gather new vigor for the labors of the coming day.

Sometimes this master of the mind, when there is much work for it, fixes the hour for its return to duty. Before it falls to sleep, it whispers to it, "I shall wake you early on the morrow;" or else it issues its orders for it to be up and doing at such an hour in the morning; and the obedient mind, however weary, and even sometimes with murmuring, is forced to break from its slumbers, and address itself to its task.

Surely these familiar facts show a distinction between the mind, the thought, and the despotic authority which rules and directs it.

Displaying the same relation and distinction, though looking in an opposite direction, is the manner in which this invisible ruler drives the mind and body into action. Consider the devoted and ambitious student, who bends to his task from month to month, from year to year, in spite of the often warning of his flagging and over-worked faculties. How despotic here is the sway of this master of the mind and of the physical organization. Yielding to the pressure of the burden laid upon them, slowly sinking under incessant toil, protesting against it, moaning and complaining continually — yet this invisible tyrant, seated on his throne within, drives them up to the labor with unsparing severity, — nay, drags them to it, and forces them to minister to its will and wish; until, crushed in the toil and struggle, they finally sink.

A striking, and mournful, illustration of this fact, is furnished us by the later history of Walter Scott. With what almost awful relief
and distinctness, in this case, does the "I myself," as the supreme power, stand out from the overtasked and complaining intellect. And how the noble faculties put themselves to the work assigned them—with what cheerfulness and courage; till at last overpowered by their superhuman efforts, and still driven and goaded on by the remorseless tyrant within, they fell down paralyzed, and passed into the sleep of death!

Now, as we have before said, call this invisible essence, this strange power, by any name that may please us, the fact of its existence is indisputable; and equally indisputable is the fact of its independence of the mental faculties and operations, as a distinct, indivisible unity and personality. It is something more than the mind, and master of it—this spirit that is in man. It never confines itself with our mental operations or thoughts, but directs and controls these, excites and, checks, awakes and puts to sleep, as it pleases. It never wearies with its labor of direction and supervision. It never changes, or loses its personal character; but, free from all the accidents and revolutions of mind, and of the machinery through which it acts, when this fails, it impatiently flings aside the obstruction, appropriates all there is enduring in mind, and rises into a higher and broader sphere of life and action.

2d. This personality of the spirit that is in man, this unchangeable identity or consciousness of an unalterable self, is also independent of the irregular action of the mental faculties; or of the derangement of the mind, and the loss of reason. This is the necessary consequent of the first position when clearly established.

Insane people sometimes reveal the fact in their expressed consciousness of the disorder of their intellect; and their regret, and even shame, that they are not able properly to connect their thoughts and words. Beside this the internal light gleams out from various other quarters, and shows the separation of the inner self from the derangement of the mental faculties, and the confusion of thought and speech.

We often see insane persons making vigorous and protracted efforts to regulate their minds, to direct their action in obedience to what is seen to be right, and to bring their confused thoughts into order and harmonious connection. So we see them striving to conceal their insanity, and for a considerable length of time successfully keeping it out of sight; and so carefully controlling the disordered faculties or faculty, as to escape detection from the most practised and scientific observers. There are many such cases on record.
Lord Erskine relates the story of an insane man who brought an action against his physician for confining him without cause. He was rigidly examined by counsel, and yet exhibited not the slightest sign of derangement. But a gentleman present, knowing his case, suddenly questioned him about an imaginary princess with whom he corresponded in cherry juice; and the disordered faculties regained the mastery, and he became instantly insane and wild. This case was tried again in London, in consequence of some technicality, and in the second trial the lunatic, remembering his former failure, "kept himself tight," to use his own expression; and no ingenuity of cross-questioning could make him commit himself, or elicit the least evidence of insanity!

Now what was this that stood behind the disordered mind, and compelled it into duty? What was this ruling power that, bewildered as thought and reason were, still could, at word of command, bring them into rank, as soldiers accustomed to obey? Confessedly, after all that may be said, we have a power here of which the mind is not the whole, something unaffected by its derangement or incapacity; something above it, which has no part in its accidents and disorder, and acts independently of its influence and its condition. Else what is it that, seeing the confusion and mistakes of the mental operations, steps in to prevent the one, and correct the other? The mind, so called, is itself deranged, is beside itself; but this power that lies in behind it, is perfectly self-possessed, and endeavors to aid the mind to correct or conceal its irregularities. It sees the difficulties of the disordered faculties, and knows how to remedy or avoid them. And when the trial is over, speaks in its own personal dialect, and says, "I held myself tight." Who is this "I," "myself" so careful not to be caught in the cross examination?

Nothing can more clearly illustrate the fact, that there is that within us which never changes, never loses its power or its individuality of life and action — something which is alike above, and independent of, the regularity and the derangement of the mental operations — something which uses the mind, when in a healthy condition, as its servant or instrument; and helps to control and direct it when diseased and bewildered. This something is the Spirit, the Self, of which the Intellect may be a part, but not all; the servant, but not the Master. This it is that constitutes the unalterable identity of life in this world, and in all worlds. This it is which no accident can harm, no sickness nor suffering weaken — which asserts independent existence in the face of
physical derangement, and disordered intellect. This it is which
triumphs over Death, and has no part in the grave—which, when
the body sinks and perishes beneath the terrible power of disease,
rises out of the shattered and helpless wreck, uninjured, in the fresh-
ness of immortal vigor.

The Old Synagogue Service.

We have been much interested in the following recent account of
the "old" service of the Jewish Synagogue. We mean by old what
was probably the ancient form or manner of conducting the service in
the time of Christ, in distinction from the present or "reformed"
method or ritual. The synagogue service of to-day has been modified
and changed, in some cases unconsciously perhaps in the lapse of ages,
in others intentionally with a view to "reform," or for the purpose of
adapting it, in unessential forms, to the spirit of the age. This is es-
pecially the case in our own country. But there is in New York an
old or " unreformed" Synagogue, where, it is supposed, the service is
still conducted after the ancient order. A correspondent of the "Lib-
eral Christian" recently visited this, and has given the account quoted
below of the singularly free, familiar and seemingly informal way of
conducting the services. It may be added that every man on enter-
ing put on a scarf or shawl, white or light colored, with black or blue
stripes, and silk or embroidered neckpieces; reminding one of the
regalia worn by Masons and Odd Fellows during the Lodge sessions.

Through a considerable portion of the service there was more or
less walking about and talking, but toward the close any violation of
order was immediately rebuked "by the President of the Synagogue,
who paced the aisles in an independent way, smiled greetings to
friends, frequently mounted the platform to perform some office and
then descended to the floor again, doing this perhaps fifty times in all,
and acted as general master of ceremonies, summoning different mem-
bers to take part in the services as occasion required."

"The Rabbi was clad in a black robe, with the light scarf about his
shoulders, and a cap on his head. He officiated standing or bending
before a spacious desk, his back always turned to the congregation.
There was no choir, but responses were frequent and sometimes long,
waning in strength and volume as the service neared its close. Some-
times all stood, and swayed to and fro as they responded, as if each
man were saying to his neighbor, in the language of Scripture, 'Know
the Lord!' The familiar words ' Adonai,' ' Osanna,' ' Israel,' could
be distinguished amidst the din of voices. Indeed, the people largely shared the service, as they ought. This alone must attach the Orthodox Hebrews to their rites more than the Reformed, who leave the service more to the minister. We enjoy and love where we share the work.

The services, lasting at least two hours, were grouped about the reading of the Law and Prophets. Laymen pushed aside the curtain, rolled away the slides, and the Rabbi brought the sacred roll down to the desk. He then took his seat on one side, while a group of men gathered about the desk, their backs to the people, and read from the roll. The elders offered it, and one pointed with a big silver bodkin while another read. There were many separate readings. Between them, the Master of Ceremonies would go to the desk and hold animated and loud conversation, he doing nearly all the talking, with the cluster of inspectors, and then another member would come from the audience and the roll would be reopened. The new comer would begin the recital, but an old man always continued it. Was he the Reader? It is something of a feat to read the Hebrew without the vowel points, as these rolls are written. Meanwhile, the Master of Ceremonies would stroll about the house, bidding members to the next reading, till it was time for him to return to the desk for a new colloquy. Several times I supposed the reading was done, but each time it was renewed, and the silver pin pointed the words for a fresh reader.

"Meanwhile, the Rabbi had not been perfectly quiet. Friends greeted him. He rearranged his scarf. He beckoned to somebody in the pews, and nobody could tell what or whom he wanted, till at last a boy carried him a book. It is an instance of the homeliness of the whole service that the Reader, wishing a pinch of stuff, another old gentleman in the pews went forward and proffered his box while the rolls were being opened for the next reading. At last the perusal of Moses and the Prophets was really done. The parchment roll was carefully re-covered, the silver tinkling ornaments were replaced upon the sticks, and it was carried solemnly back to its sanctuary behind the platform by the Rabbi, who then resumed the service of chant. He prayed for President Grant and others in authority. He waited; he extolled. Once more the director brought narrower scarfs from the platform and handed them to certain younger men, who opened the alcoe of the Scriptures once again, while blessings were pronounced, and then closed its doors for the day. There was no sermon. Worshippers began rolling up their scarfs into bundles and preparing for departure, meanwhile responding louder than ever. Abruptly the ritual terminated, and there was a general stampede, while the Rabbi was hastily divesting himself of his robes of office. Very social the men were among themselves. The women came quietly down from the gallery and joined their lords in the street.

"Of one Scripture scene the beholder was naturally reminded. Jesus went into the Nazareth synagogue on a Sabbath day. He stood
up to read in his turn. The president of the synagogue—for in this account minister does not mean rabbi or preacher, but director or ruler—opened to Isaiah. Jesus read, returned the book, and sat down; but as they looked to him for a speech, he told them of himself and his Messiahship, and they were angry and drove him away when he made the Gospel of Isaiah a message of to-day."

_The Brahmin and the Bible._

SOMETIME since Dr. J. Chamberlin, a missionary from Southern India, related the following interesting and very suggestive incident. He had delivered a lecture in one of the villages, which was listened to by an audience of nearly two hundred natives, Brahmns, students, merchants, artisans, and officials of various sorts. When he had finished, and was about leaving, a Brahmin, one of the most learned in the place, arose and asked permission to say a word; which was of course readily granted, without knowing whether his purpose was to condemn or approve. Greatly to the surprise of the missionary, "in a neat address of ten or fifteen minutes, couched in choice and ornate language, and with apt illustrations," he urged his hearers to aid in every way the efforts the Doctor was making for their moral and intellectual advancement.

We give below an example of the felicitous manner in which he uttered his thought. Our readers will be pleased to see what will so forcibly remind them of the Scripture parables, which method of teaching is still current in the East, while at the same time it shows the remarkable candor of the man, and the growing influence of the Bible and Christianity in the realm of heathendom, even when shorn of half its power by the theological errors of those who teach it. The acknowledgments of the Brahmin will also discover to us the methods of missionary work, which, it will be seen, is not only preaching and praying, but a wise and faithful devotion to the sweet charities and humanities of the Sermon on the Mount:

"Behold that mango tree on yonder roadside. Its fruit is fast approaching to ripeness. Bears it that fruit for itself or its own profit? From the moment the first ripe fruits turn their yellow sides towards the morning sun, until the last mango is pelted off, it is assailed with showers of sticks and stones from boys and men, and every passer-by, until it stands bereft of leaves, with branches knocked off and bleeding from many a broken twig, Piles of stones underneath, and clubs and sticks lodged in its boughs are the only trophies of its joyous crop of fruit. Is it discouraged? Does it cease to bear fruit? Does it
say, if I am barren, nobody will pelt me, and I shall live in peace? Not at all; the next season the budding leaves, the beauteous flowers, the tender fruit again appear. Again it is pelted, and broken, and wounded, but it goes on bearing, and children's children pelt its branches and enjoy its fruit.

"That is a type of these missionaries. I have watched them well, and seen what they are. What do they come to this country for? What tempts them to leave their parents, friends, and country, and come to this, to them, unhealthy climate? Is it for gain or profit? Some of us country clerks in government offices receive more salary than they! Is it for the sake of an easy life! See how they work, and then tell me. No! They seek, like the mango tree, to bear fruit for the benefit of others, and that though treated with contumely and abuse from those they are benefiting.

"Now, look at the missionary. He came here a few years ago, leaving all and seeking only our good. He was met with cold looks and suspicious glances, and shunned, and avoided, and maligne. He sought to talk with us of what he told us was the matter of most importance in heaven or earth, and we would not listen. Was he discouraged? He started a dispensary, and we said, 'Let the Parsees take his medicines, we won't;' but in the times of sickness and distress we had to go to him, and he healed us. We complained if he walked through our Brahmin streets, but when our wives and daughters were sick and in anguish we went and begged him to come into our inner apartments, and he came, and our daughters and wives now smile upon us in health. Has he made any money by it? Even the cost of the medicines has not been returned to him! And, now, in spite of our opposition, he has bought this site and built this beautiful room, and furnished it with the choicest lore in many languages, and put into it newspapers and periodicals which were inaccessible to us before; he has placed here tables to write on, chairs to sit on, and lamps for us to read by. And what does he get for all this? Does he make money by it? Why, we don't even pay for the lamp oil consumed by night as we read. Now, what is it that makes him do all this for us? It is his Bible. I have looked into it a good deal, at one time and another, in the different languages I know; it is just the same in all languages. The Bible — there is nothing to compare with it in all our sacred books, for goodness and purity, and holiness and love, and for motives of actions. Where did the English-speaking people get all their intelligence and energy, and cleverness and power? It is their Bible that gives it to them. And now they bring it to us and say 'This is what raised us; take it, and raise yourselves.' They do not force it upon us, as the Mohammedans used to their Koran, but they bring it in love, and translate it into our language, and lay it before us and say, 'Look at it, read it, and examine it, and see if it is not good.' Of one thing I am convinced: Do what we will, oppose it as we may, it is the Christian Bible that will sooner or later work the regeneration of this land."
In this closing number of the volume we cannot but acknowledge the liberality with which the laity of our denomination answered to the call made in behalf of the Quarterly at the beginning of the year. We wish we could extend equal thanks to the clergy, and hope to at the end of the next volume. We trust that all our friends will continue their aid, and help us to place the Quarterly on a permanent and paying basis. We have the promises of some of our ablest writers, for the next volume, whose names have long been absent from our pages.

— An amusing illustration of voluntary or unconscious blindness is the indignation and contempt which a Roman Catholic priest expresses for “the enslaved and submissive Greek Church.” The Czar rules it at will, and governs without consulting the clergy at all. What he decrees, the Synod decrees; what he determines shall be done, the Synod submissively does, asking no questions, making no objections. This is shockingly despotic, says our papal friend, in blissful ignorance of the absolute tyranny of the Pope, and the foreordained decrees of the late Ecumenical Council! “Let the Old Catholics,” he says pathetically, “be warned in season. Let them go to Russia. They will see there how much liberty a church gains when it cuts itself off from its obedience to the See of Peter, and what kind of clergy is constructed when men try to improve upon the models of Almighty God!”

Such innocence is delightful, and we are half sorry to disturb it by adding the following from Archbishop Manning’s proclamation; “Whoever does not in his heart receive and believe the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the doctrine of the infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, as they have been defined by the supreme authority of the Church, does by that very fact cease to be a Catholic.” And he warns all such skeptics that by going to confession and holy communion they deceive the clergy and commit a sacrilege to their own greater damnation. And that this is meant in earnest is shown by the fact that Mr. Henry Petre, a member of one of the oldest Roman Catholic families in England, for denying that the Pope is infallible, has been formally excommunicated from the church by Bishop Vaughan, and priests are solemnly warned that to allow him to enjoy the privilege of the Sacrament would be an act of sacrilege on their part.

NEW SERIES. VOL. XII
—The school for girls, lately established by the wife of the Khedive of Egypt, which is one of the greatest innovations the country of the Pharaohs has ever seen, is turning out a great success. This lady bought a large house in a thickly peopled locality, near the dancing dervishes, erected around it a quadrangle of spacious buildings, and handed them over to the Education Department, but she defrays the whole cost of maintenance. The school is free to all, and when it had been open only four months there were 207 boarders and 100 day scholars, all Arabs or slaves. They discard the Oriental veil, and are dressed in frocks, pinafores and shoes, in English fashion, and they sit, not squatting on the ground, but at desks.

—“Spotted Tail,” the great Sioux chief, says that most Indians believe in a heaven and a hell, though there are some unbelievers. The poor will become powerful in the spirit world. The Great Spirit has been on the white man’s side in this world, but there He will help the Indian. “And then,” says the chief, his eyes kindling at the thought, “we’ll fight it out, and we will not be driven from our hunting-grounds like the sneaking, savage wolf. The bad men of all nations will go down into the centre of the earth, and be excluded from the spirit land. It was for a long time after I first heard about Jesus Christ that I did not understand how the white man could have killed him; but when I got better acquainted with the whites, when I realized the fact that they had no respect for the rights of the Indians, I then very readily understood how they could even kill the Son of the Great Spirit as they did.”

—The following shows the intellectual condition of the masses where Catholicism has its own way, unobstructed by the shaping influence of political and educational institutions; shows also the secret of Catholic opposition to our common schools. It these people had been trained in the schools of New England, could they have been made to submit to these priestly insults to the enlightened understanding?

“A curious festival has just been observed at Douai, in France, of the miraculous wafer. Six hundred years ago, a priest there saw, to his horror, a consecrated wafer on the floor. He stooped to pick it up, but to his surprise it leaped up of itself, and took its place upon the napkin. When he called the canons to look at the miracle they saw it changed to a living child. When the Dean came to look at it, the wafer had become a full-grown man, with the face of Jesus
Afterward Jesus was shown as crucified, as judge on the throne, and in other forms. The clergy of Douai have certified to the authenticity of these miracles, and call on the faithful to come and worship the marvelous Host."

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.


Bishop Haven has done a good and useful thing in giving us this record of his observations of a country and people about whom we think we know so much, and really know so little. The book is written in a lively and gossiping style, though not always exactly what we should expect of a bishop. He has the faculty of seeing, and of telling what he sees; and he has given us a good deal of fresh and very desirable knowledge respecting the climate, products, forests, agriculture and varied and vast physical resources and commercial capabilities of Mexico. And one can readily see what a paradise the land is, and how easy it would be to make of Mexico one of the most prosperous commercial countries in the world, and lift her up to the important and influential position among the nations to which she is entitled. All that is needed are the very elements and agencies which the priests and the populace under their control hate and resist, viz.: Protestantism, Education, and Yankee energy, enterprise and activity.

The author gives us some delightful sketches of the grand and lovely scenery of the country; and also of the social customs and character of the people; and of the political complexion of the Spanish and Indian races, which last, we are told, make up three quarters of the entire population. If the reader would learn how much these Indians know of pure Christianity, let him read in the Appendix of the miserable mixture of Catholic and Pagan idolatries which make up their worship. Utter ignorance, brutal superstitions, intense hatred, and the murder of heretics, and a compound of Spanish and Indian ferocity, are predominant traits in the Mexican character.

In spite of all the difficulties, however, Protestantism, under Episcopal, Baptist and Methodist direction, is slowly making its way among the more enlightened portions of the people. The narrative of this progress is one of the most interesting parts of the book. We must not forget to state that the bishop has woven into his narrative many valuable historical facts, which add much to the pleasure and profit of reading. It is due also to the publishers to note the excellent illustrations which give added value to the text.

We took up this volume in the expectation of finding a thorough and exhaustive argument for the personality of the Holy Spirit in distinction from the Father, but we have laid it down disappointed. The first section, which treats of the "Personality and Manifestation" seems to us utterly destitute of every thing like exposition and argument; and there is not a paragraph in it which could not be applied to God the Father with as much force and fitness as to the supposed third person of the Trinity. In what sense does the Holy Spirit "comfort," "teach," "guide," "sanctify," "lead into all truth," and "testify of Christ," so as specially to distinguish its work and method from the work and method of the Father? What is the difference in results, by which we may determine whether the work is done by God or the Holy Spirit? And is it not just as common to personify the spirit, the mind, the heart of man, as those of God?

And in what sense can God be said to be distinct from his spirit, which may not apply with equal force to a man and his spirit? Is it said that the Holy Spirit is individualized in the Scriptures in a way to make it something by itself, a personality wholly distinct from the Father? Is not this equally true in regard to man? We discuss in the abstract "a divine spirit," "a generous heart," "a noble character," as if they were entities, distinct from the man. So the Scriptures give personality to Wisdom, Charity, Death, ascribing offices and actions to them as freely as to the Holy Spirit; but neither exegetes nor common sense leads us to suppose that they are therefore as truly persons as are men and women.

Our author even seems occasionally to forget himself, and to write in the same style. Speaking of Pentecost and the promise of the Spirit, he says, "It holds good to-day — men may test it for themselves, seeing that the residue of the Spirit is with God, and that the Father will give it unto them that ask him." What is the residue of the spirit here? Is it the residue of another personality which the Father gives to them that ask him? Or is it his own spirit, in the same sense that a wise and good man imparts his spirit, thought, character to those who come to him for advice and counsel?

We did not intend a criticism, however, but only to say that the second part of the volume, which reviews the current discussions on matter and spirit, has some most excellent things in it, worthy to be read of all. In the sections on "Materialism and Spiritualism," and "The Spiritual Organ," Tyndall and Huxley get some hard blows. The reply to James Mill, in the "Epilogue," is not so satisfactory. It is special pleading.


This work grows in our estimation, the present volume being almost every thing which could be asked for in a popular commentary. It
is also a valuable assistant to students and preachers. The books of Scripture which it treats are among the most interesting in the Old Testament, in their relations to history and prophecy, and the connection of Jewish annals with those of the surrounding nations. And this interest is intensified by the remarkable discoveries among the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, the excavations at Jerusalem, and the explorations in Palestine, and the consequent large and valuable additions made to our knowledge of ancient history and archaeology. This Commentary is alive to all this, and incorporates into its expositions all the important and striking confirmations thus furnished to the exact and authentic narratives of sacred history.

Its expositions of the various difficulties of chronology and arithmetic are not always satisfactory, and it seems to us sometimes to assume a miracle where there is no occasion for it. Its theology is not ours, and this of course is to be expected in a Methodist work; but as a commentary giving a large amount of valuable matter in history, antiquities, manners, religious customs, methods of warfare, &c., of the Jews, Assyrians, Egyptians and contemporary nations; and letting the light of this information so fall upon the Scripture records as to give to them a fresh attraction and interest, we can heartily commend the work. And its convenient form and cheapness, combined with equal merit and usefulness, as compared with Lange, The Speaker's Commentary, &c., should gain for it the examination of those with whom room and cost are a consideration. The Speaker's Commentary on these books costs five, and Lange ten dollars. A word for the maps, which are finely executed; and for the illustrations which, though not numerous are well chosen, and suggestive helps to the text.


A pleasing, and what may be made a very useful book in the hands of wise parents and teachers, written by one who is an earnest and almost devout lover of children. He verily believes that the boy is the father of the man, and therefore that it is of infinite moment that the boy should be rightly guided and instructed, all his tendencies studied and regulated, the evil repressed and the good strengthened and developed; all his words and wise sayings treasured up as revelations of what he is thinking and wishing and seeking, and prophetic of what, unchecked, untaught, he will be, and do, and strive for when he becomes his own master, and begins shaping his future.

We think his “Cabinet of Specimens” (anecdotes illustrating the intelligence and wit of children) is unnecessarily large, and some of the specimens are hardly worth preserving; but taken as a whole they show how much more of seeing, hearing, thinking and reasoning is going on in these busy little brains than is commonly supposed; and how needful it is that all should speak and act with caution in their presence. It shows also what an amount of raw material we have
here, which in the right hands may be worked up into useful, learned and noble men and women.

We advise the reading of this book by all those ministers who carefully prepare their sermons, but say any thing which comes up when speaking to the Sunday School. They will learn from it that children are often sharper and wiser critics than their parents, and will weigh and measure a speaker quicker and more accurately.


Useful for all students of ecclesiastical history. It is a very convenient manual on the subject, giving most of the important facts, events, authors, sects, heresies, and persecutions, of the ancient, and the denominations, divisions, controversies and wars of the modern Church. It copies Schem's Statistics of the present strength and condition of the various churches, including its errors. Nevertheless it is seldom that so much information is condensed into so few pages. It should be on the desk of every preacher and writer on religious matters. The series of maps of Europe from the time of Christ to the present day, are admirable as showing the territorial changes which have taken place, while the Missionary Maps are equally useful in showing the inroads of Christianity upon Paganism.

6. Our King and Saviour; or the Story of our Lord's Life on Earth — in which its Great Events are arranged in their probable Chronological Order, and so set forth as to make their Reality and Meaning clear to the Understanding and attractive to the Imagination and Hearts of Young Persons and General Readers. By Daniel Wise, D.D. With Eighty-three Illustrations. Nelson & Phillips.

This lengthy title describes the aim of a very beautifully printed and illustrated volume, which is written in an easy, conversational style which cannot fail to please and interest even the most indifferent readers. We think the execution of the author's purpose fully justifies the very large claims of the title page. We have had visible proof of its attractiveness for children, and, with a proper correction of its doctrinal errors, of its capacity for instruction. Of course it is marred by its orthodox heresies regarding the Death of Christ, Salvation, the Devil, Demoniacs, &c., but an intelligent parent will easily correct these in the reading.

As an example of the first we have, on page 200, the exclamation of the disciples; “Of a truth thou art the Son of God.” To this Dr. Wise says: “It was a most fitting tribute if Jesus was God; if he was a man only, it was criminal folly, and in accepting it Jesus was either a fanatic or an impostor!” Does such reasoning need refutation, even with a child? If he allowed them to call him the Son of God, then he was either God or an impostor!


Mr. James always puts himself into what he writes, and the reader seldom loses sight of him, even in his fictions. These sketches are
chiefly photographs of his impressions and emotions when looking upon European scenery, pictures and architecture, not altogether forgetting social life, travel, snacks of history, &c. There is so much sentiment, and learning, and nice criticism in them, that we cannot read without profit, even though we may not agree to all the writer's judgments and conclusions.

There may be insight and delicate analysis in his estimate of the genius and style of Reubens, but we certainly cannot accept as just his faint praise of the painter, and of his master-piece in the Antwerp Cathedral—"The Descent from the Cross." That wonderful picture was the first that thoroughly moved us, and laid hold of every fibre of our being. It did more for us spiritually, and in its revelation of the possibilities of true art, than all the galleries of Italy; and compensated for the disappointment caused by Michael Angelo's "Last Judgment."

His Swiss and Florentine Notes and Italian Sketches are delightful reading, and will be useful to those travelling in these regions, and wishing to know how and when to see what is most attractive. The sketch of "Wells and Salisbury," including the Abbey of Glastonberg, England, is as exquisite a piece of painting as one could well make out of words.


A book written in such a sweet, Christian spirit, so charitable in its judgments, so generous in regard to the educational and moral condition of the Catholic masses, because so clear-sighted as to its causes; a book which so skilfully exposes the sources of that all controlling influence which the church and the priesthood have over the people, and the methods by which they inspire such distrust and hatred of Protestants, and contrive to keep their children apart from them—that we wish it were possible to put it into the hands of every Catholic who knows how to read. It certainly could not fail to open the eyes of the more intelligent and thoughtful, and lead to the doubts and questions which invaded even the childhood of its author; and in the end opened the way to conviction, conversion and final deliverance.

It is a book also for Protestants, as it will furnish them with the particular information of an eye-witness on many points, respecting which they have now only the general and vague notions which come of common rumor. Parents, teachers, and ministers should give special attention to that portion which treats of the author's childhood, and the manner in which Catholic children are instructed as to the meaning of Protestant, and the priestly espionage over Protestant families employing Catholic help. And Christians of all sects should consider seriously what is said of the impression made on this Catholic lad's mind by the difference which he had noted in the words, and in the manner of keeping Sunday, in the communities north and south of the Canada line.
The observations touching the use and effect of symols in church service, specially as regards Lent and Easter, are very suggestive, and not without a lesson for Protestants. Altogether it will be seen how great are the difficulties which beset an intelligent, conscientious, pious Catholic in his efforts toward freedom.

The book is written in an easy, conversational style, and is certainly as pleasant reading as it is informing.


This book is much more than its title promises. It not only furnishes some hundreds of receipts, many of them new, for the preparation of meals in the most appetizing style, but it gives the history, romance and poetry of cooking and eating. It is very useful, practical, and entertaining. For example: it instructs us how to prepare Breakfast, and prefaces the talk about coffee, chocolate, cakes and butter, with a delightful description of the famous breakfasts of Queen Elizabeth, Pepys, Isaac Walton and others, and a sketch of what breakfast was with the people generally hundreds of years ago; and follows this with the poetry of this morning meal. Then we have an amusing account of Roman, Japanese and Chinese dinners and the story of the Round Table, introductory to teaching how to prepare Dinner, after which there is pleasant gossip of the style of living among the English and Scotch of the past, of Irish hospitality, and French entertainments, as well as the Dinner customs of other nations of Europe, Asia and even Africa, and the celebrated feasts of history. A quotation from Cowper, and the praises bestowed upon Tea by Dr. Kane, Dr. Johnson, &c., brings us to the evening meal, and the best method of preparing it, and making it attractive and entertaining, followed also by most charming talk of the suppers of noted persons, Alexander the Great, Sydney Smith, Antony, Cleopatra, &c. If our young housekeepers would learn the art of properly preparing the daily meals, and at the same time enjoy much pleasant reading, thus furnishing good for mind as well as body, let them secure this book.


This little book takes us back through the years to the beginning of our ministry; to the Lowell that was, but is not; to the crowds of young men and women, from all parts of New England, which made up the operative population, and among whom were often found girls equally cultivated in mind and manners. Some notices of Miss Larcom's work have questioned whether such girls as Esther, Eleanor and Minta are to be found in our manufacturing towns. "If there are many such in the factories," says one, "there ought to be a rush in that direction by sensible young men who are looking for wives." The writer forgets that the book speaks of thirty years ago. Then there were many such; daughters of farmers, mechanics, lawyers,
physicians, clergymen, &c. A daughter, still living, of a Unitarian clergyman owned and edited the "Lowell Offering" for several years. Another was the author of a novel of which more than ten thousand copies were sold. Another wrote a poem which was highly complimented by N. P. Willis, no mean judge. And Miss Larcom is herself an example of what sort of persons were in the Lowell mills at that time. It is not pretended that many such are to be found there now. At the period named you might go the entire length of a Spinning or Weaving room, and not find an Irish or German girl in it; now you might go through them, and not find an American girl.

But of the Idyl (why spell it with double II?). It is a sketch of life in the Lowell mills thirty years ago, into which are woven a story of love and temptation and moral peril, a plea for the education and elevation of woman, beautiful pictures of mountain scenery in New Hampshire, and some of the author's songs and ballads, among the very best of which we count "Peggy Bligh's Voyage." The poem is not in all its parts of equal merit, some passages being harsh, and halting, and prosy; while others are very smooth, musical, and among the sweetest which the writer has produced. Witness the following pleasant picture:

"Sabbath upon the river and the hills!
And Sabbath-rest among the weary wheels,
That ceased their groaning with a conscious hush.
Sabbath to lives unwound from labor's coil;
One welcome pause between dull sentences
Of week-long prose. That Sabbath in the air,
Which made New England, as old Palestine,
An Olivet of every green ascent.
With Kidron or Siloam flowing past,
In windings of familiar streams—how vast
Its depth and height of stillness! Every leaf
Of every tree seemed whispering reverently
Some Hebrew tale or parable. The sky
Came close to earth as bending to let down
The glory of the New Jerusalem."

11 Queen Mary. A Drama by Alfred Tennyson. James R. Osgood & Co.

We have Tennyson here in a comparatively new role, and yet one which he seems amply able to sustain. "Queen Mary" is as different in style, in thought and language and aim from all his former productions, as the Apocalypse of John is from his gospel. We miss the delicacy of sentiment and feeling and the sweetly musical rhythm of expression, which gave such charm to his previous poems; though we have in the place of it a careful study of scenes and characters, motives and emotions, and a wonderful power of painting them in words and phrases that sometimes carry a terrible force and earnestness in them. Witness the following outburst from one of the personages of the drama:

"O Paget, Paget! I have seen heretics of the poorer sort,
Expectant of the rack from day to day,
To whom the fire were welcome, lying chain'd
In breathless dungeons over steaming sewers,
Fed with rank bread that crawl'd upon the tongue,
And putrid water, every drop a worm,
Until they died of rotted limbs; and then
Cast on the dunghill naked, and become
Hideously alive again from head to heel,
Made even the carrion-eating mongrel vomit
With hate and horror."

And this leads us to say that Tennyson has undoubtedly in this work a higher purpose than the production of a poem merely, or a drama, however finished and beautiful. He probably had the stage in view in writing, but only, we think, as a medium through which to reach the people more directly, and move them more powerfully. The lessons to be drawn from the reign of "Bloody Mary," are the lessons which need to be enforced upon the English nation of to-day. The Laureate sees as clearly as Gladstone the dangers of the Catholic movement in England, and like him employs his position and popular influence to warn alike the masses and the educated classes of what they may expect under the rule of the Church.

The real temper and action of Catholicism, whenever and wherever it has the opportunity, were fully and terribly shown in the brief reign of Mary; and the poet would teach his countrymen, that the same results are sure to follow its restoration to power and place — the destruction of all political and religious liberty, the abolition of general education, the subjection of the state and its legislation to the Church, and a return to the inquisition, the dungeon, the gibbet and the stake. And in doing this he has given no wing to the imagination of the poet, but with the fidelity of the historian he has in all his incidents and illustrations kept close to the record.

Queen Mary is a history, as well as a poem; and all the leading characters of the times appear in the drama clothed in their true personality — Philip of Spain, Elizabeth, Cardinal Pole, Cranmer, Lord Howard, Paget, Lady Jane Grey, Renard, Peter Martyr, Bonner, &c. The dialogue, though sometimes tame, is often eloquent, full of force and fire. As an example: Pole asks, "When did ever Rome tremble?" and Paget answers, "In Henry's time, and Edward's;" to which the cardinal replies,

"What, my Lord!
The Church on Peter's rock? never! I have seen
A pine in Italy that cast its shadow
Awharst a cataract; firm stood the pine —
The cataract shook the shadow. To my mind,
The cataract typ'd the headlong plunge and fall
Of heresy to the pit: the pine was Rome.
You see, my Lords,
It was the shadow of the Church that trembled;
Your church was but the shadow of a church,
Wanting the triple mitre."

As a poem Queen Mary is worthy of the genius of Tennyson, and shows that, on occasion, it can break away from the old paths, and walk in new ways, and speak in a new dialect. There are passages of great beauty, felicitous in expression, subtle in analysis of motives and feelings, and wonderful for their portraiture. But there are also
passages in which the verse falls below the Tennysonian level; and occasionally there are rhymes in his songs which would be censured in a school-boy; as in the following, where we have in three lines the short o, long o, and the short u sound, not one of them rhyming with another:

“Hapless doom of woman happy in betrothing!
Beauty pass as a breath, and love is lost in loathing;
Low, my lute; speak low, my lute, but say the world is nothing —
Low, lute, low!”

The Philosophy of Spiritualism and the Pathology and Treatment of Mediocrity. By Frederic Marvin, M. D. $1.00

All from the press of Charles P. Somerby, N. Y., and evidently in the interest of Unbelief; though not without some true and useful things in them. The first named is a compound of facts, fancies and foolish reasoning. We give two sentences: “The origin of Christianity is involved in so much obscurity that the most distinguished Fathers of the primitive Church explicitly declared that it had existed from time immemorial.” Again: “The word Hell in the New Testament is the rendering of four different terms in the original text, not synonymous in signification — namely, Avernus, Gehenna, Tartarus and Hades.” The first extract shows the spirit and aim of the pamphlet, and its accuracy of statement; the second shows the original research, and great Biblical discovery of the author. Avernus! to think that all previous scholars and critics should have overlooked it!

“The Philosophy of Spiritualism” is treated in a tentative spirit. Mediocrity is a disease, and is to be regarded and prescribed for as any other physical derangement. Dr. Marvin has certainly approached the subject in a frank and fearless style; and given some staggering medical facts in support of his position. He obligingly settles some other troublesome questions. “The old dream of Moral Agency is over, and the philosopher now detects the working of natural law as much in the rise of a religion or the growth of crime, as in the revolution of the seasons and the flowing of the tides.” How comfortable to have these profound problems which have challenged all the ages, solved and settled for us. Why need any man vex his brain with study so long as we have an infallible pope on one side, and an infallible doctor on the other?


This volume is made up of six Lectures and Essays on various subjects: Nature and her Lessons, Woman and her Sphere, Education and its Errors, America and her Future, Life and its Aspirations, and Mission Monument and its Dedication. There is nothing new nor specially striking in Mr. Rice’s discussion of these topics.
BOOK NOTES.

though what he says is well said, and we generally agree with him. The first essay is the most interesting and informing portion of the book, and is a very compact and useful résumé of natural phenomena, mostly with dates; of geological changes, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, aerolites, fluvial action, formation of deltas, &c. The facts may be accepted; his inferences may be questioned.

BOOK NOTES.


All for Christ; or How the Christian may obtain, by a renewed consecration of his Heart, the Fulness of Joy referred to by the Saviour just before his Crucifixion. With Illustrations from the Lives of those who have made this consecration. By Rev. Thomas Carter, D.D. New York. Nelson & Phillips. 75 cts. [The object of these books, is to show "that every Christian may obtain in this life a deliverance from sin," and come "up to the standard of the fulness of Christ." In other words, it is the argument for Christian Perfection in the present life, notwithstanding Paul's sad confession. In Romans vii. of his own experience of the warfare between the flesh and spirit. And yet we cannot but commend some of the "Testimonies" or personal Experiences recorded in these volumes to the serious and honest study of those who hesitate regarding the special, direct working of the Spirit. They will remind them of the day of Pentecost.]

Binnie's Theological Compend Improved. Containing a Synopsis of the Evidences, Dogmatics, Morals, and Institutions of Christianity. Designed for Bible Classes, Theological Students and Young Preachers. By Rev. Amos Binnie and Rev. Daniel Steele, D.D. Nelson & Phillips. 50 cts. [We can cordially approve of Parts I., III. and IV. of this book, and much of Part II., on Dogmatics, as well suited to Bible Classes; but theological students and young preachers need a more complete and elaborate statement of the subjects treated. The book is not wholly free from errors of statement. We are surprised that both the author and Dr. Steele should blunder regarding Cicero's death, and that the blunder should enter the second edition. He did not commit suicide.]

The Living Wesley, as he was in his Youth and in his Prime. By James II. Rigg, D.D., Principal of the Wesleyan Training College, Westminster, England. With an Introduction by John F. Hurst, D.D. Nelson & Phillips. $1.55. [The author aims to "furnish a true portrait of Wesley in his human affections, in his intellectual character, and in his gifts and powers as a preacher;": in the course of which he has some damaging criticisms on the work of Tyerman, especially in its statements regarding Wesley's love affairs with Grace Murray, and with Miss Hopley when he was in Georgia.]

Statement of Reasons for Embracing the Doctrines and Disclosures of Emanuel Swedenborg. By Rev. Prof. George Bush, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. New York. E. H. Swinney. New Edition. [Worth reading as showing how尚书lism may successfully command itself to the faiths of a thoughtful, scholarly, orthodox Christian. The Biographical sketch will be, to a majority of readers, the most interesting portion of the pamphlet.]


