





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



such relations, and to maintain such a connection. I think that our meeting together at such times as these may, under God's blessing, greatly help to carry out this intention. An association which gives to the individual schoolmaster the support of his fellows in something like an organised body, and which leads to the mutual interchange of ideas, must tend to produce those results which we are so anxious to see gained. If only you can in that way trust one another, can in that way act together, can together receive your common commission, for the object for which you are labouring—that successful training which is to cultivate in the rising generation of this country true morals, and as far as may be, the development of the intellect founded upon the true religious life—no doubt you will have a power which no contrary force can resist, and a reward that will reach on into eternity.

FALLACIES EXPOSED

IN A WORK ENTITLED

MODERN CHRISTIANITY

A

CIVILIZED HEATHENISM.

Salisbury :
BROWN & CO., CANAL.
LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.

PREFACE.

It is a matter of some difficulty to discover the motive which has induced the author of "Modern Christianity, a Civilized Heathenism," to write his book.

The fallacies are so many, and yet the earnestness of the writing so great, and the style so vigorous, that one is surprised a person endowed with the wit to write it, should have fallen into such glaring errors.

It is likewise even more surprising that one who is really interested in the subject of religion should like to handle sacred matters which are very near the heart of a real Christian, in the flippant manner in which many parts of the Dialogue are carried out, where the Parson indulges in tobacco, and where he is often made to speak like a fool.

I think many will agree with me in feeling that the reverence due to the truths of Revelation is inconsistent with the manner and style of much that is written by the author.

The danger to many, who superficially study the subject of this book, arises from the admixture it contains of truth and falsehood, blended together in so united a form as to render their separation a work of some difficulty.

To point out its fallacies in declaring Christianity requires much, which it *does not*, and in speaking of a mere morality of life as the only alternative, is the object I have at heart—to show that real Christianity is something different in its essence both to the asceticism which the Heathen describes, and to what the poor miserable Parson clings to as a whole,

is the line of argument here adopted. And in this way I hope to give some answer to a book which, to my mind, is false in many of its conclusions and dangerous in its consequences.

I would add that in page 130 the Heathen admits more about secular pursuits being possibly right for a Christian than elsewhere, but the general tenor of the book is to enforce quite the reverse. And I would wish the reader especially to remark that when I have stated the general effect of the argument used in this book to be that all earthly pursuits and institutions must perish, if Christianity be legitimately carried out, I have not pretended to quote the author's words, but the fair logical results of his general position, spread throughout the pages of his work.

November, 1873.

FALLACIES EXPOSED

IN A WORK ENTITLED

MODERN CHRISTIANITY A CIVILIZED HEATHENISM.

FIRST of all I take for granted that the man professing himself to be an infidel is intended by the author to state fairly and correctly what Christianity requires at our hands—the true view of Christian Doctrine and Christian Practice, and the best evidence to convince an unbeliever of its truth and reality. And this assumption seems to me to be the only fair one to be drawn from the dialogue between the Parson and the Infidel, and the only one to be gathered from the inanity and idiocy of the former on the one hand, and from the earnestness and force of the arguments of the latter on the other hand.

Secondly, I take for granted likewise that the heathen expresses correctly enough the views of the author, when he endeavours to prove the utter inconsistency which exists between the lives and practice of all so called Christians, and the above requirements of Christ and his teaching—excepting of course in the instances, few and far between indeed, of men similar to that clergyman, whose manner of life convinced the heathen *at last* that Christianity might be true.

These two points are then the data upon which I fairly found what I may have to say on the subject of this book.

In the next place, before I attempt to show in what particulars it appears to me the infidel profoundly errs in his description of the nature and requirements of Christianity, and before I attempt to express on the other hand what seem to me to be

the real nature and requirements of Christian Doctrine and Practice, I would observe the following—that, taking for granted the author is a Christian, it is surely most dangerous and most unreasonable to make the main issue, whether Christianity be true or not, to depend almost exclusively, and I think *solely*, on the discovery of one, who is a faithful and personal witness of Christ in his manner of life and conduct. And surely this is the general impression, if not the actual position taken up by the author.

To make the truth of Christianity to depend on the consistent life of another—that we are only to believe in consequence of the effects produced in our brother—is fallacious in the extreme. The evidences of the religion of Christ are external and internal; they are both historical and experimental. Miracles, prophecy, tradition, or what not, may form the first line of evidence, as drawn out by a Paley or many other authors; the inward voice of conscience, the work of grace on the human spirit, and the spiritual yearnings of an immortal being alone satisfied by the presence of its Maker resident in the soul and heart, may be another; or that other internal evidence—undesigned coincidences in the text of Scripture and its narrative of events—may be a third; hence the objective and subjective testimony, as they may be severally called, are thought to be of sufficient weight to lead a man to be a Christian by many, not altogether unsound divines, *in addition to* and superior to the witness of Christ as seen in our neighbours' life and actions. This is no doubt of great additional force and power in leading others to believe and repent; but to put *the whole* issue on such a narrow basis as *this* testimony alone, is quite inconceivable, illogical, unreasonable, and opposed to every theory of evidence ever hitherto advanced.

It is ridiculous to imagine that a Butler or a Paley or any others who might be named are to be shelved altogether as exponents of Christian evidences, whilst the arguments in favour of Christian truth are to be *alone* founded on the *living* witness of our neighbour, in his holy life and conversation—and this, too, proved in a few pages of an one-sided

dialogue, ever the most unfair mode of conveying truth to the human mind.

Having prefaced these few remarks of a general nature, let us endeavour to grasp at the argument of this dangerous little book, dangerous because there is so much of genuine and earnest truth contained in it, so much which I apprehend would be allowed by every candid mind to be absolutely undeniable. So that this very fact alone, considering it is mixed up with erroneous conceptions and false conclusions, constitutes the true character of its danger. The poison of its *misstatements* is concealed in the genuineness of its *true* statements, and they are so interwoven together that it requires the utmost caution and labour to unravel the one from the other.

Now the infidel on the one hand fairly states, on the whole, what the author conceives to be true of the nature, requirements, and results, of *real* Christianity, and on the other hand the utter inconsistency in well nigh all cases between professors of the gospel, and *such* requirements, the infidel being only in the wrong in imagining that there are no Mr. Ainslies existing at all in the world.

I would first, therefore, just briefly express in my own words what *I* understand that statement to amount to.

He states in effect that all the Christians he ever comes across are no better than mere civilized heathen; that there is not a shadow of actual difference between the one and the other, as far as he can possibly judge from their outward conduct; that in every class of society the former is indistinguishable from the latter, excepting in name and hollow profession. The Christian speaks in the same way, he is interested in the same matters—political economy—civilization—money—pleasures—and such like. He lives in the same way—dines out—plays at croquet—goes to concerts—laughs—cries—eats and drinks—and is as much interested in all these terrestrial matters as the veriest heathen as ever existed. He may go to church on the seventh day, but in what does the whole tenour of his existence differ from that of the heathen on the other six days of the week? The fact is the heathen has far

the best of it, for whilst the one is *dishonest*, the other at any rate can claim the meed of honesty; in short, the charge endeavoured to be substantiated against professing Christians is simply this—that there is not a thing in their whole lives which differs from, or which is superior to the life of a respectable, upright, and honest heathen.

It is as well to have the accusation clearly made out, and this is the true purport of it. And then he paints, in vivid colours, side by side with this, what the nature and requirements of true Christianity really are. Christianity is not a philosophy, but something quite outside and distinct from it. Christianity is not a system of morality (however moral the Christian ought to be), but Christ came to condemn all the righteousness of men.

The author *states that Christianity is not a philosophy, but quite the reverse.* The force of the whole argument on this point seems to amount to this—that whilst Philosophy on the one hand would lead us to the utmost civilization and to the acquirement of every *earthly* blessing; that whilst it would induce us to promote every art and science for the benefit of the human species, to utilize with our utmost powers all the blessings and gifts bestowed upon us by the Creator, to enjoy every terrestrial advantage within our reach; that whilst it would teach us to improve all the talents we possess in whatever line of life we may individually be placed, in statesmanship or political economy, in improving the condition of the working classes or in mercantile operations, in business of any kind, *Christianity*, on the other hand, cares for none of these things—nay, verily, she as much as loathes them, *bidding us to forsake them all, and to follow Christ.* We must forsake the common sense which Philosophy would teach us, we must renounce the development of the gifts of the Creator bestowed for ends clearly defined by himself, and, to be a Christian indeed, as well as by name, we must *so* follow Christ as to be entirely disconnected with every avocation, and every pursuit, and every business which exists in this civilized world.

This is the conclusion we arrive at—that if Christianity be faithfully carried out, not a single pursuit or avocation, not a so-called innocent pleasure or recreation, not a merry laugh or joyous game, not a thought which has any direct bearing of a terrestrial character, should lawfully exist—but all, all (if we truly follow Christ), is swept away with one foul swoop for ever—*hence Christianity and Philosophy are opposed to each other*, hence indeed civilization and Christian teaching go not hand in hand.

The old philosophers thought of a moral aim and a moral training, loved to develop the religion of nature, and see in the creature the living signs of the Creator, and in the advance of the former the blessing vouchsafed by the latter. But Christianity is not a philosophy. Whilst the former would inculcate honesty, temperance, truthfulness, the latter, of course, approving of such heathen virtues, begins its career altogether after these have been taken for granted. A heathen citizen loves these for gentlemanly reasons: now the Christian (so called) of the present day goes along the same road, *to the same point in it exactly*, and he loves them too, but he goes no further than the heathen citizen. Exactly where Christianity makes its start and *true beginning*, there the so-called Christian stops with his unfortunate associate in life. This is the alliance which exists between nearly all professors and good-natured and well-behaved heathen, and it is proved by the same love of the world and its pursuits, and it is proved by the same ends and objects existing equally in both, and when you look around can you distinguish the one from the other?

This is certainly a dark picture, but one drawn by the author; he has not stated it in so many words, but surely this is his meaning, and then he describes what Christ requires of us. He requires an entire giving up of all earthly avocations as already described; he requires the hatred of all things, excepting those things which have a direct and personal connection with himself—directly in his service—the going out of the world altogether—and the renouncing its pursuits, and *only* praying and working for the saving of

souls as the direct and only pursuit of every man, woman, and child calling themselves Christians.

What! if we know *hell* is near each one of us any day or hour of the week—hell—eternal, awful, unquenchable agony—is there any room for a laugh, a game, a pursuit, *not directly* connected with God and Heaven? Is it possible, when we are aware everlasting agony, *real agony*, may be the lot of any one we know, and that, too, an hour hence, can we smile or speak of politics, or read the Times, or care for any earthly interest!! No! so be absorbed in Christ that all interest, all work is gone and forsaken, except in direct, distinct, and clear connection with himself.

Hence Christianity is not a philosophy, is not a civilizing motive power. But enough of this; I have endeavoured to state what the kind of argument amounts to, and I think faithfully. This is the author's view of the nature and requirements and results of real Christian faith. Would he kindly consider the consequences of his own position? The world must stop short, life must cease, and all the objects and talents committed to our charge, such as philosophy, art, science, civilization, and advance, be neglected.

God has given us certain powers of mind and body for the carrying out certain ends, and yet all these His gifts are to be neglected *if Christianity* be true, and the blasphemous conclusion is arrived at that those things direct from God are yet sinful in His sight.

I am perfectly aware, in the above explanation of the state of the argument as advanced by the heathen, that I have introduced the idea of the existence of the Creator, which the civilized heathen altogether ignores. But, notwithstanding, I presume I have only stated in that addition what the author *must*, I apprehend, acknowledge to be capable of proof, *quite irrespective of Christianity*, capable of proof also from those *very* results of civilization itself, so clearly acknowledged to exist by the heathen in his argument. For instance, man is endowed with innumerable powers and qualities both of mind and of body, evidently designed by an Intelligence for certain ends and results.

The human mind, as well as body, are the means in thousands of ways of effecting certain results, and are adapted to certain ends, and in those ends and results we behold infallibly a witness of God's existence. The adaptation of every portion of our marvellous structure to certain definite ends—the foot for walking, the eye for seeing, the ear for hearing, the mouth for speaking, the interior organs for their innumerable purposes, the human mind with all its powers and qualities, which are suited for self-preservation and intellectual development and culture, adapted for enjoyment, for sympathy, for the promotion of arts and sciences, for the carrying out of every work of civilization, whether it be purely mental or more or less connected with bodily co-operation, the whole complex nature of *one single* human being capable of such marvellous development in mental progress and such marvellous conceptions and practical effects, *are all* indicative of a system of design and adaptation *only consistent with the supposition of Deity.*

It is therefore surely a pity that the objector to Christianity is represented as a *heathen* and *not as a Deist*, and that the only alternative is made to exist between simple infidelity and true Christianity, for, by ignoring the existence of Deity, the very force of the argument is thus unfairly weakened when with *irresistible* power it can be stated that the GOD of nature and *true philosophy* is the GOD likewise of grace and revelation, and that therefore there must be a consistency between the results of the one and the results of the other; that it is absolutely impossible to imagine that God would endow us with a power intended by Himself definitely for certain ends and yet could condemn those ends as sinful and wrong. Hence when the system of true Christianity, supposed to be fairly stated by the heathen, results in an absolute annihilation of all existing institutions and civilization itself, *it is clearly a false and untrue estimate of the nature, requirements, and results of real Christianity*—for the GOD of nature and civilization and the GOD revealed by Christ are one, and what he teaches *cannot be inconsistent or at variance with itself.*

Now it is most emphatically stated by the author, as the very data whence he draws his conclusions, that our blessed Lord was either a philosopher, inculcating a system of morals upon his followers, or else that he was the incarnate Son of God, revealing His Father's will to mankind. It is stated that he cannot be both the one and the other, and that Christianity as He taught it, is either therefore a simple system of morals or a new revelation of God's will, fresh from God Himself and essentially disconnected with all morals ever discovered elsewhere or by any means.

Surely I am not unfair in declaring that such a statement as this is not only totally false, but illogical as well.

Is it impossible that the religion of Christ should be both a most remarkable system of morals, having certain points in common with what a Deist, a Jew, or a Mahometan may hold, and that yet it is a new revelation of God's will as well—declaring to us essential truth, never understood before? Is it impossible that a Christian should hold the great mighty fundamental truth, in common with a Jew, with a Deist, or with a North American Indian—that there is a God, and that He is one, and that yet the glorious gospel of our dear Lord and Saviour tells us of truths concerning that God which nothing but the light of revelation from heaven itself could ever possibly have revealed to poor grovelling, sinful man? Nay, our friend, whether he be the Author in the preface, or his gentlemanly heathen in the text, is in a sad dilemma here.

Now logically—I state that from every page of the Bible we gather that the vast fabric of religion in His revealed word is from beginning to end declarative of a moral system, a moral end, a moral tendency. This permeates every portion as an essential element of its very being. The moral instruction and the moral element in the system of the gospel are as much of the very essence of Christianity, as the new doctrines and new teaching, revealed by Christ alone, are essential to that existence. They are equally necessary to make Christianity what it really is. Deprive it of either element and it no longer exists *as Christianity* at all. *The generic property*

of any given idea is as essential and needful to that idea as the specific property ever can be. *The differentia*, which, when applied to the genus, creates the species, is also equally essential to the existence of that species. It is thus that moral teaching in other systems, so far as *it is* moral teaching, is as essential to Christianity as the peculiar doctrines which it inculcates. It is thus that the new doctrines, viz., the revelation of God's will through Christ and the facts of Christianity, never understood before Christ came, are likewise equally necessary and of its very essence, and it is thus that there is no inconsistency in declaring that Christ is a philosopher and moral teacher and also the Incarnate Son of God. Man is defined in Aldrich to be a reasonable animal—animal, the *genus*, and when the differentia, *reasonable* is added to animal, it then constitutes a *species* of animal (viz.) man. Surely it is evident to the meanest capacity that for the existence of man, the element *animal* is as essential as the element *reasonable*, which makes man differ from all other animals—so is it with this most important subject of morals and religion. Except it was to expose to the unwary this most transparent fallacy, it would seem almost a waste of words to have stated the above simple argument; and yet here is a writer of some discernment and of great power of expression declaring as the very foundation of his argument that which is as easily upset as that one and two make four, and doing so in a manner so specious and forcible as easily to catch the ignorant or superficial.

And now consider, if that which is essential to Christianity necessitated such a life as Mr. Ainslie's—one necessarily at variance with every mundane avocation and business, every human art and institution, every terrestrial pleasure and amusement, it would clearly be of the essence of the matter to give up every such pursuit. In fact, to upset much that the God of nature intended to be developed and for the development of which he has purposely given us certain talents and powers—hence it is very needful, believing, as already has been proved, this to be a gross fallacy to point out, *not what a Christian may be*, for he may of course be one who has

renounced every mundane pursuit, but what he must be, and therefore *what is essential* to a Christian character. And to prove that the alternative does not lie between a mere moral code and the view of Christianity stated to be needful by the Book, but between such a mere moral code and what really constitutes Christian teaching and Christian truth.

Now there are two propositions which I wish to bring before the attention of my reader in answer to the erroneous deductions of this Book and to prove what I have stated.

FIRST there is all the difference in the world existing between the heathen civilization of the heathen gentleman and *true* Christianity.

SECONDLY, that much that the Book endeavours to prove as needful to true Christianity is by *no means* so, quite the reverse; therefore it is not needful to live the life of a Mr. Ainslie.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

There is all the difference in the world existing between the heathen civilization of the heathen and true Christianity, and this can be shown by *four* considerations:—

First. Christianity is a grand objective system.

Secondly. The motives suggested thereby, and acted upon, make the actions of life *morally* different in value.

Thirdly. The government and control of the inward affections and heart form an essential of its teaching.

Fourthly. Christianity is a grand system by which grace regenerates and influences man.

Take the first and second considerations together.

These two considerations bring before our attention a grand objective system suggesting motives for our conduct, which conduct and actions of life are intrinsically different in value when thus produced, to the same actions performed in consequence of other inferior motives. Now surely Christianity in the first place teaches us the deep-seated depravity of human nature and its proneness to sin, that man does continually come short of GOD'S law and requirements and incurs thereby guilt in his sight. Surely Christianity teaches us that God so loved the world that He has given His only begotten Son

that whosoever believes in Him might be saved, that Christ has become incarnate and lived to introduce into man a renewed nature by grace—that Christ died as the atonement made for our sins, the just suffering for the unjust—that our guilt might be pardoned—surely Christianity teaches us that man must repent and sincerely endeavour to lead a godly life (viz.), not yield to what is sinful in God's sight, that he must likewise believe in all the promises of God through Christ, and love God supremely and his neighbour as himself—and that any effort after good and after God is all the result of God's grace and strength vouchsafed through Christ Jesus our Lord—and lastly, heaven is the reward of those who love and believe in Christ and live godly in Christ Jesus ; whereas hell is the doom of those who will not believe and repent.

Now in this brief sketch of the nature and requirements of Christianity we behold something very different indeed to a bare outward respectability which the gentlemanly heathen declares is the prevailing Christianity of the present day—alas, that it does prevail too much is that which gives force and point to the Book under discussion, and is the element of truth therein contained, however admixed with error. The bare abstaining from dishonesty, drunkenness, lying, and impurity as far come short of what Christianity really teaches and requires, as these same negative virtues come short of the devotion of the one genuine Christian of the Book. It is clear in the gospel scheme there are facts declared which are of paramount and vital importance—facts external to ourselves which affect and influence the whole destiny of the human species ; Christ was born and died, rose and ascended for our sakes, and out of these facts spring up the grandest system of motives conceivable, to affect human thought and human conduct, and man's everlasting destiny. It is hence in consequence of these facts and truths that man is influenced to believe and to live continually in a certain manner of life. It is hence that our affections are enlisted in the cause of God—that we love God and his dear Son, and that out of this love we strive to do His will.

The objective portion of Christianity produces the objec-

tive, every thought, every feeling, every duty, every action are more or less tinged by the motive which induces them. A dying beggar whose life may be saved by the crust given him by another, is thus saved by the food, but the act of the giver, though positively the same act, differs entirely morally and religiously according to the motive which induced it. One may have given him food because of human sympathy and love, because of Christian charity and kindness; another may have been forced to it against his will by the superior power of a third. One man is hanged for intentional murder; another escapes all punishment who killed his brother accidentally.

Hence the very same acts of temperance, honesty, purity, or such like, assume a different moral aspect, exactly in proportion to the motive which induces them, and the gentlemanly heathen's argument about outward conduct is answered in the preface by the author himself, when he remarks, "that the sternest type of morality was worthless before God, unless sanctified by faith and beautified by graces sought of him in prayer."

And hence I deny that even such conduct as temperance and honesty are the same in God's sight when exemplified by the civilized heathen and the sincere believer, and that in as much as Christianity is a glorious objective system, stating and substantiating facts, and thus suggesting motives of action of transcendent importance, whereby the nature of those actions are themselves totally altered in complexion, I assert that the morality of the heathen is totally different to the life of a Christian. Why, I would ask, did not the inane Parson in the dialogue enforce more distinctly *this* argument in accordance with the above remark quoted from the preface, and with the real truth of the case.

But the third consideration under our first proposition is this, that the government and control of the inward affections form an essential part of the teaching of Christ.

The outward act as affected by the inward motive is not alone to be considered, but the *inward condition* of the heart is of all points the most important and most essential ele-

ment in Christianity. Hence spring the conduct and life of every mortal being.

Christ was indeed a true Philosopher, and proved his divine knowledge of his creature's nature, when he preached in the sermon on the Mount not only that we may not kill ; but likewise we must not hate, nay, we must even love our enemies. He saw that the stream of water is either good or bad according as it flows from a good or bad source ; that the tree is known by its fruit—he insists in all his teaching that to make the life pure, the heart's affections must be pure as well, and that no mere outward respectability of conduct, representing nothing but a worldly spirit, and a worldly object, can satisfy the case. God wants our hearts ; he wants the subjection of the human will to his own will, and that thus our whole life may be brought into due submission to our heavenly father's government, and in this subjection of the heart's affections, in this victory over the wilfulness of our inner nature, whence all life and action spring, we say a warfare has to be accomplished, a battle to be fought, and a victory to be gained, which differ more than words can utter from the shallow outside form of respectability, so much prized by the heathen gentleman ; herein, thirdly, there is all the difference in the world between the morality of the heathen and true genuine Christianity.

But fourthly, consider one other point of vital importance in the comparison between mere outward respectability and the true conduct, life, and heart of a Christian indeed.

Whence comes all this love for God and our neighbour in its beauty and fair development ? Whence comes the deep repentance and sorrow for the past and determination to serve God for the future ? Whence springs the faith which affects the value of the conduct ? Whence, in short, comes the whole interior work in the heart of any human being ? *It comes of grace.* It is the work of God Himself. It is the product of God's presence resident in the human temple. Regeneration, or the new birth, renewal day by day—the presence of Christ with His people—here is the secret of the matter, here is the ground we take our stand on, and though

all good comes from God, the nearer we draw to Him, and the closer our communion with Him, according to *His own* appointed method, the wider is the difference between the civilized heathen and the real Christian. The one is the child of God, the other denies that he even knows Him. Now from the foregoing four considerations we clearly gather that the gentlemanly and respectable conduct and character of the heathen differ materially from the conduct and character and life of the true Christian.

From the consideration of the facts of the gospel; from the consideration that these facts afford motives of a transcendent character for man's conduct in accordance with Christ's commands; from the consideration that it is of the essence of Christianity that man should control the inward affections and bring them, as well as the outward conduct, into subjection to God's will; from the consideration that it is a *living* system, whereby its disciples are united to God by the gift of His Spirit—from all these four points any *mere* outward conformity of the life, in certain particulars and from inferior motives, comes as far short of the reality of religion as Mr. Ainslie himself could assert.

THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

But I now come to my second proposition, and it is this—that much that this book endeavours to prove as needful to true Christianity is by *no means* so, *but quite the reverse*; therefore it is not needful in order to be a Christian to lead the life of a Mr. Ainslie.

What *I have* been proving is this—In what essential particulars Christianity differs from the mere morality claimed by the heathen, as quite consistent with his heathen views.

What I am *now going* to endeavour to prove is that the heathen asserts or implies certain things *are needful* in the Christian's life and conversation, *not really* so.

The argument of the heathen in its results amounts to this, and the Preface fully corroborates the same view.

First, that Christianity is a new revelation and system destructive of all human institutions by its very nature; that it is so entirely a new revelation that it intrinsically is sepa-

rate from and independent of all other teachings, however good or beneficial; that it suggests pursuits and pleasures totally inconsistent with all earthly avocations and enjoyments, however necessary for civilization or refinement; that it begins a new system both of ideas and motives, which are opposed by its very nature to all mundane pursuits, however beneficial for our interests here in this world, and that it has no connection with any philosophy or wisdom propounded before or since.

Secondly, that Christianity teaches and commands us throughout its length and breadth to forsake all and to follow Christ, to take up a cross daily and hourly, to give up every pursuit and every pleasure which is not directly and definitely connected with Christ. To have no other thought, no other business, no other pleasure, no other object, no other occupation than the one absorbing pursuit of living in and with the Saviour; that any other occupation, not thus directly and purposely connected with him, is totally inconsistent with our absorption into Christ and annihilation of self by our union with him.

Thirdly, that heaven is the reward of those who thus seek Him, and hell the punishment, eternal, never ceasing, excruciating agony, for not myriads of years, but *for ever*, prepared for those who are impenitent and will not forsake all and follow Him.

Is it not, he therefore implies, the utmost insanity, if Christianity be true, if hell be our lot for ever, unless we conform to the above life, to think of anything else—to think of human business or human pleasure, to think of civilizing arts and education, of anything not *directly* connected with Christ and heaven, and with our deliverance from eternal flames? Hence all mundane pursuits and avocations as above stated are inconceivable to the true Christian, and all terrestrial pleasure must be in itself wrong and evil, and that the Bible from beginning to end declares such to be the case.

Fourthly, that to be a Christian indeed, we must be hated, if not loathed, by all other men—for as with the master so with the servant, and this our Lord distinctly states will be

the case, that the necessary result of Christ's doctrine evidenced in the life, will produce antipathy in the hearts of all who are not essentially Christian themselves.

Here are four propositions suggested.

Christianity is a new revelation subversive by its very nature of all earthly institutions and avocations arising therefrom.

Christianity requires us to give up all avocations and pleasures, not *directly* connected with the pursuit of holiness, and to follow Christ.

Christianity teaches us hell is the portion of the majority, therefore, how can we follow any pursuit not connected with our deliverance therefrom, or even smile or be merry in this world ?

Christianity renders us odious in the eyes of all not essentially Christian, and the legitimate result of such an interpretation is that none can be Christians who do not in *this* manner, and in the sense here intended, forsake all and follow Christ ; that therefore not only not one Bishop can be a Christian (as is kindly suggested by the heathen), but it is clear that from the Queen on her throne to the lowest clerk in a counting house, from the highest to the lowest of those occupied in the concerns of life, *there cannot be one* who is a true follower of our Lord ; not one member of the royal family, not one member of either house of parliament, not a statesman or politician, not a merchant or man of business, can possibly, owing to their position and obligations, be really what our Lord requires, a man who forsakes *all* and follows him.

In the effort here evinced to crush out of profession the real worldliness of professors, surely such statements as these prove a little too much, and grate against that common sense, despised by the author, but yet the gift of an all-wise Creator and Father.

FIRST, then, the book would lead us to suppose that *Christianity, being a new revelation, is subversive, by its very nature, of all human institutions and avocations and of all the results arising therefrom.*

To my mind nothing can be more totally false than such a supposition as this, and arises from a *total misapprehension* of the intention and object of Christ's mission on earth. Of course, Christianity is a new revelation, but it is *not* by its nature destructive of all human institutions. Christianity finds upon earth an already existing state of things—man with his varied faculties and qualities of mind, and endowed with talents and gifts bestowed by the Creator of heaven and earth. The faculties of mind and body, originally faultless and pronounced to be very good, have been marred and injured by the fall of man, have fallen consequently from their high estate, and been defaced by the introduction of sin.

The object of God revealing himself in the person of his Son was not to *re-create* those fallen faculties and powers of mind and body—not to make man over again—a new humanity, as it were, but to restore, renew, and purify an already existing human being. Not to bestow *new* faculties and powers, but to sanctify and make them good, and fit for the ends and objects for which originally they were intended by their Maker. Hence *strictly* speaking it is not a new nature which Christ gives us by His Holy Spirit, but a *renewed* nature, called a new nature because of the effect produced, from a dead torpid state the grace of God raising us up to God and newness of life, restoring the whole inner being of man to what it should be, so that in effect he has a new heart and leads a new life. It is of course an entirely new life in one sense, for the gift of God's Holy Spirit is a new gift, and this being granted to the soul of man, he is born again to newness of life; but the faculties of soul which are thus germinated with God's grace were there before—the work of God which now he restores to himself.

Bearing this in mind, then, it is easy to perceive that Christianity does not require us to believe that all human institutions, the product of human thought and human power, are necessarily evil and all avocations wrong. They *are only* so when opposed to God's will, unsanctified with His blessing, and subversive of His orderings; therefore

Christianity is not a new revelation, subversive of all human institutions and all human work, no more than it is subversive of all human faculties and powers of mind. No, it is to exalt every affection and quality of heart and mind, to permeate every human avocation with the presence of His grace, and to raise the already given nature to its original goodness and position in God's sight, to point out to it the true and proper standard of right and wrong, that Christianity is vouchsafed to a fallen world.

Endowed with certain powers of mind, with capabilities of soul and heart, we are responsible for their due cultivation, whatever they may be—to exercise them in the daily pursuits and habits of life for which they are intended by the giver. For in this spiritual part of our being there are resident qualities, some of an intellectual, some of a moral tendency, whilst others are more closely allied to the affections and desires. There are aptitudes which adapt themselves to all the varying circumstances through which we pass, either of joy or of sorrow, either of temporal or eternal importance.

Christianity is indeed a new revelation, fresh, glorious, and the only one ever vouchsafed to the children of men ; but it is a scheme employed by the giver of all good whereby his creature may be fitted for heaven whilst resident on earth, and through his terrestrial life to pass to a celestial existence. Every thing in the economy of life must bear a proper proportion to each other ; not one point should possess an undue importance as compared with another, but all things should work together in harmonious concord, the less important never usurping the place of the more important, but all things done with a sense of God's presence and God's requirements, and *then* shall we find out the true method when God is found *in all*, whether in the merchant's office or in the council chambers of the nation, whether in the House of God or in the private chamber at home, whether in the merry laugh of a child romping on the village green or in the innocent pleases of youth and manhood.

Christianity is *not* subversive of all human institutions and pursuits, *though it is a new glorious revelation*, affecting all

these matters only so far as in their nature they require to be affected under the altered circumstance of Christ having come upon earth.

But secondly. Christianity requires and commands us to give up all avocations and pleasures not directly connected with the pursuit of holiness. We have seen that the *external* pursuits of life are not necessarily inconsistent with our calling in Christ Jesus, and therefore evil; and by no means are they sinful because in a *direct* sense they are not connected with the pursuit of holiness, but quite the reverse. The power of carrying out such avocations and the results arising therefrom are clearly the gifts of God himself, as much as corn for food and air for breath, and cannot therefore be either necessarily evil or inconsistent with His own revelation of His will. As with the power of mind, so with the pursuit which springs legitimately therefrom—if the one is of God, so is the other, whether it be a *direct* service to his honour or *as indirect as possible*. The labourer working in the field is serving God in his station. The minister in the House of God declares His will and is doing His service as well. Both are doing God's will, the one more directly in a sense than the other. But we know that the moment anything sinful enters into our pursuits, then are they inconsistent with our calling as Christians. And more than this, for even when in the abstract this may not be the case, there may yet be sin in the pursuit or pleasure *to us individually*, and this owing to circumstances or results pertinent to ourselves alone.

On the one hand there are many pursuits and pleasures in life which are distinctly sinful in themselves by being opposed to the very first principles of right and wrong, or by being inconsistent with God's will and command, and on the other hand there are many pursuits perfectly harmless and innocent in themselves, which only become evil by either weaning the heart from better objects or by occupying too large a share of our affections in comparison with matters far more important.

Moreover, a thing harmless may become harmful to him who pursues it, from natural infirmity of heart and mind, owing to which the most innocent avocations may become injurious, and therefore to be strictly avoided.

One of two points has therefore always to be ascertained—is the pursuit intrinsically evil or is it an evil only to us individually, for in either case sin of course lies at the door. Unless, therefore, there is evil in either one way or the other, we cannot, as reasonable beings, consider the pursuit or pleasure under discussion as anything else than that which may be perfectly good in God's sight, and in accordance with his own intention and gifts, whence these very matters spring. Now we have to apply the test of Scripture as the crucible in which the alloy may be discovered and the precious ore obtained. And I would remark that in this investigation, which as Christians we ought to undertake, it should, I consider, be taken for granted that, unless there is some clear reason to the contrary, the Old Testament must guide us to our conclusions in union with the New. And this is the more especially the case regarding the matter we are now discussing, as the daily life, the political events, the business and occupations of man, are delineated in the one, whilst they are not historically portrayed in the other, but are only indirectly alluded to and enforced.

And surely were the whole conception of man's life, interests, business, and occupation to do with earth, totally at fault, under the old Dispensation, it is evident *under the new* we should have a *clear* unmistakeable Voice, explaining the whole matter and guiding us aright in so intricate and constant a difficulty. Instead, therefore of the Word of God proving to us that all life's occupations must be evil, unless in a direct sense connected with the pursuit of holiness and God's worship, we shall find this, that "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of this life that now is, and of that which is to come."

It is to my mind an unfortunate term to speak of anything as *directly* or *indirectly* connected with holiness, because after all *everything* good in itself has a certain bearing upon, and relation towards, the result desired, so that, as in a beautiful landscape the slightest light or shadow goes to produce the general effect, even as the more important features are essential to its existence, so every so-called trivial circum-

stance and action, every pursuit and object has some influence, however imperceptible, in producing the whole character and position of each individual being; but I use the terms in order to distinguish between the less and the more important matters of life in which we are interested in this complex existence, through which we are passing to eternity. It is owing to our not realising how complex, how apparently inconsistent, how difficult of comprehension, our nature really is, that we fall into the error of imagining things are not, what they actually are—items which affect the sum total more or less of this life.

I maintain that in no part of Scripture where the history of man and his affairs are brought before our attention, where his daily work and business, where his riches, power, and influence, as results of that work, are related, shall we find that such work and such results are condemned abstractedly, or as in themselves an evil. And even this is not the case, where riches and power exist independently of all work to obtain them, but through the force of circumstances.

We are told that the “meek shall inherit the earth,” and this is carried out in the earthly blessings of those who love the Lord. This is proved to us in the history of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah and Daniel. Here are Kings and Statesmen, rich men and prosperous. Here are those who especially loved God, and yet were at the very summit of political and social power.

Abraham was occupied with his herds and his cattle, Joseph wielded an almost sovereign sceptre over the whole land of Egypt, Daniel prospered in a similar manner, political economy occupied much of their attention on earth, in endeavouring to rule honestly kingdoms and nations. David and Hezekiah, whilst sovereigns themselves, over a great people, occupied with wars and troubles of all sorts, were yet especially beloved of God.

The enormous power and wealth of Solomon himself are not condemned by the Scriptures, nay, they were the direct gifts of God Himself, and to sum up the list of Old Testa-

ment saints, Job was a wealthy man, probably unparalleled in his age, powerful, and in every sense a great man of this world; but notwithstanding this greatness is not condemned as an evil—nay, quite the reverse—it was the gift of God. It was not the avocations he pursued—not the business he controlled, not the glory of his renown spread over the world, which brought desolation and destruction upon all his hopes. The mighty owner of innumerable herds and flocks, of pastures and far-stretching acres, fell from the pinnacle of all his earthly glory and prosperity, that he might be tried in the furnace of affliction and led to put his trust on the Lord his God, and not on those perishing baubles, and yet they were restored to him sevenfold into his bosom by that God of love who still cared for his servant, and Job became greater than ever. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, Hezekiah, Daniel, and Job, whether as kings or as statesmen, whether as men of great earthly substance or influence, are clear proofs that such pursuits as result in riches, that such avocations as are needful for government, for civilization, for advance in all human progress, are not only harmless in themselves, but when used aright (and not abused), when used in due subjection to higher duties, are appointed by God as methods of his government, and flow from the gifts which He Himself has vouchsafed. Whilst on the other hand the passages of Scripture where the contrary seems to appear as the lesson intended, where we are told to forsake all and follow Christ, where every relation must be forsaken, and every penny given up, where the only pursuit must be the preaching Christ, the only occupation the direct work of saving souls, we shall find that it is *not* with the intention of laying down a *general* duty for all mankind, but that such advice was needful because of the condition of the heart of the individual advised, or because it was the peculiar and especial call of some certain individuals to give up all in order to go forth to preach the Gospel. The Young Ruler representing the one class, the Apostles the other.

The New Testament does not profess to give us the history of manners and the occupations of a people—these are more

delineated as a matter of course in the Old Testament, but notwithstanding in the teaching of our Lord we find no general condemnation of worldly advance and civilization, quite the reverse.

Herod, Cæsar, Pilate, are not condemned for their princely power and influence. Zaccheus, or the nobleman of Galilee are not censured for their riches. The daily occupations of the masses are not dwelt on as of little importance, but the very parables of instruction are taken from these daily matters, in order to illustrate spiritual and more important truth, but never with the intention of making light of its relative importance. I totally deny, therefore, the inference, supposed to be derived from the Bible, that all interests are wicked and all earthly pleasure unsuitable to an immortal being. Somehow or another they have their part in the formation of that being's character. The external pursuits of life entirely depend on what they actually are, whether they be good or bad. The danger consists in the manifold temptations surrounding them, interlacing their varied intricacies, and permeating every path of life. These temptations are the danger and the precipice to be avoided lest we slip and fall and perish everlastingly. The difficulty of a rich man's salvation is declared to be in consequence of temptations surrounding that which may be used aright. The abuse and not the use of all these matters is condemned—and the danger is lest we abuse and do not use aright God's gifts and favours. Herein is the real struggle of life, the real knot to be untied, the point to be decided by us all. The fallacy is to suppose a matter *must* be evil because danger lurks under the brightest outside.

The danger is in the heart of man, which is desperately wicked, and in the abuse of that which is intended for our proper use and for our sober regard, *and the conclusion* to be drawn from the Scripture is, I maintain that Christianity *does not* require us to give up all avocations and pleasures not *directly* connected with the pursuit of holiness—but that all things should hold their proper position relatively to each other and be subjected to God and His Divine will.

And in this theory the teaching of the Book is entirely wrong, the life of a Mr. Ainslie not being needful to true Christianity.

THIRDLY. *Christianity teaches us that Hell is the punishment of the majority, how is it possible therefore for us ever to follow any pursuit not connected with our deliverance from its flames—or ever smile, or be merry in this world, when we think either of our own possible perdition or the loss of others.* The Book forcibly puts this question in many places.

And at first sight it has a specious appearance and an ugly look, and yet our common reason, and, thank God, the common sense with which we are endowed, and which is enforced in every page of the Bible, give us an answer to the question, whether it be intelligible to us or not. They strikingly show us the exact contrary to what this book almost blasphemously tries to enforce. They show us that God has so made and so constituted us, that the human mind would not bear, could not endure, to dwell exclusively on the thought of punishment, and that yet punishment *does* await the impenitent and the unbelieving. The book asks how can it be said that the same Creator, Who has made the mind of man, has yet so constituted it that it cannot endure the *perpetual* contemplation of eternal punishment, if that punishment, according to his own ordinance, is the fact, truly awaiting the majority of this world. Turn to pages eleven and twelve, and there we read the following passages:—“No man with one grain of sense, if he soberly believed
“that he was to live upon this earth for three score years and
“ten, and then to live in Heaven or Hell for three score
“million centuries ten times told, would consent to spend
“one short minute of his life in any work which did not
“tangibly and obviously tend to make his salvation more
“secure. If this should be denied, and it should be urged
“that the mind of man is constituted with a view to present
“action, and is incapable of brooding over possible futurities,
“I would ask, who constituted it thus? Has God, who is
“represented as all merciful, and as longing to save our
“souls, has He threatened us with everlasting torment if we

“do not obey His will, and at the same time so created us as
 “to make it impossible for us to be very much afraid of His
 “judgments? Has He said to us poor miserable creatures,
 “I shall damn you to all eternity if you do not consecrate
 “your whole life and being to my service; but if you dare to
 “be overwhelmed with terror at such a thought, and to go
 “about weeping and wringing your hands and crying to me
 “for salvation, I shall say that you are neglecting your
 “worldly duties, and shall damn you all the more?”

Further on again, “If it be true that the human mind
 “cannot realize the horrors that await the impenitent, such
 “a constitution was never ordained by a merciful God, but by
 “a crafty Devil.”

Now as *Christians* maintain that the punishment of the wicked *is allowed* by GOD, and that it will actually take place hereafter is a *fact*, not suggested by the devil, but declared in GOD’S word itself, *Christians* cannot of course admit that to enforce the doctrine of punishment in hell is the devil’s work, for to do so is blasphemy. Moreover, *Christians* and reasonable men endowed with common sense likewise maintain, that though it is possible for the mind to contemplate *at times* this awful truth, that yet *God has* so constituted the mind of man as to render *it impossible* that man should *continually* dwell on this most awful thought. Hence the position taken up by the author that if hell is declared to be a fact by GOD, then man must think of and contemplate nothing else but its horrors, in order to escape from them, or that else GOD cannot have declared *hell* to be a *fact*, but that the devil must have declared it, is to a reasonable man false, for a reasonable man knows *it is* declared by GOD in His Word, and yet he knows also that the mind of man *is so constituted* as to be unable to endure its perpetual contemplation. This may seem *unreasonable* to the author, who as professing himself to be a Christian, has of course cast common sense to the dogs, and condemns Philosophy, as opposed to Christianity; but yet (as I think) I can show it to be all of a piece with, and even in strict analogy with, the gravest and most practical matters of every day life, even setting aside Christian truth for argument’s sake.

We find it to be an actual fact, incontrovertible, that man is perfectly aware that death is certainly awaiting him. He is perfectly aware that in a large proportion of cases sickness, long and severe, pain, great bodily agony, distress and weakness, trouble and trial, are endured before death itself closes our mortal career. He goes into a hospital and he finds pain and weakness stamped on his fellow creatures' face with lines which are unmistakeable; he visits the sick and dying. He goes forth into life and he finds constant accidents are occurring around him, death in its most horrible forms happening to very many in the world. The newspapers supply the facts, our own experience can conjure up a vast host of witnesses to the truth of these assertions—and yet though he himself (and he is perfectly aware of it) may be the very next victim who may suffer—though he knows that there may be an end of all his terrestrial joy in an instant, yet he is able to be cheerful and hopeful, to laugh and to feel merry, and to work with a good heart after those very objects—power, influence, riches, glory, which in an instant, his reason tells him, may make themselves wings and flee away. Why, if we view only one side of human nature, only the liabilities to which it is heir, and not the firmly implanted feeling of *hope*, which upheaves the human bosom with energy and power for action, we shall undoubtedly come to the conclusion that that man must be a fool indeed to hope almost against hope, and to laugh and sing and work and live, often as if he had no share or lot in any of these trials, however much his fellow creatures may have to endure them.

Surely here is a strictly analogous case to the higher, and, I grant, stronger one urged by the author. But the argument is *clear* and *unfaltering*, and it answers the view so unreasonably and almost wickedly advanced.

God made man and his nature. God has ordained the trials and sorrow to which more or less he is heir in this life—yet God implanted the hope and the energy, and gave the talents and capabilities which render the individual's walk elastic, his face to smile, his heart to rejoice. God has given the mercies he possesses as well

as the sorrows. He has given him a wife whom he adores, children whom he loves, friends, whose friendship he values. He has afforded a thousand opportunities for gratitude and praise, and hence, whilst he has likewise often tried his creature for some wise end and object, he has afforded him cause for rejoicing. Here are two sets of facts, positive, actual, and real, so contradictory that the one set makes our hearts to mourn, the other our souls to rejoice. And yet, however contradictory to our poor grovelling, ignorant, one-sided view of things, yet all these qualities of heart and mind and all these external circumstances by which our minds are moulded—so contradictory and so apparently inconsistent, are all the work and the ordering of Him who knows whereof we are made, and has of his wisdom for wise reasons *actually thus constituted our human nature.*

So with Christianity. There is the truth that punishment awaits the impenitent, and it is dwelt on in God's word to some extent. It has its proper position in the scheme of the Gospel, not unduly cropping up, not holding so important a position as other even still greater and happier truths. There is the love of Christ as well, there is the cross of Calvary, there is the glorious resurrection of Him who rose the first fruits from the dead—there is the trust we fix on Christ, there are the arms of His love held out towards us, and the glorious hope thus implanted in our hearts, which bear a Christian—one who sincerely wishes to obey God and his Son, through the trials and tribulations of life, and make him rejoice even in the midst of sorrow. Now I maintain that just as we are constituted, irrespective of revelation, so does revelation itself deal with our humanity. And I maintain that if there appears to be an inconsistency in the last case, so is there in the first as well. But there is no real inconsistency, it is only so to our finite understanding—no more than in all nature around, in which we find the law of compensation ever at work in the arrangements of the Creator, but which yet result in that which is good and right and perfect. Hence the argument is clear; it is a part of our common nature to possess an implanted hope within us which

compensates for the fears and sorrows of life and enables us to bear and even to rejoice under the present, or at the prospect of future trouble. We do as a fact possess the capacity for hope and joy, though sorrow and pain are clearly near to every man : even in old age we possess it, when life, we are certain, is drawing to its close, yet hope in the withered heart stirs up her glowing fires within, and bears us over the roughest roads and through the darkest nights of this world.

Now if it be so regarding the things of time limited by the grave, so with the future beyond its portals and beyond its power.

Are the sorrows of hell infinitely worse and more enduring than the worst agonies of this life ? Yes, it may be so indeed. But yet the joys of heaven set before us in the Gospel of life are as infinitely greater than the joys of this life as heaven is better than earth, and this, in due proportion, adequately compensates in God's orderings for all the terrors of a future punishment, which at times we realize and remember. The law of natural religion and revelation are one and the same, and the argument is complete. The fallacy of this book is that the man who writes it, not being a philosopher, views human nature only on one side of it. The love of God and the trust we have in Christ are meant to those in earnest richly to compensate for the harrowing thought that we may possibly be castaways, or that our friends may be lost. *We trust in Christ.*

And the position taken up in the Gospel is this : that whilst there is no uncertain reference made to the punishment of the impenitent, yet every page of it teems with the love and work of Christ, who came into the world not to condemn it, but on purpose to save it, and to be the hope of immortality set before those who look to him for life.

I maintain that the joys of religion are full to overflowing to those who trust.

I maintain that there is nothing inconsistent in the due regard we should pay to more purely earthly occupations and pleasures, and those greater pleasures and more important

occupations of *direct* communion with our God and Saviour, so long as the less important does not take the place of the more important; so long as each and every pursuit of life whatever it may be, holds its proper position in the economy of life—so long God's will is done.

I maintain that instead of its being a glaring inconsistency and an evil that our children should romp and play and sing and laugh and be happy, it is one of the *best* of sights with which God gladdens our hearts and refreshes our eye sight.

It is a good and pleasant sight to see the children playing on the village green, enjoying God's blessings and mercies. It is a pleasant sound to hear their merry laugh ringing in our ears, and to see their enjoyment full—few things make us remember God's love more; few things make us realize His goodness and His mercies towards the children of men more distinctly: and that he has indeed given us all things richly to enjoy, when thus employed in their proper and right places.

“We have piped unto you and ye have not danced, we have mourned unto you and ye have not lamented.”

The Christian, as described by this book, is in danger of being a misanthrope indeed. Oh let us avoid such Christianity! Oh let us remember that joy and love are the true goal we seek after and shall inherit, and that the Gospel is a sound of glad tidings to man more than ever it is a sound of woe to the wicked, and that God willeth not the death of the sinner.

But, fourthly, Christianity should render us odious in the eyes of all not essentially Christian.

I believe that in such a statement as this the author again looks at only one side of truth, and draws a general conclusion from insufficient premises. I cannot help feeling we ought to be very careful to weigh well one scripture with another, and the different portions of Christian truth with each other, before we seize hold of one passage, which bears on a particular truth, and hence generalize throughout every phase of our teaching that which was meant to have in reality some limit to its application.

We must, in considering the above statement, review not only certain passages, but we must review them in the light of the whole nature and genus of Christianity. We cannot arrive at the truth without fairly doing this; and I would assert that instead of the *whole* gospel declaring that every real Christian shall be hated and necessarily loathed (if he do his duty in declaring truth) by all those who are not real Christians, it is a statement which cannot for a moment be borne out by the facts of the case, and a theory never intended by our blessed Lord Himself.

Now I am bearing in mind distinctly that which makes, I acknowledge freely, so much for the general theory of the author, that our Lord declares on two solemn occasions that his disciples shall be hated of all men, the one when he was sending forth the seventy to preach repentance, and describing the persecutions and trials they would have to undergo at the hand of the unbelieving Jews. The other, when pointing out the similar persecutions coming on the earth at the hand of unbelievers and those who opposed themselves professedly to the gospel of Christ.

A description of the trials to be endured under certain definite circumstances of an especial character and at the hand of especial people. In both instances pointing to the positive opposition to the truths of Christianity promulgated by the teachers of religion and opposed by those who hated the very name of Christ, so much so, that in consequence of the strong feeling aroused thereby, "Brother shall deliver up brother to death and the father the child, and the children should rise up against their parents and cause them to be put to death." A result from the cruel opposition of those who rejected Christ and his servants. So that all family ties of affection are forgotten in the fierce outburst of the passions of the heart, opposed to truth and light.

In one other passage in St. John xv. our Lord is enforcing brotherly love, and speaks of the world hating his disciples, but he says, "Ye know it hated me before it hated you, if ye were of the world, the world would love his own, but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out

“ of the world, therefore the world hateth you,” and then he continues, “ Remember the word that I said unto you, the “ servant is not greater than his Lord, if they have persecuted “ me they will also persecute you, if they have kept my “ saying they will keep yours also.” A passage referring again to the open opposition the Gospel would meet with from unbelieving nations, and which to the letter came to pass in all the fiery persecutions of Christ Himself and His devoted followers.

Are these passages such as prove that under every existing circumstance of social and political and domestic life, in all ages and at all periods, that Christianity and its teachers shall be hated of all men who are not religious themselves? Can it be said from hence, as the author does by the mouth of the polite heathen, that we ought to be odious and make ourselves disagreeable and intolerable to all our neighbours who are not converted men and real Christians, that we ought to effect this desirable object by constantly reminding them of their sins and follies, and forcing our advice unasked upon their wearied and sickened attention? Such a deduction is perfectly monstrous and unreasonable in the extreme, and could only be advanced, I humbly suggest, by a man who, whilst professing himself a Christian, is yet acknowledgedly *no philosopher*. A title which, for consistency sake, he *must* indeed have ignored.

The question regarding the above and any similar passages is simply this: are we to suppose that the dislike and hatred of Christianity are feelings entertained by *all* persons not actually themselves practical Christians, or are these feelings confined only to a *portion* of those who are not really Christians? I maintain that such feelings are not necessarily entertained by *all* unconverted men, but quite the reverse, and strictly speaking the antipathy for goodness and Christ has been, and is only, entertained by *some* of those who are not thorough Christians in their lives.

It was entertained exactly by those regarding whom our Lord was speaking at the time, and it is entertained by such in the present day. Hatred and antipathy were manifested by

Pharisees, Sadducees, and the Jews generally, who rejected the Christian religion. It was entertained by the Romans, Asiatics, and Greeks, who worshipped Jupiter, Diana, or other false deities. It was entertained by a people and individuals who professed another religion and viewed the Gospel as false, and who wilfully rejected the light even when they were forced to credit the miracles of the Lord. It was of such that our Lord distinctly was speaking, when he stated his followers should be hated of all men. The *all* referring to all those who professedly hated the truth of the Gospel, referring to a certain phase and condition of things—the trials and persecutions actually alluded to in each of those passages of Scripture—in which it is said his followers should be hated of all men, and Christianity is now hated by Buddhists, Mahometans, and heathen generally, who are opposed to the truths of Revelation.

Can it be possible that the author imagines our Lord referred to *all professors* of the Gospel who did not act consistently with their high calling? Would Constantine or any Roman Emperor who did what they could to advance the interests of the Christian faith, however inconsistent themselves in their lives, have really *hated* good and consistent men who taught the truth and acted according to it? Practically this cannot be; theoretically it is improbable.

I will grant that it may be answered that philosophically there is a natural antipathy between what is good and evil. And it may be that evil as evil may hate good as good, and yet as a rule *mere* professors may respect and admire the Gospel, for we are, after all, not any of us thorough devils or thorough angels, and hence not being possessed with this particular kind of evil which leads to hatred of all that is good, the professor, whilst inconsistent himself, may, from some good qualities yet resident within, admire that which he does not practise himself. Or it may be, as far as he is bad he might dislike it, but as far as he is good, he cannot but admire it. And in this particular the good counter-balances the evil.

However this may be, *this* is likewise Philosophy and

Christianity to believe that good, *wherever* really found, will elicit praise and admiration at the hand of those with whom it comes in contact, unless *every* avenue to the human heart be closed to light and righteousness. That which is pure and lovely and God-like, that which is beautiful and healing, that which offers peace and consolation and life, that which promotes good-will on earth and honour and glory in heaven, is very much to be loved and admired from its own intrinsic force and from its blessed effects.

That *Christianity* is thus admired by the force of its own inherent merits is, I imagine, beyond question. Its very genius and character elicit the praise even of those who do not care to follow its life-giving precepts. In a land where it is generally *professed* by *most* men, not thoroughly hardened to all that is right, it will naturally be regarded as a good and not as an evil.

The statement, therefore, *that all* Christians must be hated of necessity by those not practically Christian is *absolutely false* and unfounded.

Oh, let it be ever impressed upon our minds that love is the leading and crowning feature which adorns the Gospel of Jesus Christ and by its *inherent force must* call forth some response from those not thoroughly hardened to all ideas of virtue. Believing all things, hoping all things, and bearing all things, it shines forth in the heart and life of the sincere servant of God, inducing him under all trials and sorrows to be gentle and forgiving, kind and affectionate, forbearing and considerate towards others. The genius of the Gospel is that "all bitterness and wrath, anger and clamour, and "evil speaking should be put away from us with all malice, "and that we should be kind one to another, tender-hearted "and forgiving one another even as GOD for Christ's sake is "willing to forgive us." Hence I maintain that such an influence as *Christianity* in the heart must be productive, as a rule, of good-will and kindly feeling in others towards one so influenced. But one word more on this head. The author, ignoring the above sentiments, seems to feel that *Christianity* should render us very disagreeable to many of

our neighbours, and should, because of our censures on their conduct, render ourselves perfectly odious in their eyes, and this, too, under the notion that we are at all times responsible openly to rebuke them for their faults, and severely to reprimand them for their inconsistencies.

There can be no manner of question that when the occasion calls for it we are undoubtedly to rebuke sin and openly to show our desire to be on GOD'S side, never denying him before men, or the cause which we profess. To compromise any truth by silence, to be ashamed of our faith and love for Christ, would be sinful, cowardly, and utterly unworthy. But we are to remember that we are informed of the method by which to effect good, and are endowed with the reason, which we are ever to exercise. The method of our instruction must be one consistent with the harmlessness of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent, and this was the especial advice of our Lord to his disciples when he sent them forth to preach His kingdom.

We are to remember in addition that for any failure in the due exercise of wisdom and due gentleness of the dove, we shall be responsible for not only not doing our best, but also for not influencing, as we might have done, our brother's heart. Now if my theory of the force inherent in the gospel be true, bringing peace and good-will amongst men, we should feel that sooner or later the consistent lives led by ourselves may have an effect in due season, that practice may answer *better* than *preaching*, that the *indirect* word of advice may at times have greater weight than the hot and angry thunderbolts of religious displeasure. And we must remember that there is such a thing as casting our pearls before swine and their turning and trampling them under their feet. The wise discreet minister, who sobers his discourse with a word spoken in due season, who does not disgust by ill-advised censure, though he *never* compromises a single truth, who by his own practice of simplicity and genuine charity and love is respected and beloved by all his parishioners, whose outspoken word of rebuke comes, when truly needed, and when a gentler word would not have the necessary effect,

will do more with the worldly and unconverted than the man who thunders out his admonitions upon every conceivable occasion.

And when we recall examples of these two classes of ministers, I think we shall all agree that the former gathers more sheep into the fold of Christ by his love and his gentleness and his known abhorrence of evil, than the other does by all his determined and out-spoken advice, so often deficient both in the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of Christian love. I conclude this by maintaining that the Christian need not render himself odious in the eyes of those who are lacking in true Christianity.

And thus have I in the above portion of the argument endeavoured to prove that much of what is declared to be of the essence of the matter is not essential to Christian faith and practice. It is not necessary to give up all earthly pursuits and all avocations unless directly connected with holiness. It is not necessary for ever to dwell on hell as the unutterable misery to be avoided by mankind. It is not necessary to render the name of Christian odious in our endeavours after the good of others.

But now let me briefly draw together the threads of the argument and place the matter fairly before the reader.

There in the Book sits before us the weak tobacco smoking Parson, who taps and refills his pipe with edifying indifference, and who endeavours to explain what Christianity really is when forced to do so by his more sagacious and powerful antagonist, and there sits the Civilized Heathen, who protests that all that his friend describes as necessary for a Christian is nothing better than civilized heathenism, and then with vigorous touches paints what (though not a Christian himself) he conceives Christianity really to be—a description which afterwards is verified in the person of Mr. Ainslie. Here we have, therefore, the one representing Christianity in the most inefficient manner possible and the other declaring Christianity to be in some respects what it by no means really is, and thus muddling up matters of the most transcendent importance, so that the young and unwary

have to choose between *an alternative of falsehood* on both sides, the one negative and the other affirmative, which leaves the most sacred matters in a state of mist and uncertainty and renders it very difficult for the mind to see the clear truth which takes up its ground on a basis different to both—for on the one hand the Parson most inadequately describes that which is necessary in order to be a Christian, dwelling on the mere outside proprieties of life, whilst on the other hand the Heathen declares certain points as essential to a Christian, which are inconsistent with God's intention and meaning.

On the one hand, instead of dwelling (when challenged to describe Christianity) on the living facts of the Everlasting Gospel—Christ's death and resurrection—standing out as motives for our conduct, such as the world never heard of before—instead of dwelling on the inward work of the Holy Spirit and God's life in the soul, as the source of all holiness and spiritual life—on the internal condition of the heart as the source of the outward actions of the life—the Parson dwells on mere outward respectability which may be nothing more than a civilized heathenism.

And on the reverse side of the picture the Heathen nobly illustrates at times what Christianity should be—how worldliness exists rampantly throughout the world, and yet mingles with it a tissue of unreasonable and false conclusions, which bewilders the understanding, and gives a false notion of the truth itself.

The method adopted in this answer is one by which the inadequacy of the statement made by the Parson is exposed and the false requirements of the Heathen are stated, whereby it may be realized how easily the Parson might have exposed the folly and unscriptural deductions of the Heathen, and yet have stated convincingly that Christianity is altogether different to Heathenism in its nature and obligations.

And now let us freely acknowledge the truth which underlies and gives force and effect to the words of this book. That which is true and forcible is this, that worldliness under the respectable name of Christianity, runs riot throughout

society to a very great extent, and it is most certainly to be freely confessed that the more unimportant pursuits and pleasures of this life are infallibly choking the word, so that it becometh unfruitful. It is true that both pursuits which are evil, and pursuits which, whilst innocent, yet usurp too large a share of our affections, engross the attention and expel the pursuit of holiness from the life, and the love of God from the heart.

Let all this be granted as but too true, but whilst acknowledging a truth let us not enforce it by a falsehood by condemning that which is harmless in itself and which is intended in moderation. Let us not renounce as sinful the use of anything, which by our nature is clearly intended, because others may abuse it to their own destruction, but rather discover the true method of withdrawing the chaff from the wheat, remembering that most things may become evil by our over indulgence in them, and that all things are invested with temptation in this state of probation and trial, because of our sinful inclination and downward tendencies. Worldliness and godliness are essentially opposed, and we can never remember this too frequently. But what is worldliness? It is surely any thing which interferes with our due love for God, and His will, whether it be by our *loving evil* or by our loving anything else more than we love God. When any other affection dethrones the supremacy of His love, then are we worldly and irreligious and unchristian. But when a man can lay his hand upon his heart and say, "I have innumerable interests and many blessings and pleasures in this life, which my God has freely given me, but on none have I set my affection to the exclusion of God, He reigns supremely, and to do His will, whatever it may be, is my chief delight," to such an one the £4000 a year he enjoys is not sinful—the dinner parties he goes to are not wrong—the intercourse of his friends and neighbours is not an evil—the joyous laugh and merry making of those whom he loves is not unchristian—but he sees in all the stamp of God's love, and that love permeates all with a gleam of its glory and with the felt presence of His grace. That in all

the pursuits and pleasures of life there exist the greatest temptations is a most certain truth, so that the "cares and pleasures of this life choke the word," but it does not follow there is sin, because there is temptation. Certainly wherever we find our own personal and chief temptation at work, striving to injure our welfare, in those particulars we have the greatest need for earnest and sincere carefulness and anxiety. The thousands who fail in thus distinguishing between good and evil should be our never failing warning and caution.

And now let me conclude by giving the following suggestions for our consideration as a means perhaps for our guidance :—

FIRST, Let us ever bear in mind that human nature is not made anew by Christianity, but every part of it, both body and soul, is renewed, enlightened, and restored to God's image by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

SECONDLY, Let us remember that in our endeavouring to understand Scripture we must fairly take the *whole* of it and compare it well, one portion with another, before we come to any conclusion.

THIRDLY, Let us remember that *abstract* and *concrete* sin (if I may so express myself) are *not always* the same, and that by not realizing this we often take, what is intended for a particular rule, under exceptional circumstances, for an universal and ever-binding obligation—which upon examination we often find is not intended to be the case.

FOURTHLY, Let us remember that the grand battle of life in which a Christian has to fight is not only against the *external* pursuits of life or to regulate the *outward* conduct, but to overcome a *rebellious nature within*, which is ever striving for the mastery, and that if we thoroughly by God's grace gain the victory *there*, then will the life be regained from sin to the service of our GOD and Saviour.

And above all things let us remember that man is so constituted both in mind and body, as to be evidently adapted for *innumerable* pursuits, some of which are more or less connected with the objects of this world, powers granted

for our maintenance and livelihood, for our improvement and culture, and which though not *directly* connected with the culture of holiness, are yet of GOD, intended for our good in some way or another. The bodily as well as mental qualities, all have some legitimate end in view, an object in the economy of human life and are all the work of our all-wise Creator.

It is as impossible to believe that GOD would require anything at our hands *inconsistent* with the due development of these powers as that He should be inconsistent with himself.

But let us likewise remember that the moment the least earthly duty or object in life is disconnected with GOD's blessing and favor, the moment it is otherwise done than with a sense of His sanction and approval, it becomes an evil, and hence in the *real* Christian there must be the closest bond of union, linking together all the actions, thoughts, and feelings of life, whatever they may be; and yet, though this bond exists between all the pursuits of life, without which we do not please GOD, let us likewise remember that we cannot serve GOD and Mammon, and that this twofold attempt at service is actually taking place, not when we do our duty in the state of life in which we are placed by transacting our earthly business or in the innocent enjoyment of those things which are harmless, but when through the force of temptation we yield to sin, or love the pursuits of the world more than we love GOD. The world, the flesh, and the Devil are at work; and the *world* means, not going to a dinner party or for a Bishop to possess £5000 a year, but when the *dinner party* and the £5000 *a year* are more precious in our eyes than the love of GOD. *The Mammon* means, not being rich as Abraham or Solomon or Job, but when these uncertain riches take hold of our affections and become our master instead of our servant, when they are not employed for GOD's honour and on those things which are consistent with our highest duties in life—preparing for eternity and the possession of heaven.

AND LASTLY, Let us remember the words of our Lord when he says so emphatically that the Pharisees were mistaken in their estimate of what was evil. Not, the omission of "the

washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of tables," not the sitting down to table with unwashed hands, but the vile affections of the heart within were condemned. "Do ye not perceive that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man it cannot defile him, because it entereth *not* into his heart."

"And he said *that which cometh out of the man* that defileth the man, for from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness, *all these things come from within and defile the man.*"



