

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07998127 4



Deal

NET







Amos A. Timmon.  
Olive M. Timmon.  
April 1842

Dean  
LET



6572  
117-114

LECTURES  
ON  
THE EVIDENCES  
OF  
REVEALED RELIGION

BY THE REVEREND  
GEORGE WASHINGTON DEAN, S.T.D.  
ALUMNI PROFESSOR OF THE EVIDENCES OF REVEALED RELIGION  
IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

WITH A MEMOIR  
BY THE RIGHT REVEREND  
WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, D.D., LL.D.  
BISHOP OF ALBANY



NEW YORK  
PUBLIC  
LIBRARY

NEW YORK  
JAMES POTT & CO.  
14 AND 16 ASTOR PLACE

1890

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
685405  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS  
R 1915 L

COPYRIGHT, 1890, BY  
KEBLE DEAN.

NEW YORK  
CLUB  
PUBLISHED

Press of J. J. Little & Co.,  
Astor Place, New York.

# MEMOIR

BY THE RT. REV.

WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE, D.D., LL.D.,

BISHOP OF ALBANY.

---

THE very pleasant duty is offered me, of writing a brief introduction—over which, as over the unpretending threshold of a home, men will pass into the refreshment and enjoyment of the book itself—to Dr. Dean's Lectures on the Evidences.

The scaffolding from which was builded up the noble character of my dear friend and brother, so far as it was completed in this world, was simple and plain. Born in North Stamford, Connecticut, on the 4th of July, 1828, he received, perhaps on that account, his patriotic name. His parents were Colonel John and Esther McCormick Dean. The earlier part of his life was passed in the city of New York, where in 1853 he graduated from Columbia College. Having studied theology at the General Theological Seminary, he was ordered deacon by the late Bishop Potter of New York in Trinity Church, March, 1857; and a year later, in the same church, and from the same bishop, received his priesthood.

His first work was, like his last and indeed the most beloved work of his life, in the line of teaching; as he was associated for a year with Bishop Seymour, in the founding and forming time of St. Stephen's College, Annandale; from which place he went to his first parish, Christ Church, Ballston, and remained there six years

laying strong and deep foundations, spiritually and ecclesiastically, of the Church, and rooting himself most deeply in the confidence and affection of his people. Here, now, all of him that is mortal lies, awaiting the resurrection of the last day.

The love of letters and of teaching tempted him after this to Racine, where for eight years he was, as professor of Greek and Latin, associated with the great DeKoven; and where he left his name and memory, alongside of DeKoven's, in the hearts of those who were associated with them, as fellow teachers or as pupils.

A brief rectorship in Freeport, Illinois, followed; and a European journey, full of interest and most intelligent study, occupied the autumn and winter of 1874, and the early spring of the next year. On his return he took charge of the little church at Schuylerville, doing all the work that was to be done, while he still had leisure for ripening in all scholarly and spiritual ways. So that he came in a very rich maturity of mind and soul to Albany, to be associated with me in St. Agnes' School, and in the Cathedral, whose first Chancellor he was.

Of his invaluable service here, I cannot speak with too warm gratitude. I think I have never seen so exquisite a teacher; treating every subject that he dealt with, whether it was theology, or the ancient languages, or moral science, or logic, with the skill of a botanist who dissects and separates the details of the flower, which all the while he loves and enjoys, in all its fragrance and in all its beauty, like a gardener or a child. As examining chaplain, he rendered most admirable service. His reading of the Lessons was in itself an interpretation of Holy Scripture. His quaint and genial humor lighted up, from time to time, the solidity of his intellect and the soberness of his soul. His companionship was welcome alike to his bishop and brother clergy, to his fellow teachers in St. Agnes, and to the girls he was teaching; and his whole nature and character were illuminated by a holi-

ness and devotion which shone conspicuously in every act of his life.

Patiently and peacefully at last, he passed, while hardly more than in the vigor of his prime, over a short and sudden road, sharp sometimes with suffering, but chiefly, I think, sad to him because of the sense of the loss that he would leave behind him. And so he went into God's paradise; and I am free to say that when, at the offering of our eucharistic sacrifice, or in our Bidding Prayer, we commemorate the benefactors of St. Agnes' School and the Cathedral of All Saints, prominent among them must always stand the name of George Washington Dean.

He felt the honor and responsibility of his election as the first Lecturer on Evidences in the General Theological Seminary, upon the foundation of the *Alumni* professorship, and the nomination of his brother graduates of this great school. He prepared with infinite pains for the whole course of lectures, bringing out from the treasury of his richly stored mind things new and old. We who knew and loved him here felt and shared the joy with which he rose to the opportunity of this highest teaching. It is the lectureship, which, above all others, demands the fullest intimacy with all old foundations, and the freest examination of all newer investigations. And for both these he was singularly suited. His mind was a library of unforgotten learning, so that somehow you could not surprise him into silence by any question in any department of literature, language, history, philosophy, or theology. And yet it kept up to the last the fresh eagerness for study. The first series of lectures was delivered in full; and his heroic struggle to complete the last course, and then to deliver it, was most pathetic to see. The closing lectures he never gave at all; but they are printed as they were prepared by him, though read by another in his stead. And while they were in reading he exchanged, for fruition, the most holy faith in which he was building others up all his life long, and entered with clear and undimmed eye upon the evidence

of what he had not seen, and yet had believed with that faith which is the evidence of things not seen as yet. "Blessed are the eyes which see the things" which he seeth in that perpetual light, which we pray God to shed on his saintly soul.

WM. CROSWELL DOANE.

WROXY WAIN  
SLOAN  
VIA SELL

# MEMORIAL MINUTES

OF

GEORGE W. DEAN, S.T.D.,

PRIEST, CHANCELLOR OF ALL SAINTS' CATHEDRAL, AND CHAPLAIN OF S. AGNES' SCHOOL.

---

MACKENZIE WOOLCOTT, in his volume of *English Cathedrals*, defines a chancellor to be, "the Secretary of the Chapter, the Librarian, the Inspector of Schools, the Reader of the Lessons, and the Theological Lecturer."

It is the truest tribute to our beloved brother, departed, to record here with what fulness of ability, faithfulness, and love he discharged all these duties during his years of service as our Chancellor.

The records bear the token of his clear and careful accuracy in seizing and stating the points that needed recording. His very last labor here was the rearranging of the books in the Cathedral library (not many, but very choice and valuable), which he handled with a lover's touch; while from time to time he refreshed his stores of knowledge from one and another of the volumes which the library contains. His constant interest in the educational work attached to this Cathedral was the chief occupation of his life. How he will be missed here! His reverent rendering of the special offices for the school; his devout celebration of the Holy Eucharist; his exquisite accuracy of scholarship; the nicenesses and delicacies of his classical teaching; his mastery in Butler and in intellectual philosophy; his bright, quaint fund of humor; his gracious courtesy and considerate patience; his great power of illustration; his vast fund of well-

ordered information, ready to give an answer to any question upon any subject, from a Hebrew root to a quotation from an English author—these are the memories of this side of his life. He was, besides this, the reader of the Lessons with such power and clearness as only one can read them who feels himself to be “the voice of one who cries.” He knew the Holy Scriptures to be the Word of God. He knew their inner meaning and felt their power, and his reading was an interpretation. The man was merged in the message, and the fire of intense feeling made the words shine and burn. And he was the theological lecturer; in his care and oversight of the students of divinity in the diocese, in the conduct of their examinations, and in a larger way as the first-elected lecturer on Evidences in the General Theological Seminary, to which he was chosen by the vote of his fellow Alumni to fill the chair which they had founded.

And all these posts are emptied, and his place in our Cathedral shall know him no more. But the echo of his teaching, the example of his life, the influence of his devoutness and fidelity will live here in this Cathedral institution, with whose whole scheme of the advancement of theological study, and choral worship, and frequent eucharists, and daily prayers, and works of mercy and education, he was in full accord, from the sympathy of his nature, the convictions of his mind, the instincts of his Order, and the consecration of his priestly life.

Commending his soul to God, in the sure and certain hope of the resurrection, and sharing, in full sympathy with his immediate family, the bereavement of his loss, we record our loving recollection of him, our indebtedness to his labors and his example, and the hope that God will “refresh his soul with the multitude of peace.”

WM. CROSWELL DOANE,  
*President.*

THOMAS B. FULCHER,  
*Secretary pro tem.*

FROM THE

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

REV. EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMANN, D.D.,

DEAN OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, 1887.

---

THE past year has also been saddened by the lamented death of our beloved colleague, the Rev. George W. Dean, D.D., the first Professor of the Evidences of Revealed Religion on the Alumni Foundation. After a severe illness he rested from his labors on the morning of March 29, 1887. I place on record the following memoranda of his life from a friend's hand:

Dr. Dean was born in 1828 at Stamford, Conn., and was graduated from Columbia College in 1853, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1856. After ordination he assisted the present Bishop of Springfield in that work out of which grew St. Stephen's College, removing thence to Ballston Spa as successor to the Rev. Dr. Geer, in Christ Church, the rectorship of which he held for six years. He then accepted the Chair of Ancient Languages in Racine College, and here for eight years longer he served the cause of sound learning and Christian education, in a way that ever after gave him a prominent position among the representative educators and theologians of the American Church.

In 1872 he returned to parochial life in Zion Parish,

Freeport, Ill., where he remained two years. After an interval of European travel he accepted the rectorship of St. Stephen's, Schuylerville, N. Y., from which he was called five years later to the Chair of Ancient Languages and Metaphysics in St. Agnes' School and to the Chancellorship of All Saints' Cathedral, Albany, which positions he held at the time of his death, together with that of Alumni Professor of the Evidences of Revealed Religion in the General Theological Seminary. "As humble as he was learned, he was as content in ministering to the humblest creature as in lecturing in the schools of the prophets. Gentle as a woman in his ordinary moods and methods, he could be a perfect Boanerges when truth was assailed, and when masked insincerity needed to be exposed. He was one of the first to give an impetus to that Catholic faith and practice whose growing acceptance by the American Church he lived long enough to see and rejoice in. His death will be sorely deplored by pupils, parishioners, and friends in nearly if not quite every diocese in this country."

The Faculty recorded their feelings on their minutes in the following tribute to his memory:

"It is with profound sorrow that the Dean and Faculty of the General Theological Seminary have received the sad intelligence of the decease of the Rev. George W. Dean, D.D., Alumni Professor of the Evidences of Revealed Religion. When they recall the fact that the news of our departed brother's entering upon his rest came to them almost simultaneously with the notice of his intention to enter anew upon his work, they are reminded of that unflinching devotion to duty which, from his earliest years, marked his laborious life. It was the secret of that profound and accurate learning which placed him in the first rank of the scholars of his day and generation, and gave to all he said and did the weight of authority won by unceasing diligence and faithful toil.

"The Dean and Faculty desire to place upon record their appreciation of the benefits conferred upon the

Seminary during the three years of Dr. Dean's official connection with it, and beg to be permitted to convey to his widow and children their assurances of sympathy in the loss which the removal of one so dear to them has brought upon the whole American Church."

FROM

THE ST. BARNABAS "CHRONICLE."

---

ON Tuesday, March 29, 1887, the Rev. George W. Dean, S.T.D., entered into his rest. This short record tells of a great loss to the Church, and of a most real sorrow in many hearts. Dr. Dean had won for himself an honored place by rare gifts of mind and soul, and by the most conscientious devotion to each task in his well-filled life.

As a scholar he had not many equals in our ministry. He was diligent, accurate, keen in his perception of truth, and clear in his every statement. He could measure with singular skill the force of arguments, and he could appreciate most fairly the views which he could not accept. His mental work was thorough, while it was much adorned by the quiet grace which is the token of finished culture. As a priest he had a lofty sense of his high calling. He was reverent in each act and attitude of worship, always mindful of what is due to the holy place and time and office; and the calmness of his presence, with the dignity of his speech, marked him as the conscious servant and messenger of God.

As a friend he was genial and considerate and true-hearted. His gentle kindness attracted first and then held fast those who came to know him well. His ready sympathy was joined with such honesty that his friendly words were a power. He had withal a merry heart which revealed itself now and then in mingled wit and wisdom,

while such modesty as comes from genuine humility never forsook him.

Our personal grief yields, as it must, to thoughts of that rest and peace and joy which are pledged to such souls "after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh." The precious memory will linger as a benediction, in some lives, which may learn more and more, in the coming time, how very much they have owed to this good priest of God.

FROM THE  
ANNUAL ADDRESS  
OF THE RIGHT REVEREND  
GEORGE FRANKLIN SEYMOUR, S.T.D., LL.D.,  
BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD,  
TO HIS CONVENTION, 1887.

---

THE Rev. Dr. George W. Dean was a remarkable man. We knew him as a student in Columbia College, when he led a recluse life in a dark, dingy room in an antiquated building in New Street, New York City. Little did the lawyers and brokers and bankers, who occupied offices all around him, dream that there was one among them, a pale-faced youth with black hair and spare form, who was as busy with the material of the past as they were with that of the present, and that, while they were eagerly striving after the acquisition of gold, he was even more eagerly seeking to gain and store away the treasures of learning. His student life was eminently lonely, one might almost say dismal. The quarter where he lodged, Wall Street, and its vicinity, was crowded by day; it was deserted by night. The lawyers, brokers, bankers, took their departure when the sun went down, to their happy homes and cheerful friends, and left the student to himself and his books. The day with its throngs brought no sympathy to him. What community of feeling could there be between Æschylus and the price of stocks, and the equations of analytical geometry and the uproar of the Board of Brokers? Even the necessary meals

brought little to relieve the loneliness of that isolated life. Two, a scanty breakfast and an equally scanty supper, were prepared and eaten in that solitary chamber; the third, about midday, was taken at a neighboring restaurant. His few associations with the living came from his classmates and his pupils, since he was forced to teach in order to defray his expenses while he studied. In due time he graduated with high honor from college, and, passing through the General Theological Seminary, was ordained deacon and priest by the bishop of New York. It was our happiness to have the young clergyman assigned to us, as helper in the work of organizing and building up S. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. We passed a year together in the prosecution of our labors, and a profitable year it was. We lived together in the closest intimacy, and outside of our parochial and school duties we read together, as a recreation in the evening, the dramas of Sophocles and several of the comedies of Aristophanes. The field then was too limited to retain him beyond his diaconate, and he passed to other spheres of usefulness, until he reached the highly honorable posts which he held at the time of his lamented death—the Chancellorship of the diocese of Albany, and the Alumni Professorship of the Evidences of Christianity in the General Theological Seminary, New York.

The Rev. Dr. Dean was a scholar of great and varied attainments. His reading had been enormous, and his memory was very retentive and well disciplined. He was, we may say, a living encyclopædia. Few subjects could be mentioned with which he was not familiar, and upon which he could not pour forth floods of information. While his learning was so vast and varied, it must also be stated that, as a scholar, he was exquisitely accurate. Quality in his case was not sacrificed to quantity; on the contrary, as he went on accumulating his treasures and increasing their amount, he seemed to sharpen and intensify the faculty of mastering what he learned and knowing it thoroughly. A word of still higher praise remains

to be said of the Rev. Dr. Dean than that he was an eminent scholar; he was a faithful priest and a devoted servant of his Divine Master. We sincerely sympathize with the Bishop of Albany in the great loss he has sustained. The place made vacant by Dr. Dean cannot easily be filled.

## EDITOR'S PREFACE.

---

THE learned Author of these lectures breathed his life out before he had been able to give the last revision to his work; and in the manuscript appeared not a few signs of the Shadow of Death under which the heavy task was completed. As one who had been a friend ever since his seminary days, and specially as the one nominated by the *Alumni* of the General Theological Seminary to succeed to the chair which he was the first to fill, I cheerfully undertook to see the entire work through the press, and prepare the *Table of Contents*. In the proof-reading I have been kindly aided by the Rev. Edward M. Pecke. Mr. Keble Dean, son of the Author of the lectures, has prepared the *Index* at the end of the volume, and secured a sufficient number of subscribers to insure the publication of the work.

As editor, I have not felt at liberty to make any but merely verbal changes in the text, and those of the slightest. The remembrance that the premature death of the learned Author prevented any revision after the first hurried draught, will atone for any slight defects which the cool and critical eye may discover in the book. It displays a vast range of reading, a thorough orthodoxy of doctrine, a sound and manly style of argument, a candor in dealing with opponents, and occasionally a keen dry wit, which will insure it a permanent place in the Church literature of America.

J. H. HOPKINS.

March 31, 1890.

B



# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## First Course.

### INTERNAL EVIDENCES.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY. Meaning of "Evidences".....	3
Threefold Division.....	4
Internal Evidence.....	4
External Evidence.....	5
Refutation of Objections.....	5
All three connected together.....	5
The Hebrew Bible.....	6
The Talmud.....	8
Josephus.....	11
Tenacity of the Jewish People.. .. .	13
The Literature of a Nation.....	14
That Nation also a Church.....	15
Attested by Our Lord and His Apostles.....	16
"Old Bailey Theology".....	16
Religious Faith and Human Faith.....	17
Natural Religion.....	18
Revealed Religion.....	18
Questioning, Arguing, Assent.....	20

### LECTURE I. NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION.

#### PART I.

The Creed of Natural Religion.....	21
Relation of Natural to Revealed Religion.....	21
Eymology of the word "Religion".....	22
Cicero, Lucretius, Lactantius.....	22
Festus, S. Paul.....	24
Proof of Natural Religion.....	25
China.....	27
India.....	30
Egypt.....	34
Persia.....	36
Germany.....	39

	PAGE
Mongolian Khonds.....	39
Polynesia.....	40
Papuans.....	41
Java.....	41
Fijians.....	41
Maori.....	42
America.....	44
Mexicans.....	46
Greece and Rome.....	48
Testimonies to Monotheism.....	50
Practical Perversions.....	52
Meaning of "Dogma".....	54
Trinity and Unity.....	54

## LECTURE II. NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION.

## PART II.

Immortality and Future Retribution.....	56
Argument of Butler's <i>Analogy</i> .....	56
The whole Human Race believed both.....	57
Beliefs of various Races.....	57
The Chinese, Buddhism, Fo-ism.....	58
The Vedas.....	59
The Druids.....	61
The Egyptians, <i>Book of the Dead</i> .....	61
The Dualism of Persia.....	63
Negroes, Indians, Papuans, etc.....	63
Mexican Maxims and Cruelties.....	66
Greek and Roman Writers.....	66
Pherecydes, Pythagoras, Plato.....	67
The <i>Gorgias</i> of Plato.....	67
Death of Socrates.....	70
Cicero, Cato.....	70
Sophocles, Tacitus, Agricola.....	72
The Koran.....	73
Universal Testimony to Immortality.....	75
Yet Revelation was needed.....	76
Traducianism and Creationism.....	79
Memorable Passage from S. Augustine.....	81

## LECTURE III. THE NATURE OF MAN: UNFALLEN; FALLEN.

The Ideal of Man.....	83
Body and Soul.....	84
Consciousness, Intellect.....	84
Knowledge, Imagination, Reason.....	85
Qualities, Substance, Space, Time.....	87

	PAGE
Conscience.....	87
Weakness of the Intellect.....	90
Weakness of the Feelings.....	91
Poetry and Music.....	92
Love God and Hate Self.....	94
The Human Will.....	95
God's Will the Law of Nature.....	95
Newton, Herschell, Leibnitz.....	96
John Stuart Mill.....	96
Freedom of the Will.....	97
Will and Duty.....	98
Summary of Reason, Feelings, Will.....	99
What can Win the Will?.....	100
The Incarnation.....	101

## LECTURE IV. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A Certain Preparation Necessary.....	103
Religious Evidence not Resistless Demonstration.....	104
Number of Books in the Bible.....	104
Miscellaneous Character of them.....	105
Still in Substance One.....	106
The Jews understand their own Books.....	106
The First Christians were Jews.....	106
Bible History tested by other History.....	107
Four Subjects noted.....	107
I. HISTORY. Origin of the Race.....	107
Abraham and his Seed.....	108
Corroboration from Pagan Writers.....	109
More Full than any other History.....	110
The Records kept with Peculiar Care.....	110
II. RELIGION. The Key-note.....	111
The Revelation of God.....	112
The Sacrifice of Isaac.....	113
Immortality.....	113
Warburton's Theory.....	114
The Ten Commandments.....	114
Meaning of the Ritual.....	115
Folly of Modern Critical Theories.....	116
Times of the Judges.....	116
The Prophets.....	117
Prophecies of the Gentiles.....	118
Three Peculiar Books: Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and Job....	118
The Central Figure.....	119
III. GREAT MEN. Moses and David.....	120
Illustration from Waverley Novels.....	122
Homer and Shakespeare.....	122

	PAGE
IV. LITERATURE. Unexcelled in Dignity, Sublimity, Depth, Beauty.....	123
 LECTURE V. CONTENTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. CHARACTER OF CHRIST.	
Substantial Unity of the Bible.....	125
Corresponding Parts of the two Testaments.....	125
Language of the New Testament.....	125
Corresponding Phrases in both.....	126
Typology.....	127
Evangelistic Symbols... ..	127
Summary of the New Testament.....	128
The Lord Himself the Substance of both.....	129
Sermon on the Mount.....	129
The Parables.....	130
The Lord's Prayer and the Golden Rule.....	131
Witness in Every Nation.....	131
Plato, the Conscience.....	132
Aristotle, the Intellect.....	132
Epicurus, the Feelings.....	132
Zeno, the Will.....	132
Christianity the Consummation of History.....	133
Athens and its Philosophers.....	133
S. Paul at Athens.....	134
S. John, the Theologian.. ..	135
S. Peter, Ruler and Pastor.....	136
S. James, Good Works.....	137
Philosophers and Apostles compared.....	138
Messianic Predictions.....	139
Christ's Claim to Sinlessness.....	141
His Miracles.....	141
His Claim of Self-surrender.....	141
All Judgment given to Him.....	142
The Christ of Dogma is the Christ of History.....	142
A Preparation and a History unlike all others. . . . .	143
 LECTURE VI. CHANGES IN INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER : WONDER- FUL CONVERSIONS.	
Elements of Character alike in all.....	146
Essence of Conversion.....	147
Sudden and Momentous Change.....	147
S. Peter's Conversion.....	149
S. Paul's Conversion.....	149
S. Stephen and S. Paul.. ..	151

	PAGE
Charity.....	154
S. Paul's Epistles.....	155
S. Augustine's Conversion.....	156
S. Jerome, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory.....	156
Augustinian Orders of Monks.....	157
Manichæans, Donatists, Pelagians.....	158
S. Augustine's "City of God".....	162
John Bunyan's <i>Pilgrim's Progress</i> .....	163

## LECTURE VII. EDUCATIONAL POWER.

Special Training.....	165
Moses, Samuel, S. John Baptist.....	165
Christ Subject to Parents.....	166
True Religion an Educating Power.....	166
Plato on Education.....	167
The Church an Educator.....	167
Theology the Queen of the Sciences.....	169
Adequate Education only in Christendom.....	169
Jewish and Muhammedan Science.....	170
Education in the Church.....	171
Intellect, Heart, and Will.....	172
Universities and Colleges.....	172
Other Learned Associations.....	174
The Church not Afraid of any Knowledge.....	175
University Education Impossible without Religion.....	175
Sectarian Universities.....	176
Dr. McCosh on Harvard University.....	176
Mode of Education.....	179
What Christian Education is.....	179

## LECTURE VIII. INFLUENCE ON NATIONS.

Rise of Civil Authority.....	181
Joseph and Daniel.....	181
Cæsar.....	182
The Four Great Empires.....	183
The Roman Empire.....	183
Persecutions of the Christians.....	184
Fall of the Empire.....	185
Fall of Paganism.....	186
Spread of Asceticism.....	187
Redemption of Slaves ..	187
Modern Slavery.....	188
Ulphilas and the Goths.....	188
Asylum in Peaceful Ireland.....	189
S. Gregory's Mission to England.....	190

	PAGE
Civilization and Christianity.....	190
Laws of Alfred.. .. .	191
Cyril and Methodius in Bulgaria.....	191
The Russian Church.....	192
Hungary and S. Stephen .....	193
The Church and State of England.....	194
New Bishoprics in our Day .....	195
Stigma of an Act of Parliament Church.....	195
Legitimate Sovereignty sought for.....	195
Spain, England, Italy, Germany, France .....	196
Brazil.....	197
Testimony of the States of the World .....	198

## LECTURE IX. INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON LAW.

Various Senses of the Word " Law ".....	199
Law in Science.....	200
Kepler's Three Laws.....	200
A Fifth Sense of the Word " Law ".....	201
A Living Person whose Will is Law .....	202
I. Christianity influenced the Foundation of European States..	202
Alfred's Statutes.....	202
Lawyers and Judges, Clergy.....	202
Common Law and Canon Law.....	203
Characteristic Maxims.....	203
Albertus Magnus on B. V. M.....	203
Partial Triumph of Canon Law .....	204
Parliament, Tenure of Real Estate, and Trial by Jury.....	205
The Three Codes of Roman Law.....	206
Patronized by the Church.....	207
II. Theoretical Definition of Law .....	207
Fourfold Division of Law .....	208
1. <i>Declaratory</i> .....	208
Imperfections of Plato's Republic.....	209
Exterminating Slavery.....	209
2. <i>Directory</i> .....	210
Factory Legislation.....	211
The Church cannot use Force.....	213
3. <i>Remedial</i> .....	213
Restitution.....	214
Merciful Treatment of Criminals.....	214
4. <i>Vindictory</i> .....	214
Chief Force of Human Laws lies in Penalty.....	214
International Law.....	214
Blackstone on Legal Education.....	215
The Temple Church in London .....	216
<i>La Sainte Chapelle</i> in Paris.....	216

## LECTURE X. INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON MORALS.

	PAGE
Keeping within the Limits of the Law.....	217
Christian Morals based on Divine Laws.....	217
Ideal of Christian Morals.....	218
The Little Child and the Father.....	218
The Virtues and the Duties of the Soul.....	210
The Four Heathen Virtues : Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, Tem- perance.....	220
Benevolence, Truth, and Purity.....	221
The Beatitudes.....	222
Two Opposite Descriptions of Character.....	223
Tertullian's Exultation over the Wicked.....	224
Supernatural Courage of the Martyrs.....	225
Christians under Persecution.....	226
S. Ignatius of Antioch.....	227
Germanicus, Blandina, Epipodius, Symphorian.....	227
Utilitarian Theory of Morals.....	228
The Intuitive System of Morals.....	231
Contrasts of the Two.....	232
Christianity produces all the Chief Virtues.....	234

## LECTURE XI. INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON SCIENCE.

1. What Science is as a Whole.....	237
Development of Science in Modern and Christian Times.....	237
Ancient Science and Lost Arts.....	237
What is Science?.....	238
The Senses.....	238
The Universe and Man.....	239
Is there no such Science as Theology?.....	239
2. Religion Necessary to the Integrity of Universal Knowledge. 241	
It is as the Soul to the Body.....	241
Gravitation, the Creator's Will.....	241
Correlation of Forces.....	242
Higher Unity of all Sciences.....	242
The Absence of God would be Chaos.....	243
Lord Brougham at Glasgow.....	243
Science of Political Economy.....	244
Intruding on Ethics and Religion.....	245
Physiology and Life.....	245
Bastian and Spontaneous Generation.....	245
Philology and Scepticism.....	246
Sciences invading other Fields.....	246
Darwin's <i>Origin of Species</i> .....	247
3. Benefits conferred on Science by Religion.....	248
God is more than the Laws of the Universe.....	248
Induction, "going on unto Perfection".....	249

	PAGE
No Abstractions, Metaphysics, or Definitions in Scripture...	249
Clement of Alexandria.....	250
Architecture, Painting, Music.....	250
Copernicus, Kepler.....	251
Newton, Leibnitz, the Herschells, Descartes.....	252
Galileo, Linnæus.....	252
An Unburied Heathen Philosopher.....	252
Chateaubriand.....	253
Pascal.....	254
No Real Knowledge can lead from God.....	254

#### LECTURE XII. INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON LITERATURE.

Meaning of "Literature" .....	255
Number of Letters in Alphabets.....	256
Length of <i>Ramayana</i> and <i>Mahabharata</i> .....	256
The Perfection of the Greek Language.....	256
Literature, Attention to Form.....	256
Poetry .....	257
I. Religion helps to an Estimate of Literature .....	258
I Cor. xiii. and Portia's Plea for Mercy.....	258
The Statute Book of the Kingdom of God.....	259
Milton's Majesty due to the Bible .....	260
Dante also Superior in this to Homer.....	260
Cicero, Scipio, Cato, Socrates, Aristotle, Sulla, Lucullus, Zeno, Epicurus.....	260
Literatures of China and India .....	261
II. Christianity has a Literature of her own.....	261
The Fathers of the Church.....	262
Questions touching the Divine Nature, discussed in Greek ..	262
Concerning the Nature of Man, in Latin .....	262
The Apostolic Fathers .....	262
Irenæus and others.....	263
The Conciliar Period, Enumeration of Writers.....	264
Writers of the Middle Ages.....	264
Modern Writers.....	265
III. Indifferent, Independent, or Hostile Literature .....	266
Bears Testimony to Christianity.....	266
Sacred Books of the Parsees.....	266
Darwin on Orchids.....	267
Humanitarian Books.. ..	267
Books for the Young.....	268
S. Augustine's <i>Confessions</i> .....	268
À Kempis's <i>Imitation of Christ</i> .....	268

## Second Course.

### EXTERNAL EVIDENCES.

#### LECTURE I. THE JEWS.

	PAGE
What can be inferred from the Service of a Synagogue.....	274
Or from a Living Jew.....	274
The Jew is an Anomaly.....	275
Fourfold Evidence of Ancient Jewish History.....	275
No other such Evidence in the World.....	275
Testimony of Written Documents.....	276
Confirmed by Pagan Literature.....	276
Geography, Monuments, Inscriptions.....	276
The Preservation of the Jewish People.....	276
Livy and the History of Rome.....	276
Contrasts between the History of Rome and the History of Israel	278
Lessons taught by Jewish History.....	281
1. Unity of the Human Race.....	282
The One True Religion has formed and preserved the One Nation that has endured until now.....	282
The Bush that Burned and was not Consumed.....	283
2. The Revolt of the Ten Tribes.....	283
They have lost their Identity as Jews.....	284
3. The Noblest Specimens of our Race.....	284
Spiritual and Literary Sterility since their Rejection of Christ	284
The Jew teaches the World what the Rechabites taught the Jews.....	286

#### LECTURE II. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

In the Creed.....	287
Its Appearance a Fact of History.....	287
Disciples, Nazarenes, Christians, The Church.....	288
Triumph in less than three Centuries.....	289
God's Revelation is the Church.....	290
The Creed in the Fathers.....	291
The Nicene Creed.....	292
Gibbon's Description of the Church.....	292
The Council of Arles.....	296
The Council of Nice.....	296
Apology of Arnobius.....	297
Gibbon's Five Causes of the Triumph.....	298
Why do these Five not convince Gibbon himself?.....	299
The Catholic Church has survived every Rival known while the Empire lasted.....	299

## LECTURE III. AUTHENTICITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES ; GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

## PART I.

	PAGE
Diocletian attempts to destroy the Scriptures.....	301
<i>Traditores</i> .....	302
The Church is the Keeper of Holy Writ.....	303
Authenticity.....	303
Credibility.....	304
Reverenced by the Catholic Church from the Beginning.....	305
Age of Manuscripts of Homer.....	305
Of the Hebrew Scriptures.....	305
Of the Greek Scriptures.....	306
Various Readings, Bentley.....	307
Three Oldest Manuscripts.....	307
Mode of Ascertaining their Age.....	308
1. The Vatican Manuscript.....	309
2. The Codex Sinaiticus.....	310
Simonides pretends to have written it.....	312
3. The Codex Alexandrinus.....	313

## LECTURE IV. AUTHENTICITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES ; GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

## PART II.

Great Number of Manuscripts of Holy Scripture.....	315
Evidence beyond the Fourth Century.....	316
Councils of Laodicea and Carthage.....	317
Ratified at Chalcedon.....	318
Fifty Copies ordered by Constantine.....	319
Donatists had the same Books as the Church.....	320
Testimony of S. Irenæus.....	321
Testimony of S. Clement.....	323
Testimony of Tertullian.....	324
The <i>Antilegomena</i> .....	325
The Peshito Version.....	326
The Heretics had the same Scriptures.....	327
The Canon Complete at the End of the Second Century.....	328
Tatian's Harmony.....	329
Papias, Quadratus, Aristides, and others.....	329
The Muratorian Canon.....	329
Syriac and Latin Versions.....	329
Justin Martyr.....	329
Apostolic Fathers.....	329
Creeds and Liturgies.....	330
No Books in the World better attested.....	330

## LECTURE V. MIRACLES.

	PAGE
Errors of Copyists.....	332
Miracles are Credentials of God's Messenger.....	333
Moses and Christ both appeal to them.....	334
The Uniformity of Nature a Perpetual Miracle.....	335
Peculiarity of Bible Miracles.....	336
Not mere Physical Wonders.....	337
Attestations of God's Revelation to Man.....	337
Three Great Eras of Miracles .....	337
Christ's Miracles of Mercy and Goodness.....	338
Miracles of the Apocryphal Gospels.....	339
Simon Magus, Zoroaster, etc.....	339
Breviary Legends.....	339
Rabbinical and Muhammedan Legends.....	340
Miracles by Relics.....	340
No Waste of Miracles... ..	341
Julian's Attempt to rebuild the Temple .....	341
I. Honesty of the Witnesses of Miracles.....	343
They confess their own Weaknesses and Faults.....	344
II. Plain Men of Average Capacity.....	345
Crowning Miracle of the Resurrection.....	345

## LECTURE VI. PROPHECY.

## PART I.

What a Prophet is.....	347
Every True Prophecy a Real Miracle.....	348
Three Conditions of Prophecy.....	349
Belief cannot be Compelled.....	349
Probable Evidence.....	351
The Story of Creation.....	352
Three Great Classes of Prophecies.....	353
I. Messianic Prophecies.....	353
The Seed of the Woman shall bruise the Serpent's Head... ..	353
In Thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed... ..	353
More than Fifty Particulars prophesied of Christ.....	354
Prophecies of the Jewish People.....	355
2. Prophecies of the Conversion of the Gentiles preserved by the Jews.....	355
No Parallel to the Triumph of the Church in the First Three Centuries.....	356
Heathens converted by the Prophecies .....	357
3. Prophecies concerning Pagan Powers .....	357
(1) Nineveh.....	358
(2) Babylon.....	358
(3) Tyre.....	360
(4) Egypt and Syria.....	360
Conclusion of Tertullian.....	362

## LECTURE VII. PROPHECY.

## PART II.

	PAGE
Prophecies do not force Conviction.....	363
1. Virgil's Instinctive Conception of Prophecy .....	364
Prophecy of Vettius.....	365
An Athenian Prophecy.....	366
Prophecy to Cræsus and Pyrrhus .....	366
The Chinese Idea of Religion.....	367
2. Opinion of Cicero.....	367
Prophecy of the Taking of Constantinople.....	368
Prophecy in Seneca's <i>Medea</i> .....	368
Plato's Prophecy of Shakespeare.....	369
Prophecies of S. Malachi.....	369
Prophecy by Newman.....	370
Plato's Prophecy of Christ.....	370
3. Natural and Inspired Prophecies .....	371
Definite Prophecies.....	371
The Mother devouring her own Child.....	372
Zedekiah, Seeing, yet not Seeing.....	372
Cyrus.....	372
S. Peter's Denial .....	373
S. Paul and the Shipwreck.....	374
Doctrine of Chances.....	375
Analogy of the Formation of Language.....	375

## LECTURE VIII. AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION.

Real Meaning of Revelation.....	377
Christ both God and Man.....	378
Authority of the Church to pronounce on the Meaning of Scripture.....	378
Individual Interpreters differ.....	379
Oriental, Roman, and Anglican.....	379
A Book alone no Real Religious Authority.....	380
The Number of Sects proves it.....	380
S. Justin Martyr, S. Augustine.....	381
No Real Revelation if Meaning is Doubtful.....	382
Inspiration .....	382
Dynamic Theory.....	382
The Text not a Fetish.....	383
S. Augustine's Declaration.....	385
The Authority of the Church .....	385
Milman's Description of Church Unity.....	386
The Bible in the Consecration of a Bishop.....	387
All Branches of the Church agree as to the Books in the English Bible .....	388

	PAGE
The Meaning of Holy Scripture witnessed by Œcumenical Councils, etc.....	389
I. Gnostics.....	389
Marcionites and others.....	390
2. Decrees of General Councils <i>De Fide</i> .....	391
Hooker's Summary of the Four.....	391
Natural Religion not enough.....	392
<i>The Revelations of Chaos</i> .....	393
Analogy with Natural Science.....	393

## LECTURE IX. HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

History, as Part of Education.....	396
Secular History is Part of the Evidence of Religion.....	396
Church History, the Story of God's Presence on Earth.....	397
Three Great Periods.....	397
Tokens of Divine Power Different in each.....	398
These Periods anticipated in Jewish History.....	399
I. To the Nicene Council.....	399
Rapid Growth of the Church.....	399
Beyond the Bounds of the Empire.....	400
Population of the Empire.....	400
Numbers of the Church.....	401
"The Christians to the Lions!".....	402
Change of all Pagan Acts and Customs.....	403
The sole Religion spread only by Persuasion.....	403
A Clear, Consistent Doctrine.....	403
Inflexibility in Faith.....	404
Three Tokens of Supernatural Origin.....	405
II. From the Nicene Age to the Reformation.....	405
The World streained in upon the Church.....	406
The Image Controversy.....	406
Muhammedanism.....	406
The Barbarians Christianized.....	407
Transformation of the Bishop of Rome.....	408
Separation of East and West.....	408
Western Progress under the Papacy.....	409
III. Since the Reformation.....	410
Excesses of Individual Independence.....	410
The Church of England.....	410
Protestant Sectaries.....	411
Missionary Energy paralyzed by Divisions.....	411
The Probation of the World.....	412

## LECTURE X. THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

The Witness and Interpretation of the Church.....	413
Set forth by the Entire Church.....	414

	PAGE
The First Step is the Confession of Ignorance.....	414
Divine Help needed to retain Truth.....	414
I. Unity of God, early known, not retained.....	415
Quotation from Eusebius.....	417
Doctrine of the Trinity.....	417
Errors of Individuals.....	417
Sequence of Errors.....	418
Apollinarianism to Adoptionism.....	418
The Noblest Conception of God.....	419
II. Man's Conception of his own Nature.....	420
In the Image and Likeness of God .....	420
Body, Soul, and Spirit .....	420
Traces of the Fall .....	420
S. Bonaventura .....	420
S. Thomas Aquinas .....	421
Points not decided by the Church .....	421
Continuity of Church Decisions .....	422
No such Continuity elsewhere .....	422
III. Relations of Man to God, and of Men to one another .....	423
Doctrine Part of the Preparation for the Use of the Sacra- ments.....	423
Controversies since the Reformation .....	424
Words and Acts of the Incarnate God repeated.....	424
Eastern and Western Views of Consecration .....	424

#### LECTURE XI. SACRAMENTS : LORD'S DAY : MINISTRY.

A Jewish Peasant changed the Religion of the World.....	426
His Disciples lived and died to spread His Religion.....	426
They proclaimed His Resurrection in the very City where He Died.....	426
The Holy Eucharist.....	427
The Lord's Day.....	427
The Ministry.....	427
I. The Christian Sacraments.....	427
Their External, Commemorative Aspect.....	428
Leslie's Four Rules.....	428
The Passover.....	429
The 4th of July and 5th of November.....	429
The Stones at Gilgal.....	430
The Holy Eucharist.....	431
Five Great Groups of Liturgies.....	431
Extract from <i>Exultet jam Angelica turba</i> .....	432
Quotations from Liturgies in New Testament.....	433
II. The Lord's Day.....	433
Weekly Commemoration of the Resurrection.....	433
Best attested of all Earthly Facts.....	434

	PAGE
Summary of Evidence for it.....	434
Change from the Seventh Day to the First.....	435
Controversies about the Time of keeping Easter.....	436
III. Perpetuity of the Christian Ministry.....	436
Quotation from Gibbon.....	437
First Mention of the "Catholic Church".....	437
S. Ignatius, S. Irenæus, S. Clement.....	437
Tertullian.....	437
Ebionites, Gnostics, Montanists.....	438
<i>Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus</i> .....	439
Apostolic Succession.....	439
The Church a Standing Miracle.....	440
Perpetual Memory.....	441

## LECTURE XII. FRUITS.

"By their Fruits ye shall know them".....	443
Nobler Fruits than any others.....	444
I. Noblest Ideas concerning God and Man.....	444
(a) The Conception of God.....	444
Conceptions of Egypt, India, Greece, Rome.....	445
Max Müller and Dr. Hedge.....	446
Athens and Rome.....	446
Worship of the Emperors as Gods.....	447
Extract from Ozanam.....	448
(b) The Dignity of Man.....	448
Due to Christianity.....	448
Aristotle on Slavery.....	448
Shelley, Pascal, S. Paul.....	449
Moleschott, Reade, Spencer, Mill.....	450
(c) Fruits in Government and Society.....	451
A Mighty and very Real Change.....	451
As to Childhood.....	452
Children Members of the Kingdom.....	452
Exposition of Children.....	452
In China, India, Egypt, Greece, Rome.....	452
Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius.....	453
The Virgin-Born exalts Woman.....	453
Condition of Woman transformed.....	454
Confucius on Woman.....	454
The Laws of Manu on Woman.....	454
Solon, Plato, Aristotle.....	454
Woman in Rome.....	455
Contempt of Woman among the Jews.....	456
King Lemuel's Virtuous Woman.....	456
Slavery once everywhere in the World.....	456
Slavery in the Roman Empire.....	457

	PAGE
The Church taught the Equality of all Souls.....	459
Christian Laws steadily tended toward Freedom .....	459
Popes who had been Slaves.....	459
Commercial Spirit to be fought. ....	460
Abraham Lincoln on Slavery .....	460
II. Personal Influence of Religion.....	460
(a) Transformation of Character.....	460
Heroism of the Martyrs.....	461
(b) Missionary Energy.....	461
(c) Countless Institutions of Mercy.....	462
Fabiola, Sisters of Mercy.....	463
Treatment of the Insane.....	464
Middlesex Hospital.....	465
Stoics and Epicureans. ....	466
Sins against Light are the Worst .....	466
<i>Xenodochia</i> in Early Days.....	466
Ignorant Sneers.....	467

---

### Third Course.

#### APOLOGETICS.

INTRODUCTION. Scheme of the Twelve Lectures. ....	471
LECTURE I. METAPHYSICAL OBJECTIONS: TO RELIGION IN GENERAL, AND TO MIRACLES IN PARTICULAR.	
No Science free from Unanswerable Difficulties.....	473
Scripture gives no Details of Human Science.....	473
Revealed Truth, what it means .....	474
What Revelation declares about God .....	475
Trinity and Unity.....	475
Metaphysical Objections apply equally to other Truths .....	475
A First Cause.....	476
Is the First Cause God?.....	477
Mind and Matter.....	477
Inferences from the First Cause.....	478
Uniformity of Nature.....	480
Non-Existence of God Inconceivable.....	481
Necessary Truths.....	482
The Terms "Necessity" and "Necessary".....	483
The Law of Reason and Consequent.....	483
The Argument from Design.....	484
Structure of the Body.....	485
Rudimentary Organs.....	486

	PAGE
The Mathematical Doctrine of Chances.....	488
Saint-Hilaire's Absurdity. . . . .	488
The Argument from Design can never be overthrown.....	489

## LECTURE II. SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIONS.

Metaphysics.....	491
Tacit Assumption of Materialism.....	492
A Natural Body and a Spiritual Body.....	492
What Science and Religion are.....	493
Religion a Disclosure from the Creator to the Creature.....	493
Only two Legitimate Lines of Attack.....	494
"Shocks to Common-Sense" in Science.....	494
The Undulatory Theory of Light.....	495
Extract from Mr. Stallo . . . . .	496
Vacillation and Uncertainty in Science.....	497
All Sciences have a real Connection.....	497
The Earth and the Universe.....	498
Extract from Pascal.....	498
Geological Time.....	499
Chemistry, Zoölogy, Botany, Biology.....	499
Numbers of Kinds of Living Creatures.....	499
Opinion of Agassiz.....	500
Protoplasm.....	501
Science gives no Analysis of Life.....	501
No Spontaneous Generation.....	501
Bible Account of Creation.....	502
Huxley's Admissions.....	502
Huxley contradicts himself.....	503
Another Inconsistency of his.....	504
History of Vaccination.....	505
Insoluble Abstract Difficulties of Science.....	506
No Greater Difficulties in Religion.....	507

## LECTURE III. EVOLUTION, NATURAL SELECTION, ETC.

Evolution has no Scientific Basis.....	509
Man not descended from the Monkey. . . . .	509
Lamarck's Idea now abandoned.....	510
(1) Difference between Darwin and Wallace.....	510
(2) Huxley on Natural Selection.....	510
Readiness of Sceptics to change their Ground of Attack.....	511
Marine Shells on the Alps.....	511
Voltaire's Explanation.....	511
Unity of the Origin of Man.....	511
Huxley's Opinion.....	511
Movement of the Calmucks . . . . .	512

	PAGE
Colonization of Polynesia.....	512
The Monkey not widely distributed.....	512
Huxley on Evolution.....	512
Huxley on Arrested Development.....	513
Materialism and Pantheism.....	514
Matter is not Mind.....	514
Growth of a Plant.....	515
Mr. James Sully's Absurdity.....	515
Agassiz, "Belief in a Creator".....	516
Nothing can make itself.....	516
Sir William Dawson on Oysters.....	517
An All-wise Creator.....	519
Fatalism, Idealism, Materialism.....	520
Tendency to Degeneration.....	521
In China, India, Africa.....	523
Advance of Europe under Christianity.....	523
The Jew a Physiological Paradox.....	523
The Ten Tribes lost Religion and Identity.....	524
Rejection of Christ destroyed Literary Power.....	524
Nature and Church both presuppose an Almighty Creator.....	525
LECTURE IV. MORALITY.	
The Heart of Man tested.....	526
Attacks on Bible Morality.....	526
Abraham and Isaac, declaring their Wives their Sisters.....	528
Sacrifice of Isaac.....	528
Ewald's Opinion.....	530
Tindal on the Deception of Isaac.....	530
Moses slaying the Egyptian.....	531
Spoiling the Egyptians.....	532
David's Sins.....	533
Carlyle on David.....	534
The Last Words of David.....	535
The Story of Jael.....	535
Jephthah's Daughter.....	536
Jewish Explanation.....	537
Excellencies of the Bible ignored.....	538
Progressive Standards of Morality.....	539
Criticism of the Half-hearted and Indifferent.....	539
Harmonies revealed to Loving Hearts.....	540
LECTURE V. OBJECTIONS TO SCRIPTURE MORALITY.	
Causes of Unbelief.....	542
Immorality, Pride, Prejudice, Stupidity, Laziness.....	542
Tindal, Celsus, Porphyry, Julian.....	542
Voltaire, Gibbon.....	543

	PAGE
De Crousaz's <i>Logic</i> .....	544
Gibbon's Life-Career.....	545
How to answer Infidel Attacks.....	547
Dr. Johnson's Allegory.....	548
Sensitiveness of a French Unbeliever.....	549
Unknown Benefactors .....	549
Lord Bacon on Three Grades of Virtues.....	549
Destructive Dilemma.....	550
Phavorinus and the Sophists.....	551
Eulogium on Thersites.....	551
Simon of Tournay.....	551
Conversion of a French Infidel.....	552
The Greatest Probability.....	553
Three Great Classes of Probabilities.....	553
Reproduction of old Pagan Opinions.....	554
Seneca, Lucretius .....	554
How Thersites was answered.....	555
S. Bernard of Clairvaux.....	555
Abélard's <i>Sic et Non</i> .....	556

## LECTURE VI. CRITICAL AND PEDANTIC OBJECTIONS.

Natural and Supernatural Revelation.....	557
Sketch of Biblical Criticism.....	558
What the Critics agree in.....	559
How this Result was brought about.....	559
Critics lost Sight of the Church.....	559
German Critics on English Judges.....	559
Criticism is not the Catholic Church.....	560
Meaning of "Rationalize".....	560
Meaning of "Critic".....	561
Wegschneider.....	561
The Church and the Book.....	563
The Madness of Criticism.....	563
Hermann and the Classics.....	563
Aristotle, Dionysius, Thrasylus.....	564
Thiersch, Socher, Schleiermacher.....	564
Mr. Grote's Opinion.....	564
Carlyle on the Germans.....	565
Ewald and Gesenius.....	565
Samples from Ewald.....	566
Ewald on Dr. Pusey.....	571
Ewald "knew it by the Holy Ghost".....	572
Warburton on Pedantry.....	572
Grammars, Lexicons, etc., tainted.....	572
The True Remedy for the Disease.....	573
To Believe is to Understand.....	575

## LECTURE VII. PAGAN AND HEATHEN RIVALS TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

	PAGE
Spinoza and the Critics.....	576
Both Virtually Heathen .....	577
Ruskin, Tyndall, Gladstone.....	578
Old Testament Idea of God wholly Unique.....	578
“There is none else” .....	579
The Miracles at the Exodus .....	580
The Ten Commandments .....	580
Expectation of the Messiah.....	581
Prophecy.....	582
The Phœnicians and their Religion.....	583
Ewald on Muhammedanism .....	584
Four Classes of Rival Religions.....	584
Coleridge on the Lantern-Fly.....	585
Hindustan, Brahmanism, and Buddhism .....	585
Caste.....	586
Gautama Sákya-muni.....	586
Brahmanism .....	587
The Religion of China.....	588
Pacific Islands.....	589
The two Americas Turanian.....	590
Ancient Egypt.....	590
Ancient Persia.....	592
The Yezidees.....	593
Religions of Greece and Rome.....	593
Homer's Deities.....	593
Iniquities at Rome .....	594
Coleridge on Stoicism.....	594
Contrast of Scripture to all these.....	595
Saxon, Scandinavian, Slavonic, and Kymric Religions.....	595
Remnants of their Religion still left.....	595

## LECTURE VIII. SCHISMS.

Definition of the Nature of Schism.....	598
Extract from Hooker .....	599
S. Cyprian and S. Augustine.....	599
Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny.....	600
The Chapel of Alexander Severus.....	601
Gnostics and Montanists.....	601
Other Sects and Heresies.....	601
Manichæans, Donatists, Apollinarians.....	603
Meletians, Priscillianists, Luciferians.....	603
Arians, Eunomians, Semi-Arians.....	603
Novatians, Sabbatians.....	604
Gaul perfectly free from Heresies.....	604

	PAGE
Distinguished Leaders of Heresies.....	604
The Catholicity of the Church is the Guide.....	605
The Church is one, the Sects many.....	605
Arianism of the Goths.....	606
Also of the Visigoths and Mæsogoths.....	606
Ostrogoths, Suevi, Vandals.....	607
Nestorians and Monophysites.....	607
Exegetical School of Syria.....	608
Theodore of Mopsuestia.....	608
Eminent Men of that School.....	609
Heretics used to injure the Church.....	609
Combination of Sects against the Church.....	609
Nestorians and Monophysites.....	610
Numerous other Sects of Heretics.....	610
Deterioration of Sects.....	611
I. Source of Nestorianism.....	611
It moves Eastward.....	611
Maris and Rabbula.....	611
Barsumas.....	612
The term <i>Theotokos</i> .....	612
Celibacy abolished among the Nestorians.....	612
Monachism destroyed.....	612
Nestorians and Monophysites more Numerous than Latins and Greeks combined.....	612
2. Eutyches and his Error.....	613
The <i>Tome</i> of Leo.....	614
The Council of Chalcedon.....	614
The <i>Henoticon</i> of Zeno.....	615
Monophysites and Muhammedans.....	615
Dismal Condition of the whole Church.....	616
The See of Rome the Centre of Recovery.....	617
No Strength but in Unity.....	618
The Remedy for the Sins of Jerusalem.....	619

## LECTURE IX. FAULTS OF CHRISTIANS.

Faults must be confessed.....	620
How to answer Objectors.....	621
I. <i>Argumentum ad Hominem</i> .....	621
Who are the Censors?.....	621
Hypocritical Affectation.....	622
Gibbon on Eusebius.....	622
Lecky repeats Gibbon's Sneer.....	622
Gibbon condemns himself.....	624
II. A Better Answer.....	624
Statement of the Objection.....	625
Science and Art.....	625

	PAGE
No Patriotism.....	626
Ambitious of Worldly Power.....	626
The Inquisition.....	626
Radical Protestants.....	627
A Cheerful Religion.....	627
The Christian's Answer to all this.....	628
Neglect of Philosophy and Art.....	628
Plato and Aristotle.....	629
Matter and Mind.....	630
Trusting in our Faculties.....	630
Christians Unsocial ..	631
Do not resent Injuries ..	631
Have no Patriotism ..	631
Consecration of Labor.....	632
The Monastery a School of Labor.....	632
Italian Manners, A.D. 1300 ..	633
English Customs, A.D. 1539 ..	633
Long Lines of Saints ..	634
Persecution a Sin against the Church.....	634
Protestants also Guilty of it.....	635
Cheerfulness ..	635
The Scent is Cold.....	636

## LECTURE X. SCEPTICISM AS A HABIT.

Definition of Scepticism ..	637
Not a Permanent Resting-Place for Reason ..	638
Secrates and Aristotle ..	639
Protagoras, Gorgias, Arcesilaus ..	640
Scepticism and Sensuality.....	640
Mill's Revolting Statement.....	641
Hume's Philosophical Melancholy and Delirium.....	641
Christianity the Foster-mother of all real Science ..	641
Humility Necessary for True Science ..	642
Lord Bacon and Professor Seth ..	643
S. Thomas Aquinas on Reason ..	643
Two Treatises of S. Anselm.....	644
Friar Bacon and Addison ..	644
Can Reason be trusted?.....	645
Davidson on Prophecy.....	645
Comparing and Combining.....	646
Humility and Willingness to learn ..	646
Abuses to which Reason is tempted ..	647
Must make Money ..	648
Commerce not Conscience ..	648
Pride.....	648
Must have Notoriety ..	648

	PAGE
Vanity and Sensationalism . . . . .	649
Sensuality and Animalism . . . . .	649
Cynicism . . . . .	650
1. Scepticism denies Supernatural Religion . . . . .	650
The Intellect commands the whole Field . . . . .	650
If it admits Revelation, claims to criticise it . . . . .	650
Religion must have no Mysteries . . . . .	650
If it admits Mysteries, will have no Dogmas . . . . .	651
2. The <i>Ideal</i> Sceptic has no Prejudices . . . . .	651
Expects Help in Answer to Prayer . . . . .	651
Accepts a Revelation . . . . .	651
Under the Church's Lead, interprets it . . . . .	651
The Pillar and Ground of the Truth . . . . .	651



FIRST COURSE.  
INTERNAL EVIDENCES.



## INTRODUCTORY.

---

IN opening a course of lectures on the evidences of religion it is suitable first to note accurately what the term "evidences" imports. "Evidence" in general is what causes anything to be seen or known, and it is familiar to students of Cicero<sup>1</sup> how he joins *evidentia* to *perspicuitas* when describing that excellence in the use of language by which things are made plain and clear, and which in Greek was called *ἐνάργεια*, used by Plato for "distinctness," by the rhetoricians for "vivid description," and by military writers for a "clear view." In law, evidence applies to all the means by which facts are ascertained for judicial purposes; and the great authority, Blackstone,<sup>2</sup> in treating of it, lays down, in the outset, that it must "demonstrate, make clear, or ascertain the truth of the very fact or point in issue," and "that no evidence ought to be admitted to any other point." Testimony comes from a witness, either individual or collective. While *evidence* is either external or internal, direct or circumstantial, *proof* is usually external, and more properly relates to facts or external objects. One or two notable rules of evidence in the trial by jury<sup>3</sup> should be here recalled. This evidence may be of two kinds: "that which may be given in proof, and that which the jury may receive by their own private knowledge." Proof can be either written or oral. Concerning written

<sup>1</sup> *Academ.*, II., 6, 17. Cf. Quintilian, VI., 2, 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Commentaries*, III., 367 [II., 281, 282].

<sup>3</sup> Blackstone commends the "excellent treatise" on this class of evidence of the Lord Chief-Baron Gilbert.

proof was the rule that deeds, or wills, or a parish certificate of thirty years' standing, proved themselves. As regards *parole* evidence, the man himself must testify in person; though *hearsay* evidence was admitted in a particular case of a person deceased. The general rule was, "that the best evidence the nature of the case will admit shall always be required, if possible to be had; but if not possible, then the best evidence that can be had shall be allowed."

When we speak, then, of the evidences of religion,<sup>1</sup> we mean, of course, of the true religion, since nothing but a fact or a truth can receive evidence in the legal sense; and we should mean, besides, revealed or supernatural religion, since, if the religion of nature be evident of itself it needs no further evidence. Moreover, the use of the abstract term "evidence," in the plural, "evidences," may fitly suggest to us the three generic or leading divisions under which [in the three successive years of this professorship] we propose to consider this great subject; these are the internal evidence, the external evidence, and the answers to objections, in which last division we shall evince the truth of religion by showing how its evidence triumphs resistlessly over every reluctance of unbelief.

The internal evidence<sup>2</sup> that our religion is what it claims to be, supernatural, the voice of God speaking directly to His creatures, implies a knowledge of the contents of the Scriptures, of the distinctive doctrines of

<sup>1</sup> The title of this Chair is "Evidences of Revealed Religion."

<sup>2</sup> In a letter to Walpole, dated Oct. 8, 1751, Thomas Gray, the poet, says: "I have seen two of Dr. Middleton's unpublished works. . . . The second is in Latin, on miracles, to show that of the two methods of defending Christianity, one from its intrinsic evidence, the holiness and purity of its doctrines, the other from its external, the mira-

cles, said to be wrought to confirm it, the first has been little attended to by reason of its difficulty; the second much insisted upon because it appeared an easier task; but that it can in reality prove nothing at all. 'Nobilis illa quidem defensio (the first) quam si obtinere potuissent rem simul omnem expediisse causamque penitus vicisse videretur.'"  
*Gray's Letters*, pp. 221, 222. Boston, 1820.

Christians, of the history of the Church, and, to some extent, of the world. The external evidence includes not only what has just been mentioned, but the vast mass of learning known as the criticism of Holy Scripture; the knowledge of books, editions, manuscripts, various readings, versions; the authenticity, integrity, and credibility of the sacred books, the exhibition of the true force of miracles, prophecies, with their attestations, and the outward triumphs of the faith. In the refutation of objections it will be necessary, not only to obtain some mastery over the details of separate human sciences, and, in particular, over logic and the "architectonic science," or metaphysics, which arranges the different sciences as parts in a symmetrical whole, but also, in particular, of the true principles for the interpretation of Scripture and of the correct conception of its inspiration.

It needs no more than such a glance at the whole subject of the evidences, to understand how intimately its different parts are interwoven and interlaced together. It might almost be said that not more closely are soul, body, and spirit united in one man, than are the different branches of religious evidence, its internal excellence, its external splendor, its militant energy, offensive and defensive. If theology be the queen of the sciences, and we believe it is, the department of the evidences might be characterized as such a review of her forces and strength as shall most briefly and impressively make good her claims to empire. What we have said shows that an adequate treatment of the evidences will touch upon every branch of theology. And if we depart from the logical order of treatment which these branches, viewed in their relation to each other, might demand—a relation that is like the structure of a kingdom, considered in itself—and adopt a different order, chronological or otherwise, this is only to marshal the forces of our sovereign with reference to the present condition of the powers, hostile, neutral, or friendly, upon her borders. Revealed religion adds new evidence and certainty to all the tenets

of natural religion ; for a man who follows passion rather than reason, as the multitude do, overturns and throws into confusion the plainest deductions of reason and common sense, as, *e. g.*, the being of God, the spiritual nature of man, and the supremacy of virtue. This is why what is self-evident, sometimes with advantage receives evidence from other quarters. Many sciences, and, eminently, the science of man's nature and destiny, on which they all depend, derive the impulse and motive to their prosecution from the disclosures of religion. Some knowledge of the contents of the Bible must precede, as a motive, the laborious investigations comprehended under the names of criticism, authenticity, credibility. And how do these in turn involve every other branch of theology!

Let us try to illustrate this. The entire Hebrew Bible, pointed and accentuated, was first printed in Italy, at Soncino,<sup>1</sup> near Cremona, between 1482-1488, some four hundred years ago. Any one curious to inspect this interesting volume can see it in Exeter College, Oxford. Only eight other copies are known to exist. This volume is wonderful ; not simply as the Old Testament, and therefore suggesting as its supplement another volume, the New Testament, still more wonderful, in another language (the Greek, first printed at Alcalá,<sup>2</sup> in 1514). Next after the New, the Old Testament is incomparably the best attested book in the world. Its most perfect edition, that put forth by the Rabbi Athias<sup>3</sup> (Amsterdam, 1661), improved by Van der Hooght (1705) and Hahn (in Germany) and Judah D'Allemand (in England), and finally enriched by the critical labors of Kennicott (who collated 581<sup>4</sup> Jewish and 16 Samaritan manuscripts, and 40 printed editions) and De Rossi (who collected 1,031

<sup>1</sup> Under the patronage of wealthy Jewish congregations.

<sup>2</sup> Under the patronage of the princely Cardinal Ximenes.

<sup>3</sup> Who had a manuscript bearing

date 1299 ; also a Spanish manuscript nine hundred years old.

<sup>4</sup> Of these 102 contained the Old Testament complete. Kennicott assigned the oldest (No. 590) of his collection to the tenth century.

manuscripts, and collated 751),<sup>1</sup> differs in no essential particular from the first printed copy. The most notable change in any printed edition is that of Gersom, at Brescia, 1494, in which the readings, *Keris*,<sup>2</sup> instead of being in the margin, were inserted in the text, from which edition Luther's version of the Bible in German was made. The manuscripts collected by Kennicott and De Rossi, from all parts of Europe, were afterward confirmed by others brought from Asia—from China and from Derbend, in Daghestan—where was discovered a Pentateuch roll bearing date A.D. 580, and another of the prophets, A.D. 916.<sup>3</sup> The manuscripts from which the Old Testament was thus consigned to the immortality of type were themselves the lineal descendants of other manuscripts, whose character and history are thoroughly known, and which have perished only because ink, paper, and parchment cannot last forever. Such were the Codex Hillel, in Spain; the Codex Aegyptius, or Hierosolymitanus of Ben Asher; and the Codex Babylonius of Ben Naphtali, and many others; the famous Codex Ezra, or Azarah, at Toledo, deserving special mention, as having been ransomed from the Black Prince for a large sum, at his capture of the city in 1367, but destroyed in a subsequent siege.<sup>4</sup> The Scriptures of the Old Testament were preserved as no other book was ever preserved in the history of the world. They had an entire nation for their custodian—a nation whose history begins with Abraham, three thousand five hundred years before the volume was committed to type; a nation whose very existence and present continuance is a standing miracle, and these same Scriptures are the very charter of their national life. They were preserved in two continents, in synagogue rolls and private manuscripts without number. From the sixth to the ninth century, while the false

<sup>1</sup> De Rossi assigns his oldest (No. 634) to the eighth century.

<sup>2</sup> See two lists of these Keris in Walton's *Polyglot*, Vol. VI. (beginning).

<sup>3</sup> Pinner, *Prospæctus der Odessaer Gesellschaft*, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Scott Porter's *Princip. of Text. Crit.*, p. 74.

Prophet of Arabia was depraving the old religion by his forgery, the Jews, in their schools everywhere, and notably in the school of Tiberias,<sup>1</sup> were elaborating the Masoretic system, by which every verse, every word, every letter of the sacred text should be secured against depravation; and deriving through the Arabian, or, as Ewald thinks, directly through its mother, the Syrian, the vowel-marks by which the traditional pronunciation was imperishably recorded. The text thus handed down by the Jews, in which their own character, their faults and sins, and their predicted punishment, are depicted in letters of fire, differs not in the least essential feature from that accepted by Christians as the primal revelation from God. "The Jews are witnesses against themselves." The Talmud ("doctrine"), which took its rise in the schools which grew up after the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), in Jabneh, Sepphoris, Cæsarea, and in Tiberias, where Rabbi Judah the Holy (died A.D. 220) wrote the Mishna ("repetition," "second law") or text of the Talmud, and its twofold commentary, viz., the Jerusalem Gemara ("completion"), proceeding from Tiberias, in the fourth century, and the Babylonian Gemara, from the schools (Sura, Nahardea, Pum-Beditha) on the Euphrates, in the fifth, in no respect obscured the testimony of the people to the integrity of their Scriptures, which S. Jerome<sup>2</sup> (A.D. 331-420) in the fourth century, taught by Palestinian Jews, translated into Latin, and which stands in the original Hebrew in the

<sup>1</sup> See Buxtorf's work, *The Tiberias*.

<sup>2</sup> This most learned of the Fathers made at first a revised translation of the Old Testament into Latin from the Greek, of which work of S. Jerome only two books, Job and the Psalms, are preserved; the rest perished through the treachery of some enemy to revision to whom the saint had entrusted it. ("Pleraque prioris laboris fraude cujusdam amisimus." —Ep. S. Hieron. ad S. Aug.) This, however, only stimulated the learned

man to perfect his knowledge of the Hebrew, and to make a new translation into Latin from the original, which was finished in A.D. 405, but not published till nearly two hundred years after. This has been attributed to the influence of the legend about the inspiration of the lxx. S. Jerome consulted a copy of Origen's *Hexapla* in the library at Cæsarea (consumed at the irruption of the Saracens). Cf. Bishop Lightfoot in volume on *Bible Revision*.

*Hexapla* of Origen (A.D. 185-254) of the second and third centuries, where we have the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Septuagint, made in the third century before Christ. The text indicated by these witnesses, as by the Targums ("paraphrases") of Onkelos and Jonathan, is identically the same with that transmitted to the latest times, with the most insignificant variations. It is the text read in the synagogues by our Lord and by S. Paul; the square or Aramaic form of the letters which had been adopted, perhaps not differing more from the ancient form as it appears, for instance, on the Maccabean coins, than modern English from German text, or even Roman from Italic type. Their authority confirms, in every material particular, the boast of the learned Jew, Josephus,<sup>1</sup> made in Judea before the death of S. John, when vindicating the statements in his book of *Jewish Antiquities* against the Grecian cavillers, Agatharchides, Manetho, Cheremon, and Lysimachus. "We have not an innumerable multitude of books among us," says Josephus, "disagreeing from and contradicting one another (as the Greeks have), but only twenty-two books,<sup>2</sup> which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine; and, of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the traditions of the

<sup>1</sup> Born A.D. 37, in Jerusalem. His father, Mathias, a priest of the first of the twenty-four courses, without doubt saw our Saviour, and Josephus may have seen all the Apostles. He was present, and commanded in the Jewish army throughout the siege of Jerusalem. He gained the conqueror's esteem by foretelling his future elevation to empire. Titus offered him any boon he would request. Josephus chose the Sacred Books and the lives of his brother and fifty friends. He composed the *Jewish War* and *Antiquities* at Rome. Date of death uncertain; probably second century.

<sup>2</sup> We do not enter into the dispute whether Josephus was acquainted with Canticles and Ezra. Origen, quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.*, VI., 25), says: "It should be observed that the collective books, as handed down by the Hebrews, are twenty-two, according to the number of letters in their alphabet." Eusebius then quotes in full the enumeration by which the Sacred Books are reduced to this number (22). So the Alexandrian grammarians limited the books of Homer to twenty-four, the number of the letters in the Greek alphabet.

origin of mankind till his death. This interval of time was little short of three thousand years; but as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after Moses wrote down what was done in their time in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true our history hath been written since Artaxerxes<sup>1</sup> very particularly, but hath not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because there hath not been an exact succession of prophets since that time; and how firmly we have given credit to those books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them; but it becomes natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them.”<sup>2</sup>

It is evident that this learned Jew understands, as clearly as Christians, the distinction between canonical Scripture and apocryphal or ecclesiastical writings. (See Marsh, Ch. III., p. 63.) It is well known that in the controversies in the first centuries between Christians and Jews, a frequent retort of the Jew to a quotation from the Greek Scriptures was: “This passage is not found in the original Hebrew,”<sup>3</sup> and it is not unlikely that this circumstance served to diminish the implicit reliance upon the Septuagint. Still, not even their enemies ever fastened upon the Jews the charge of depraving their Scriptures, in the utmost stress of controversy.

<sup>1</sup> B.C. 464-430.

<sup>2</sup> Josephus against Apion, I., 8.

<sup>3</sup> Just as the learned Selden used to discomfit the Puritan divines by saying to them: “Perhaps, in your little pocket Bibles with gilt leaves, the translation may be thus; but the

Greek or Hebrew signifies otherwise.”—Johnson’s *Life of Selden*, p. 303. The Puritan Dr. Owen “clung with desperation to the theory of the antiquity and inspiration of the Hebrew punctuation, as the only safeguard for the certainty of the sense.”

Josephus repelled the cavils of Greek critics, who affected to regard his proofs of the antiquity of the Jewish people as but another instance of the vanity so common in the ancient world, the seeking after a high or divine lineage. It is the fashion to compliment the wisdom of our day upon the growth, among other things, of what is called "the historic sense." But the preposterous cavils of these Greek sophists were not a whit more absurd than the grave reproductions of Jewish history,<sup>1</sup> heard with patience in our own day, evolved from philological studies alone, historical tradition being thrown to the winds—the bold sciolists being not polished Greeks, but the children of barbarians who but yesterday issued from the Teutonic woods. Either folly is alike shattered against the rock of a national history the most marvellous and the most conspicuous in the history of the world. The history of the Hebrew Bible is the history of the constitution of a nation. The preservation of the sacred manuscripts, their authenticity and credibility, are infinitely removed from the petty uncertainties that must attend every similar research concerning the private works of individual authors, however celebrated—Thucydides or Livy, Tacitus, or even a Cæsar. We maintain that whatever arguments can establish the credit of the private works can be alleged also for the sacred writings, and many other arguments beside, and infinitely stronger. It is here that the internal evidence of religion blends with the external. If we can place ourselves, in thought, in Josephus's day, we may realize the full absurdity of some of the most plausible objections urged in our time. The Jewish writer was but little farther removed from the latest of the prophets than we are removed from the first

<sup>1</sup> We may compare the reclamation of an able man upon a parallel matter: "There is something extremely nauseous to me in a German professor telling the world, on his own authority, and without giving the smallest reason, that two of the best Latin

poets were ignorant of the quantity of a word which they must have used in their exercises at school a hundred times."—T. B. Macaulay, in reference to Niebuhr, *Life and Letters* I., 234.

printed Hebrew Bible, a copy of which may be seen in Exeter College, Oxford. There are people with a reputation for learning who gravely maintain that the composition of the Pentateuch must be placed at about the period of Ezra—an hypothesis which has really about as much and as little to recommend it as that of the ignorant blockhead who, the other day, in New York, put forth the theory that there never was any Greek or Hebrew original, but that the English Bible was composed by defenders of kingcraft and priestcraft, in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Ewald's hypothesis of seven authors of the Pentateuch would have seemed to Josephus as reasonable as the hypothesis, for instance, of a four-fold Homer, based on the Doric, Æolic, Ionic, and Attic idioms<sup>1</sup> in the great epic bard, would have seemed to Aristarchus or Plutarch. There is no absurdity in criticism,<sup>2</sup> as in metaphysics, so great as not to seem plausible to some human being. But the plain answer to such folly for any unsophisticated mind, is, that you cannot deceive a nation as to the authors of its fundamental laws, the origin of its most significant commemorations, the substance and meaning of its most sacred records. This would be true, generally, of any worldly State. In the Jewish polity State and Church were welded into one. The Pentateuch touches upon the history of three thousand years. It gives an outline of the original settlers and colonizers of the world—an outline on which all authentic history is still based. It contains prophecy of the

<sup>1</sup> Warburton (*Divine Legation*, Bk. VI., Appendix) has scornfully characterized the "pedantry which is the ape of criticism," that would attempt, in the Hebrew, from considerations of style, to fix the age of compositions as a Bentley could do in Greek and Latin.

<sup>2</sup> Father Hardouin (1647-1729), a learned Jesuit, maintained that Terence's *Plays*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, Horace's *Odes*, and the Histories of Livy

and Tacitus, were the forgeries of monks of the thirteenth century. He allows that the *Georgics*, Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*, and the whole of Cicero, are genuine. *Chronologiæ ex nummis antiquis restitutæ prolusio, de nummis Herodiadum*, 1693 (Refuted by Le Clerc and La Croze). Cf. Lipsius's tract on the *Commentaries* of Cæsar; also the *History* of Anniius of Viterbo.

currents of history that were to come after. It describes the origin and progress of the only race that has withstood the changes of the world, war, prosperity, slavery, persecution, exile, climate, and still remains unchanged. The Assyrian, the Chaldean, the Persian, have arisen and passed away; the Egyptian, the Greek, the Roman, have had their day on the world's stage; their memories are preserved in pictures and books, and perhaps, now and then, in a living reproduction in some corner of the world; but the Jew survives in indestructible vitality in every quarter of the globe. Nay, in almost every city and principal place where men are found, the least instructed observer can, without trouble, turn to some human being and declare, "That is a Jew." This fact, unique among all that is known of the race of man, unsolved by any science, the paradox of ethnology, the reversal of all political and social laws, is predicted again and again in the sacred books of the Hebrews, and has caused them to be likened to the bush seen by their law-giver, Moses, "burned but not consumed."

" A hopeless faith, a homeless race,  
 Yet seeking the most holy place,  
 And owning the true bliss!  
 Salted with fire, they seem to show  
 How spirits lost in endless woe  
 May undecaying live." †

To this unyielding race was given a divine revelation in sacred books, revised, perfected, attested by a succession of prophets for a thousand years, and this revelation, though itself portraying, with terrible distinctness, their sins, humiliation, and punishment, they have nevertheless

† Keble's *Christian Year*, "Fifth Sunday in Lent." It is curious that the word "dispersion," *διασπορά*, applied to the Jews in their later condition, is also in mineralogy the name of a lamellar or prismatic mass of

alumina and water, having a pearly cleavage, and, although infusible, *decrepitating with violence* before the blowpipe. This is a kind of allegory.

preserved with characteristic fidelity and tenacity. Before being driven from their own land and their sacred city, Jerusalem—another name for Heaven itself—and while the people themselves were the seed and the type of the Catholic Church, it could be said to them: “In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness.”<sup>1</sup>

Thus, bearing her Lord's name, we are entitled to consider even the Jewish Church, in her day, as invested with an image of the authority of Christ's bride, the Catholic Church, and entitled to pronounce upon the Canon of the inspired writings. In the synagogue rolls<sup>2</sup> containing the Parshioth (“sections”) or appointed lessons from the Pentateuch, and the Haphtaroth, or corresponding sections from the prophets, read not alone in Palestine, but, in process of time, in the synagogues throughout the world, the Church of the Old Covenant not only recorded her attestation of the divine oracles she had received, but devised a means which, under Providence, secured their uncorrupted preservation for all coming time. The strength and purport of this attestation of the national church of Israel, or of the church which was also a nation, to the reality of the Revelation and the inspired authority of the sacred books entrusted to her, should be seriously considered. The history of the chosen people themselves is part—a most important part—of that Revelation. Faith was never perpetuated among men by being shut up in a book, to be proved by the fidelity of scribes and the accuracy of editions; it is created and lives in the atmosphere of a divine body, formed among men by heavenly agency, animated by great examples, defended by martyrs, taught by prophets, whose living oracles cherish the faith they

<sup>1</sup> Jeremiah, xxxiii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> A complete Jewish calendar containing these lessons may be seen in Bartolucci, *Bibl. Rabbin.*, II., pp. 593-598, 655-664. The word Haphtarath (“Dismissal.” Cf. Acts, xiii. 15)

corresponds in meaning to the Christian *Missa*. The portions from Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther were called Megilloth, “volumes,” “rolls.”

have created by loving memories and immortal hopes. The average of men receive their beliefs, not from investigation or careful reasoning, but from the community in which they live. This fact is as evident in the church as in the state. If, therefore, Almighty God has revealed supernatural truths to His creatures and desired the knowledge of these truths to be preserved and transmitted, we might argue with confidence *a priori* that such knowledge would be entrusted to a Church or Divine kingdom. We should be justified in such reasoning, by that principle of moral evidence which has been defined as "a habit of referring everything that will admit of it, to its end, and of determining its value by its subserviency thereto."<sup>1</sup> There is a touching picture in the history of the greatest of the prophets, Elijah, of the soreness of the trial that comes to a faith, even supported by miracle, when it perceives itself solitary, through the falling away of surrounding sympathy.<sup>2</sup> The burdened soul is relieved and comforted by a revelation, not of new truths, but of a faith like its own, in other souls of its own people, though for a time hidden from view by a cloud of apostasy. For the majority of human beings faith comes and goes with their faith in the faith of others. This is not wholly a fault, even in the eye of reason. Man's highest life, his only true life, is in a community. His temporal, his religious, perfection are wrought out and conferred upon him by his Maker and Saviour, through the action and reaction upon him of other beings like himself. The union of consenting brethren was appointed and prayed for by the Saviour of men, as the one triumphant instrument of subjugating the unbelieving world to faith.<sup>3</sup> Under the elder covenant the people chosen as the instrument of conveying the divine message to man bore the signature of their oneness in their relation to an earthly progenitor, written indelibly on their outward frames, and attested the truth of the

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction to the Study of Moral Evidence*, by J. E. Gambier. London, 1824.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings, xvii., especially verses 4, 14, 18.

<sup>3</sup> S. John, xvii.

divine words written in books entrusted to their keeping throughout the most wonderful of human histories, alike, and with equal emphasis, amid the most splendid of earthly triumphs, and amid the extremities of mortal anguish and humiliation.

This illustration, protracted perchance unduly, may serve to show how the eternal verities unite with what are called the "external evidences." The testimony of our Lord and his Apostles is undoubtedly for us Christians the great attestation of the Old Testament. But the early dispensation had in itself a sufficient solidity of evidence to make good its claim to be an immediate disclosure of the Almighty to his creature man. The world's creation, the formation of a chosen race, its history, the coming Incarnation through that chosen and selected channel, the unique majesty of the moral law, the direct dealing of the Almighty with His people, by chastisement, by mercy, by religious rites of typical significance, by great examples, which, though not without faults, are still without parallel in their virtues and their trials, the instructions of parable and prophecy, all illustrated at times by poetic strains of more than mortal elevation—these should make every right-thinking human soul confess the presence of God.

In the eighteenth century the study of external evidences seemed at times so exclusive as to provoke the nickname of Old Bailey Theology, in which, as Dr. Johnson said, "the Apostles were being tried once a week for the capital crime of forgery." The extreme which shut up religion within the covers of a book, has its counterpart in the extreme which directs our thoughts too exclusively to men, even though they be the living representatives of the heavenly kingdom, immortal through its author, but built up here on earth and enlarged amid a perishing race. One who spoke out of his own experience said: "There is but one sort of scepticism that is genuine, and deadly in proportion as it is real; that, namely, which is forced upon the mind by its experience

of the hollowness of mankind: <sup>1</sup> for 'men may be read, as well as books, too much.'" But in God's world no such force can ever constrain a religious mind; its experience of human weakness and wickedness in itself and in others will serve only to fasten its reliance the more utterly upon God, who can and does redeem to honor and purity even such creatures as these.

Belief is the embrace of a truth, not solely by the mind, but with the whole powers of a man. No one thoroughly believes a thing who does not also *live* by it, as even etymology shows. And since we not only believe truths, but believe in persons as well, it is evident that faith must be a complex act. We may describe various aspects of it by a syllogism, but the whole concrete fact, with its motives and grounds and final certainty, outruns and transcends logical forms. Religious faith is belief in God, and belief in truth on God's Word. Human faith is belief on the testimony of man. In its own sphere, such testimony is competent to produce certainty. In religion, human faith and divine faith meet in this way: human testimony is competent to assure us with absolute certainty that God has spoken: faith in God makes us receive without all doubt the message He delivers. The multitude who were fed with five loaves and two fishes were unimpeachable witnesses to a miracle: the Incarnate Son of God alone could assure us that He Himself is the living Bread that can give life to all that will feed upon him—that came down from heaven to give life to the world.

Consider what it is for a human being, a man or woman, neither wiser nor more learned than the average, to be fully convinced by the evidence of religion. Without any supernatural voice we may assume that they know there is a God, that they have a soul, that there is a right

<sup>1</sup> Warburton, in his dedication of the *Divine Legation*, thus addresses the Earl of Hardwicke: "Your Lordship's humanity and candor enlarged, and not (as it often happens) diminished, by your great knowledge of mankind."

and wrong in actions, that they must give account. These truths are so instinctive to man, so inevitably the result of any serious or logical reflection upon the problems of the world, or of life, that they may be considered as articles of natural religion. This means the religion to which each man may attain by his own powers, and which, though perhaps in no given place discovered in completeness, or held with consistency, lies potentially behind, or is implied by, the thoughts of all the wisest and best men on this subject.<sup>1</sup> Now suppose a man, awake to natural religion, but of course not able to escape the effects of surrounding indifference, uncertainty, and inconsistency, to be told, "God has spoken to men; His words have been verified by miracles; they have been taken down. He has sent a message of love and hope to His creatures; the mystery of sin has been met by a greater mystery of mercy; He reveals himself as Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier; He has come to us in our own nature; He has set up in the world an imperishable brotherhood, which is also a kingdom, to which men are admitted, and in which their spiritual life is sustained by simple but powerful rites; that this kingdom is the appointed support of faith in the world; that still it requires of faith the reception of no mysteries concerning God or man, but such as are needful to guard and regulate the probation of human beings, as they pass through time to an imperishable destiny in a future state."

Now, what is properly evidence of so tremendous a revelation as we have thus briefly summarized? It is not simply the existence of sacred books, whose authors are known, and whose preservation can be proved with reasonable certainty. It is not that the authors of these books wrought miracles, uttered prophesies, and laid

<sup>1</sup> "Neque tam est acris acies in naturis hominum et ingeniis, ut res tantas quisquam, nisi monstratas, possit videre; neque tanta tamen in rebus obscuritas ut eas peritus acri vir ingenio cernat, si modo aspexerit."—Cicero. If the mind be unable to *discover* these truths it can still appreciate their weight and evidence when made known.

down their lives (as they had before laid aside human comfort and security) in attestation of their sincerity. It is not the presence in these books of a peculiar elevation and depth of style, a simplicity, a sincerity, a tenderness, a searching directness and truth, distinguishing them from all other compositions. Nor is it the majesty and comprehensiveness of the doctrines disclosed, concerning God, His nature and attributes; or concerning the powers and history of man, and the provisions made for his redemption and salvation; or the glimpses afforded of other beings in the spiritual world, as the blessed angels. Nor is it the wonderful history in the world of the church, or heavenly kingdom, at first confined to one race, then embracing the whole family of man, but always drawing into itself and subjugating to its loyal service the flower and glory of the human race, all that is loftiest in intellect, most heroic in devotion, the most tender and generous with the stoutest and bravest: a history partly recorded and partly predicted in the sacred books, but attested also by all that is finest in literature and art, and by the very records of man's most memorable crimes and failures. I say that the evidence from either one of the topics mentioned, or perhaps from more than one combined, might not subdue the natural man to receive the message of Revelation. But if he could, even in a general way, be made to feel the impression of them all, we cannot conceive how they could fail to be irresistible. That message comes, with the most thrilling tidings concerning all that is most important for him to know, to every human soul. It is attested by every conceivable evidence; it is the word of a father to a child. It speaks of forgiveness of sin, of eternal mercy, of endless life and endless death. It has been received by the wisest, the purest, the gentlest, the bravest, the young and innocent as well as the most sorely tried, and has proved the strength of their life, and a sufficient stay amid the most cruel deaths.

We can conceive a soul honestly asking itself, Is this message true? Or arguing, If such and such facts be

established then its truth must follow. Or finally assenting, I am as sure that this gracious message is from my Maker and my Saviour as I am sure of my own being. We can conceive, I say, a soul honestly in either of these three stages of questioning, of arguing, or of assent. We can conceive of one who has really reached the third stage of joyful assent, going back in thought to help a struggling brother through the first and second stages. His sympathies, quickened by charity, will serve to recall to him his own anxieties during that dread experience. The mind can review the steps of its progress, though it never really returns to its past condition. This may be said of the discovery of any truths. And so ye who are teachers of religion must pass in review again and again the questions and arguments of those who have not faith as yet, and with infinite tenderness and patience give them such guidance as you may, while they blindly grope toward the glorious truth which to you seems not only more certain but more precious than all other truths, the only truth for which it is worth while to live, for it is the substance of your eternal life.

## LECTURE I.

---

### NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION.

#### PART I.

SOMETHING in the nature of man suggests to him that he does and will continue to live even after the mysterious change which death brings on him ; that the future life develops and completes the present ; that he cannot by any change in his being escape the just consequences of his actions ; that God, who is the maker and ruler of the world about him, is as much pledged to the vindication of the moral law, the eternal distinctions of right and wrong, as to the control and care of the material earth, its water and land, its seasons and inhabitants. These, then, may be called the articles of the creed of natural religion : the existence of God, Creator and Judge ; the immortality of the soul ; conscience testifying to the law of right and wrong, and a future judgment, retributive and just. Our present task is to show the relation of revealed religion to these truths, both what light it throws upon them, and what confirmation itself receives while it thus illustrates and completes the first instincts of the human soul.

Christian writers<sup>1</sup> sometimes express briefly the relation of natural to revealed religion by saying, that while natural religion makes known to us the first Person of the Trinity, God the Father, the Creator of all, it is from revealed religion alone that we learn of the second

<sup>1</sup> *E. g.*, Butler in the *Analogy*, Part II., Ch. I., on "The Importance of Christianity."

and third Persons, the Redeemer and the Sanctifier. And this statement is well calculated to impress upon us the necessity and the importance of revelation. For if we once conceive the relation to be real and true that we bear to God the Son, as the Redeemer of our race from the slavery of sin, and to God the Holy Ghost, as the Strengtheners and Restorer of our fallen nature, our duties of gratitude and religious service are no less immediate and even natural toward the second and third Persons of the Holy Trinity than toward the first, our Creator. They are no less natural and moral, we are to remember, when they rest upon the truths and facts of our relation to these divine Persons, even though these facts and truths would never have become known to us except by direct (or supernatural) revelation. It would be unreasonable to deny the duties which result from our revealed relations to the Son and Spirit, as it would be irreligious to deny the new sanction and significance given by the same revelation to many of our duties to God the Father, which even nature and reason point out.

We do not, therefore, hesitate to put into the same class, and to call by the same name, a certain kind of truths, though some of them come to us through nature (by instinct or by reason), and some only by revelation; that is, we call them religion. It is well known that the Latin writers are not agreed upon the derivation of this word; some, like Lucretius,<sup>1</sup> obtaining it from *re*, "back," and *ligo*, "to bind," and thus making it descriptive of the bond<sup>2</sup> of duty and piety which fastens the creature (man) to his Creator; others, with Cicero, say that *religio* is

<sup>1</sup> In reference to this derivation, apparently, he twice has the line: "Religionum animos nodis exsolvere pergo uretis."—*De Rer. Nat.*, I., 931; IV., 7.

<sup>2</sup> "Diximus nomen religionis a vinculo pietatis esse deductum, quod hominem sibi deus religaverit, et pietate constringerit, quia nos servire Ei,

ut domino, et obsequi, ut patri, necesse est."—Lactantius, *Instit.*, IV., 28.

<sup>3</sup> "Qui autem omnia quæ ad cultum deorum pertinent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo."—*De Nat. Deorum*, II., 28.

from *re*, "again," and *lego*, "to read;" and that hence "they who diligently perused and read or practised over again all the duties relating to the worship of the gods, were called religious (*religiosi*)." Perhaps it may not be wholly fanciful to see in the first derivation a recognition by man's nature of the strength of the primary religious truths which bind man to his Maker with something like the force of a natural tie; and, in the second, a reference to the diligent consultation of the inspired documents which preserve the divine Revelation believed once to have been given by oracles and prophets. Certainly, both of these things enter into an adequate conception of religion.

It is curious that the great Roman orator as well as the Christian writer, both Cicero and Lactantius, when thus defining "religion" through etymology, take occasion to attempt to do the same thing for "superstition,"<sup>1</sup> the corruption or parody of true religion. And it is very notable that it is the Christian father's rather than the heathen philosopher's account of superstition which has been made the ground of an attack, in our day, upon all religion. Cicero says: "The best, the chastest, the most sacred and pious worship of the gods, is to reverence them always with a pure, perfect, and unpolluted mind and voice. And not only philosophers, but our ancestors also, have thoroughly<sup>2</sup> distinguished *superstition* from *religion*. For they who for whole days uttered their prayers and made offerings that their children might survive them, were called *superstitious*; and this name afterwards obtained a wider significance." Lactantius, however, rejects this explanation. He affirms that it is the object worshipped, not the manner of the worship, nor

<sup>1</sup> "None of the ancient languages possessed a word answering to the general idea which we express by 'superstition.'"—Ewald, *History of Israel*, Vol. II., p. 130. Eng. Tr. London, 1869.

raverunt. Num qui totos dies precabantur et immolabant, ut sui sibi liberi superstites essent, superstitiosi sunt appellati: quod nomen patuit postea latius."—*De Natura Deorum*, l. II., Ch. 28.

<sup>2</sup> "Superstitionem a religione sepa-

the end sought, that distinguishes religion from superstition. "Without doubt," he affirms,<sup>1</sup> "religion is the worship of what is true; superstition the worship of what is false (or imaginary, *falsi*) . . . They, moreover, are called superstitious, not who wish for children to live after them, for we all wish this; but either they who keep up by religious rites the memory of the dead, or they who, having survived their parents, worshipped their images at home as household gods. For they called those *superstitious* who devised for themselves new religious rites in order to honor, after the fashion of gods, the dead whom they thought to have been received from among men into heaven."

In modern parlance, Cicero gives to "superstition" a subjective, and Lactantius an objective sense. The only place in Scripture where the word occurs (Acts, xxv. 19)<sup>2</sup> is in the language of the Roman governor, Festus, who calls the religion of the Jews "their superstition." The adjective formed from this, which in like manner occurs but once in Holy Scripture, is employed by S. Paul in addressing the Athenians from Mars' Hill, and according to the most probable explanation should be rendered "very religious," rather than "too superstitious."<sup>3</sup> The Greek words, both noun and adjective, describe simply "a fear of the Deity." It might be maintained that both conceptions of superstition eventually coincide; since unbecoming religious rites, or even unworthy thoughts of the Deity, either presuppose or lead to a wrong object of worship; and on the other hand, false gods, or the demons that inspire them, transform into a snare and peril of the soul the most sincere religious impulse. Better, perhaps, than any speculation is it to try and

<sup>1</sup> "Nimirum religio veri cultus est, superstitione falsi . . . Superstitiosi autem vocantur, non qui filios suos superstites optant: omnes enim optamus; sed aut ii, qui superstitem memoriam defunctorum colunt, aut qui parentibus suis superstites, colunt imagines eorum domi tanquam deos penates."—*Instit. Div.*, L. IV., Ch. 28.

<sup>2</sup> δεισδαιμονία.

<sup>3</sup> δεισδαιμονεστέρους. Acts, xvii. 22.

grasp the simple facts, that man instinctively looks up to a Spiritual Author and Ruler of the universe about him, lifts up hands of adoration and longing, with ever-increasing clearness of conception, while nature is healthful and unperverted by passion; that even when sick with sin,<sup>1</sup> and blinded by custom, nature asserts itself even in the homage to uncouth gods, or in the cruel or narrow or unbecoming rites offered to the true God; and that superstition in either form is less hateful, and more becoming to human nature, than swinish indifference to everything loftier than appetite, or the leprous frivolity which besmirches with ridicule every act of religion or impulse toward real worship.

We propose to prove that mankind have believed the articles of natural religion, by quoting the opinions of different races, in various lands, and in all ages. Notwithstanding every variety of expression, we believe that there is a substantial agreement of belief in certain articles. It should be distinctly said in the outset that this proof is not of the nature of a direct proof of the truth of the articles of natural religion: since it is conceivable that errors even on these subjects may prevail widely among men. Neither is the proof we are about to bring designed to satisfy the inquiry, how men came by their religious beliefs; whether, *e. g.*, by original revelation, or by the natural working of their minds; whether at once or by a gradual process. We would like to ascertain with as much clearness and exactness as the case admits, what has seemed true upon these subjects to the mass of mankind,<sup>2</sup> to the wisest and best in all nations, what they

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, in his *Treatise on Superstition*, observes that whereas slaves, when they despair of freedom, may demand to be sold to another master, superstition admits of no change of gods, since "the god cannot be found whom he will not fear who fears the gods of his family and his birth, who shudders at the saving and the be-

nignant, who has a trembling and a dread at those from whom he asks riches and wealth, concord, peace, success of all good words and deeds."

<sup>2</sup> This may be called, in the language of the schoolmen, treating the subject *in facto esse*, in contrast with *in fieri*.

have reached by reflection, as well as what they have received through teaching. Undoubtedly anything like universal consent upon any one point must be regarded as a reasonable presumption of its truth, since the race is wiser than any individual man, and it would be an arrogant aspersion for any one member to charge the whole race with unanimity in error. Moreover, the statements made by different men concerning the articles of natural religion may seem to throw light upon the origin of their belief; to give more probability, for example, to the theory of original Revelation than of spontaneous ex-cogitation, or the reverse, to different minds; but we must not allow the doubtfulness attending any such theory of origins to obscure the clearness of the facts themselves, the reality of the beliefs, their importance to all human beings. Nor, again, because certain persons think fit to say that there is a real "revelation" in the very nature of man, ought we to permit ourselves to confound the word, when used in this way, with the perfectly different sense it bears when we speak of a direct "revelation" to human beings from their Maker;† or to allow, because the substance of "revelation" in the first sense is subject to reason, so that it may be rightly received or rejected for no other cause than its conformity or nonconformity to reason, that the same should be required of the truths of "revelation" in the second sense; as if God could not disclose truths to us directly, for our guidance, to be received on His authority, not because we could have discovered them, or can now analyze or comprehend them.

† This seems to be the meaning in the New Testament of ἀποκάλυψις, concerning which word S. Jerome says: "Verbum quoque ipsum ἀποκάλυψεως id est, *revelationis*, proprie Scripturarum est, et a nullo sapientum sæculi apud Græcos usurpatum. Unde mihi videntur quemadmodum in aliis verbis, quæ de Hebræo in Græcum Septuaginta

Interpres transtulerunt, ita in hoc magnopere esse conatos, ut proprietatem peregrini sermonis exprimerent, nova novis rebus verba fingentes."—Comm. in *Ep. ad Gal.*, Bk. I., Ch. I. The word does not occur in the LXX. in connection with religion. See 1 Sam. xx. 30; Ecclus. xi. 27; xxii. 22; xli. 23.

Let us first look over the world for some typical expressions of mankind upon the existence of God.

CHINA.—The Chinese, in look, habit, feeling—in all the details of civilization not less than in religion—seem, at first sight, farthest removed from the Christian nations of the West. But it is curious how the unity of human nature is attested by the resemblance between the ancient paganism of this peculiar nation and the most characteristic outbreak of modern unbelief—the pantheism, materialism, positivism of Germany, France, England, and America. Confucius<sup>1</sup> taught that underlying all nature is a principle of cohesion, which he calls *Tae-keih*, beyond which thought cannot reach. Beings rise and sink from sight, like bubbles on the water. “The absolute,” says *Tschu-hi*, “is like a stem shooting upward; it is parted into twigs, it puts forth leaves and flowers; forth it springs incessantly, until its fruit is fully ripe. . . . Nothing hinders or can hinder its activity until the fruits have all been duly ripened, and activity gives place to rest.”<sup>2</sup> This school had a materialistic conception of God, of soul, and of spirit. The unity which held matter together had no existence apart from matter. The slightest disturbance in the order of the universe would dissolve the principle of cohesion, and it would be no more. In the *Shoo-king*,<sup>3</sup> which Confucius remodelled out of older documents, allusion is made as many as eight-and-thirty times to some great power or being called *Shang-te* [“august” or “sovereign ruler”].<sup>4</sup> Whether or not this name ever suggested “the conception of one living, bounteous, and paternal Providence, whose earthly shadow was” the Emperor of the Middle Kingdom, the Confucianists finally came to identify *Shang-te* with the material

<sup>1</sup> 551-479 B.C. Confucius-Kung (proper name), *Fu-tse*, “revered teacher.”

<sup>2</sup> Neumann, “Religions Philosophie der Chinesen,” in *Zeitschrift für die Hist. Theologie*, VII., 50. 1837.

<sup>3</sup> “The great text-book upon which all Chinese literati have expatiated.” —Gutzlaff, I., 127.

<sup>4</sup> Malan, *Who is God in China?* p. 167.

heaven. "Who is the heaven you worship?" McClatchie asked of one of them. "Why, Shang-te, of course," said he. "Can you see Shang-te, or not?" I inquired. "Why," replied he, looking at me with surprise at my ignorance, and leading me to the door, while he pointed up to the sky, "there he is." "What!" said I, "do you mean that *blue sky* up there?" "Of course," said he, "that is Shang-te."<sup>1</sup> Yet a revolt against materialism can be seen in the philosophy called Tao ("the Way") of Lao-tse (B.C. 604), who said: "You look for the Tao and you see it not: its name is *I*. You listen for it, and you hear it not: its name is *Hi*. You wish to touch it, and you feel it not: its name is *Wei*. These three are inscrutable, and inexpressible by the aid of language. We are, therefore, in the habit of combining them into one. . . . It is called a formless form, an imageless image. It is vague and indefinable."<sup>2</sup> These three elements (*I*, *Hi*, *Wei*) are well-known terms in Chinese philosophy; the first denotes the absence of color; the second the absence of sound; the third the absence of form, or body.

This early Chinese philosophy also took another development toward a dualism of Force (Le) and Matter (Ke). Then Ke, or subtilized matter, evolved into Yang and Yin, conflicting forces, whose antagonism produces the phenomenal world. *Yang* is the impulse forward, *Yin* cuts progress short. *Yang* predominates in spring and summer, and is the author of all movement and activity; *Yin* is visible in autumn and winter, and is passive, de-

<sup>1</sup> McClatchie on "Chinese Theology," in *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, XVI., p. 397.

<sup>2</sup> *Tao-te-king*, p. 19, ed. Julien, and notes, p. 147. This is the passage upon which, among several, Cardinal Wiseman (*Science and Revealed Religion*, p. 402), Dr. A. Grant (*Bampton Lectures*, 1843, p. 268), and others based their proof of a Chinese Trinity. Another passage from the *Tao-*

*te-king* (p. 65) is as follows: "The Tao produced one; one produced two; two produced three; three produced all beings." The school of Tao-tse is said to have had the fables of Epimenides, of Niobe, of Venus issuing from the sea after Saturn had thrown into it a magical composition, and a representation of Neptune with his trident.—*Nouveau Jour. Asiat.* [1854], T. IV., p. 314.

caying, or inert.<sup>1</sup> The two are likened at times to the masculine and feminine, and, again, to the heavenly and earthly principles.

Though from the earliest times worshippers of the spirits of the dead, of their ancestors in particular, the Chinese never developed a systematic polytheism, nor confounded the spirits whom they worshipped with the deity. Thus, in Confucius we read: "Che says, In Ee I do not find the least deficiency: he lived on coarse food and venerated his deceased ancestors *and the deity*."<sup>2</sup> "The master said, 'Heaven produced the virtue that is in me.'"<sup>3</sup> The following is a specimen of their prayers: "Fang said, 'I, the child Le, presume to announce to thee, O most great and sovereign God, that the sinner I dare not pardon, and thy ministers, O God, I do not keep in obscurity. The examination of them is by thy mind, O God.'"<sup>4</sup> "By the ceremonies of the sacrifices of heaven and earth they served God, and by the ceremonies of the ancestral temple they sacrificed to their ancestors."<sup>5</sup>

Practically, the religion of China is a worship by the emperor, who is king and priest, of the power that harmonizes heaven and earth; and by the mandarins, with every form of debased idolatry of ancestors, of genii of the soil, the streams, the mountains, of malignant demons haunting this or that locality, of the elements and atmospheric powers—wind, drought, rain, lightning, or tempest.

The Chinese are the people of all the world least affected, during long periods, by influences from without. A spiritual barrier separated them from the rest of mankind long before their Great Wall was erected against the Tatars. Even when invaded, China subdued its conquerors to accept its civilization, and Confucius greatly

<sup>1</sup> Abel-Remusat's *Tao-te-king*, p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> Bk. IV., Ch. XI. *Confucius*. Translated by J. Marshman. Serampore, 1809.

<sup>3</sup> *Confucian Analects*, Bk. I., Ch. I. *Chinese Classics*, p. 68.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, Bk. I., Ch. II., p. 82.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, Bk. III., Ch. IV.

modified even Buddha. Shrewd, calculating, sordid, prosaic, fraudulent, gambling, strong in worldly wisdom, wanting in religious fervor and moral sensibility, having an unparalleled popular education, the inventors of printing, the compass, gunpowder, music, yet, in all the higher intellectual faculties, from age to age, conspicuously imbecile and inert.

INDIA.—Turning to India, we find a people contrasted with the Chinese, in imagination, in the subordination of the practical to the speculative understanding, in susceptibility to poetry, often tender, sometimes heroic, always strangely fanciful.

The Rig-Veda ("Praise of the highest knowledge"), a book of 1017 hymns, written B. C. 3100-1500, contains worship of the sun, the sky, the dawn, finally of one God, the Lord of all these, a mysterious, self-existent person, called sometimes Asoura-Medhas, "the wise being," or "the living one," sometimes Viswakarman, "the Maker of all things." The following is from a hymn to the one God, in the Rig-Veda: "In the beginning there arose the source of golden light. He was the only born lord of all that is. He established the earth and the sky. Who is the God to whom we shall offer sacrifice? He who gives life, he who gives strength; whose blessing all the bright gods desire; whose shadow is immortality; whose shadow is death. He who through his power is the only king of the breathing and awakening world, he who governs all men and beasts. . . . He whose power these snowy mountains, whose power the sea proclaims, with the distant river. . . . He to whom heaven and earth, standing firm by his will, look up, trembling inwardly."<sup>1</sup> In the Vedic hymns there appears a kind of Trinity of Indra, Agni, and Varuna (Light, Fire, Water). In the succeeding period, that of Brahmanism, the Triad is Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva (creation, preservation, destruction). The philosophy of this period represents

<sup>1</sup> *Sanscrit and Kindred Literatures*, 1880. Cf. *Rig-Vêda*, ed. Langlois, p. 34. L. E. Poor. Boston, IV., 409, 410.

Brahma as self-centred, self-absorbed, the cause and the end of all, the impulse of his will causing beings and matter to spring into existence—a teaching that borders at one time upon an evolution of nature, at another upon the idealism that denies positive existence to the visible world. In the Vedic period the word *Máyá* denoted the personified “longing” of God for some being other than his own; in Brahmanism it means “illusion,” or “unreality,” being descriptive of the phenomenal universe as that which beguiled the Absolute from his original quietude.<sup>1</sup> The following is from an upanishad (supplement to sacred books) of the fourth Veda: “As the spider spins and gathers back [its thread]; as plants sprout on the earth; as hairs grow on a living person; so is this universe here produced from the imperishable nature. By contemplation the vast one germinates; from him, food [or body] is produced; and thence successively, breath, mind, elements, worlds, and immortality arising from [good] deeds.”<sup>2</sup> If this seem like pantheism, simple and materialistic, we should compare with it passages like the following from the laws of Manu: “He whom the mind alone can perceive, whose essence eludes the external organs, who has no visible parts, who exists from eternity, even *he*, the soul of all things, whom no being can comprehend, shone forth in person. He having willed to produce various beings *from his own divine substance*, first with a thought created the waters, and placed in them a productive seed, etc.”<sup>3</sup> Man was a reflex of God, his microcosm. Out of Brahmanism arose the philosophy called *Sánkhya*, or “pure reason,” the formula of whose teacher, Kapila, was, “Neither I am, nor is aught mine, nor is there any I.”<sup>4</sup>

The rise of Buddhism is the most startling picture in

<sup>1</sup> Wuttke, II., 282.

<sup>2</sup> Colebrooke, *Asiatic Researches*, VIII., 475.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Wm. Jones, *Works*, III., 66. 4to.

<sup>4</sup> *Násmi na mé náham*. Colebrooke, p. 44. Ballantyne, Lect. on the *Sánkhya* Philosophy. Mirzapore, 1850. *Sánkhya* means “number” and also “reason.”

the history of natural religion. It is the deliberate acceptance, by a thoughtful and sensitive spirit,<sup>1</sup> of the uncertainties of philosophy, the horrors and absurdities of popular religion, the pitiful miseries of human life, as a sorrowful burden that must be borne, and as necessitating, or at least excusing, the rejection of the good God, and the hope of immortality; and substituting for religion and virtue a passive and feminine acquiescence in the evils of life, or the withdrawal to a meditative quietude, where asceticism reaches its climax in an enforced longing for annihilation. If this be a religion it is a religion without God, and without priest, sacrifice, or prayer; with only meditation. But after a triumph of a thousand years<sup>2</sup> it has been expelled from the land that gave it birth, and lives only in China and Thibet. It raised a loud but ineffectual protest against the cruelty of caste and the horrors of transmigration, and substituting morality for religion, taught the equality of all souls, "to kill no living thing, to abstain from lying and intoxicating liquors, to indulge no sensual appetites, to be honest in one's dealings." The system has been characterized by some one as "Puritan-quietist." It founded monastic hospitals for the sick, the deformed, and the destitute. But a fundamental point of Buddha's teaching was but a ghastly reproduction of the transmigration he had repudiated. Buddha said: "He that is now the most degraded of the demons may one day rule the highest of the heavens; he who is at present seated upon the most honorable of the celestial thrones may one day writhe amidst the agonies

<sup>1</sup> Gautama (B.C. 623-543), called Sákyamuni, the "solitary" of the race of Sákyá, and by himself "Buddha," "the awakened," or "the enlightened," a prince of one of the most polished provinces of central India, who, at the age of twenty-nine, forsook power, wealth, wife, and society, to become the missionary, feminine in beauty and gentleness of manner, apostolic in ardor and eloquence, of

the dreariest of negations of faith and hope.

<sup>2</sup> It became the state religion under Ásoke, in the third century B.C., and was extirpated under Saukara-Áchárya, A.D. 850. It remained in one place at the foot of the Himalayas, and in the island of Ceylon. See the paper on "Buddhism," by Dr. O. Frankfurter. Ap. I. to Wordsworth's *Bampton Lectures* for 1881.

of a place of torment, and the worm that we crush under our feet may, in the course of ages, become a supreme Buddha."¹ From this terrible circle of necessity the highest virtue pointed to but one door of escape, viz., "annihilation" (nirvána), which is more than "eternal quietude," "unbroken sleep," or "impenetrable apathy." Still human nature asserted itself amid this dire system of negation. For the Buddhists of Nepal and western Thibet, we are told, clung to a loftier and more spiritual faith, whose idea of God was one supreme intelligence, whom they designate Adi-Buddha² (The First Buddha).

In the midst of the great epic poem Mahabharata, which belongs to the early literature, a poet philosopher, after A.D. 100, and therefore in the height of the Buddhist ascendancy, inserted a remarkable episode, "The Bhagavad-Gita," or "Divine Song," which in style compares with the original as Lucretius (if written in Greek) might compare with Homer. "The Bhagavad-Gita" is mostly a colloquy between Arjuna, a prince, and Krishna, one of the incarnations of Vishnu. The following is from a prayer of Arjuna: "The universe, O Krishna! is justly delighted with thy glory and devoted to thee. The Rakshasas (evil spirits) flee affrighted to the divers quarters of heaven, and all the multitudes of the Siddhas (demigods) salute thee. And, indeed, why should they not adore thee, O great one, thee, the first Creator, more important, even, than Brahma himself?"³

The Duke of Wellington said of the people of India that they had a peculiar indifference both to life and to truth—a not unlikely result of the deep impression of such a system as Buddhism. Their popular religion now for a thousand years has been, as much as that of any idolatrous nation, "the worship of many gods," but "of

¹ Hardy, *Man. of Buddhism*, p. 36.      ³ Translation of *Bhagavad-Gita*, by St. Hilaire, *Du Bouddhisme*, p. 183. I. C. Thomson, Ch. XI., pp. 79, 80.

² Elphinstone, pp. 104, 105.      Cuninghame, *Bhilsa Topes*, p. 39. Hertford, 1855.

no god,"<sup>1</sup> with every variety of absurdity, obscenity, cruelty—from the prayers, flowers, incense offered at one time (say in the north) to the memory of a departed sage, to the hideous devil-worship paid to Siva<sup>2</sup> at another, in the south of the peninsula. In a society where the central truth is lost, science is without regulative force and imagination without symmetry; history can tell, without rebuke, of men and monkeys thirty feet high, of reigns thirty thousand years long, and geography expatiate in seas of treacle and mountains of butter.

EGYPT.—It is natural to turn from China and India, communities separated by a world's distance from western thought, to Egypt, the mysterious home and source of so much of the religion and philosophy of Asia and Europe. Amid the three orders of deities mentioned by Herodotus<sup>3</sup> in Egypt, we can discern one,<sup>4</sup> "the Creator of the sun and moon," whose preëminence remains even when joined in dual union with Neish or Pasht, or made the progenitor of Ra,<sup>5</sup> and through him of the historic dyad, Osiris and Isis. The following hymn to Osiris, inscribed on a *stele*, or column, is believed<sup>6</sup> to belong to the seventeenth century B. C. : "Hail, Osiris, lord of the length of times, king of the gods, of names exceeding many,<sup>7</sup> conspicuous for thy holy transformations and mysterious emblems in the temples. . . . From him descend the waters of the heavenly Nile. From him proceeds the wind. The air we breathe is in his nostrils for his own contentment and the gladdening of his heart: he purifies the realms of

<sup>1</sup> "The personified Brahma was never much worshipped, and has now but one temple in India."—Elphinstone, p. 89.

<sup>2</sup> Worshipped now for ten centuries under the form of the *Phallus* or *Linga*.—Wilson's *Rig-Veda Samhita*, Int., pp. xxvi, xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> II., 145.

<sup>4</sup> Ptah (whence Kopt), from whom Egypt is thought to derive its name, Kah-Ptah, "the land of Ptah."

<sup>5</sup> Or Phra, "the Sun," a name which appears in Pharaoh. Potipherah, in Gen. xli. 45, is Phout-Phra, "Priest of the Sun."

<sup>6</sup> M. Chabrias, the translator. *Revue Archéologique*, 1857, pp. 65-193, *et seq.*

<sup>7</sup> One hundred are enumerated in a chapter of the *Ritual*, or *Book of the Dead* (edited in hieroglyphs by Lepsius, Leipzig, 1842), portions of which go back to the XIIth Dynasty.

space, which taste of his felicity, because the stars that move therein obey him in the height of heaven. He opens the grand doors, he is the master of invocations in the southern sky, and adorations in the northern. . . . He is the excellent master of the gods, beautiful and lovely. . . . He it is that executes justice in the two worlds, and plants the son upon the father's seat. . . . Of mighty arm, he overthrows the impure; invincible, he crushes every foe. . . . He fabricated this world with his hand, the waters and the air, the vegetables, all fowls and winged creatures, all fish, all reptiles, and four-footed beasts. . . . He shines, the horizon, he diffuses dawn upon the face of darkness. . . . In will and word he is benignant, the praise of the greater gods, and the delight of the less." Of Ra it was said in a sacred hymn that he was "the source of life in heaven and on the earth, he is himself the unbegotten."<sup>1</sup> And the goddess Neish was made to say: "I am the things that have been, that are, and that will be."<sup>2</sup> The stoic, Chæremon, chief librarian in the Serapeum, in the first part of the first century after Christ, held that the basis of the Egyptian mythology was materialistic;<sup>3</sup> while Porphyry, addressing Anebo, a priest, with the question, "What the Egyptians really held to be the First Cause?" is answered by Iamblichus that the Egyptians "distinguish both the animal life and principle of intelligence from nature itself, not only in the universe, but also in man."<sup>4</sup>

The shame of human nature reached a peculiarly degrading climax when, in Egypt, famed as it was for wisdom, the Deity was worshipped under animal forms, not the stately bull (Apis) alone,<sup>5</sup> but creatures the most con-

<sup>1</sup> De Rougé, *Revue Archéologique*, 1678. Cf. Creuzer, *Symbolik*, II., viii<sup>e</sup> année, pp. 54, 55.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, p. 59. See Kenrick, I., 389, u. 5.

<sup>3</sup> See Prichard's *Egyptian Mythology*. London, 1819.

<sup>4</sup> *De Mysteriis*, VIII., 4, ed. Gale,

269.  
<sup>5</sup> In the early mythology of Egypt, as in the later Siva-worship of Hindustan, the Phallic symbol was very common. Cf. *Herodotus*, II., 46. Khem or Pan was a kind of Priapian Osiris.

temptible and trivial. There is a famous passage in the Christian father, Clement of Alexandria, where, after dwelling on the splendor of the Egyptian temples, and speaking of the veil wrought with gold, separating the *adytum* from the rest of the building, he adds: "But if you pass beyond into the remotest part of the enclosure, hastening to behold something most worthy of your search, and seek for the image which dwells in the temple, a shrine-bearer, or some one else of those who minister in sacred things, with a grave air, singing a pæan in the Egyptian tongue, draws aside a small portion of the veil, as if about to show us the god; and makes us burst into a loud laugh. For the god you sought is not there, but a cat, or a crocodile, or a serpent sprung from the soil, or some such brute animal, which is more suited to a cave than a temple. The Egyptian deity appears—a beast rolling himself on a purple coverlet."<sup>1</sup>

Plutarch, who was an admirer and an apologist of the Egyptian creed, aware of the contempt which the polished Greeks and Romans expressed for such worship, notwithstanding the philosophy and artistic beauty with which it was mingled, still plainly confesses that the multitude did not stop short at any relative worship, but adored the animals themselves.<sup>2</sup>

PERSIA.—Plutarch<sup>3</sup> discovered in the malignant Typhon of the Egyptian mythology a resemblance to the dark Ahriman in the Zoroastrian dualism of Persia. The characteristic feature of the Medo-Persian religion is the coördinate position of the good and evil principles—a feature to which Sir H. Rawlinson even ascribes the original disruption of the Aryan tribes. The Sanscrit name of God, *déva* (or "light"), is etymologically the

<sup>1</sup> *Pædagogus*, L. III., 2. Cf. *Juvenal*, XV., 1-13, who notes the inconsistency of human sacrifices (which prevailed, nevertheless) among those who venerated all manner of beasts, and even vegetables:

"Porrum et cæpe nefas violare et frangere morsu,

Nefas illic fetum jugulare capellæ : Carnibus humanis vesci licet."

<sup>2</sup> *ἀντὰ τὰ ζῶα*.—Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.*, Ch. LXXI.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, Ch. XLVI.

same as the Zend *daéva*, the name of a class of hostile genii in the train of the Evil One. The glorious *Indra*, highest of the Vedic gods, is among the Perso-Aryans as *Andra*, invested with malevolent attributes. The rival principles of Medo-Persia are Ahura-mazda<sup>1</sup> (Ormazd), the good divinity, and Agra-mainyus (Ahriman), the "Evil-minded." The following is from the second part of the *Yasna* ("liturgy," "sacrificial service"), the oldest portion of the Avesta ("text") or sacred book of the Persians: "I invoke and celebrate the creator, Ahura-mazda, luminous, resplendent, best, and greatest, excellent in strength and in perfection, most intelligent, most lovely, eminent in purity, possessing the good knowledge, source of pleasure, who created us, who fashioned us, who feeds us, most accomplished of intelligent beings."<sup>2</sup> In the next oldest part of the sacred books, the *Vendidad* (or "Law Given")—a dialogue between the great Ormazd and the prophet Zoroaster<sup>3</sup>—we have reference to the mysterious *Zervana-akarana* ("uncreated Time"), conceived as a personal god, the basis of all other forms of being, the Absolute, or primal essence. The following is a famous passage: "What the holy-minded one (*i. e.*, Ormazd) created, he created in the *boundless* (or 'uncaused') Time."<sup>4</sup> In a subsequent verse<sup>5</sup> the servant of Ormazd is bidden to "invoke the self-created firmament, the *boundless* (or uncaused) Time, and the breeze that works in the high places." In a Parsee writing of the twelfth century these passages of the *Vendidad* are thus explained: "In the religion of Zoroaster it is to this effect declared, that God (*Khudá*) created everything from time; and that the Creator is Time. And for Time no limit has been made, and no root has been made. And it

<sup>1</sup> Called also *Speuto-mainyus*, "the Holy-minded." For etymologies of Ormazd, see Burnouf, *Commentaire sur le Yasna*, p. 70, *et seq.* Wilson, *Parsee Religion*, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Burnouf, *Comment.*, p. 146.

<sup>3</sup> Or Zartusht, by some identified

with "Zása" of the Perso-Aryans; by others made a contemporary of Hytaspes (Gustasp) and his son Darius (530-490 B.C.).

<sup>4</sup> *Vendidad, Farg.* XIX., § 33. (*Avesta*, I., 245, ed. Spiegel.)

<sup>5</sup> § 44. Cf. § 55.

always has been, and it always will be. . . . Afterwards fire and earth were created; and from their union Ormazd was created. *Time* was the Creator, and this lord has guarded the creation he has made.”<sup>1</sup> In the *Vendidad*, also, is contained the following declaration of Ormazd: “I am Ahura-mazda, I am the giver of good things. When I formed this dwelling-place, the beautiful, the brilliant, the noteworthy, saying: I will go forth, I will go over, then the serpent<sup>2</sup> beheld me. Thereupon the serpent *Agra-mainyus*, who is full of death, created, with an eye to *my* creation, nine sicknesses, and ninety, and nine hundred, and nine thousand, and ninety thousand.”<sup>3</sup>

It is well known how, in fact, the Medo-Persians identified their Ormazd with the sun, whom they worshipped along with the other heavenly bodies, and sometimes as the element of fire; how, as their religion became idolatry, their astronomy became the handmaid of demonology and magic. These facts remain, in spite of an intimation, here and there, of the final triumph of the good principle, or of an attempt to resolve Ahriman into the hypostatized evil in man.<sup>4</sup> Mani, who taught at Babylon in the third century of the Christian era, attempted to blend the Persian dualism, among other elements, with something of Christian teaching. S. Au-

<sup>1</sup> *l'Ima-i-Islám*, A.D. 1126. The replies of a Parsee doctor to a Moslem inquirer.—Wilson's *Parsis*, pp. 135, 136.

<sup>2</sup> “There is found to be a singular consent in East and West, in North and South, in civilized and semi-barbarous countries, in the Old World and the New, not only to the fact that serpents were somehow associated with the ruin of the human family, but that serpents so employed were vehicles of a malignant personal spirit, by whatever name he was described.” — Hardwick,

*Christ and Other Masters*, P. IV., Ch. IV., § 2, p. 538. London, Macmillan.

<sup>3</sup> *Farg.*, XXII., §§ 1-6.

<sup>4</sup> Dosabhoj Framjee, a modern Persian writer, in his work on the *Parsees*, p. 255, says Ahriman “should be taken in an allegorical sense, to denote the cause of the temptation under which man often falls into sin.” This is the precise counterpart of Dr. Donaldson's heresy (*Christian Orthodoxy*, p. 349, following Schleiermacher) concerning Satan in Holy Scripture.

gustine resisted this error, which, in different ages of the world, where the true light has burned dimly, has addressed with strange power the heart of man, darkly brooding on the mysterious strifes throughout created things.

In the later heathenism of Persia, contemporary with the rise of Christianity, Mithra succeeds to Ormazd something as in Egypt Osiris had succeeded to Ptah. And in what is said of Mithra, as of Buddha, who at this same time becomes missionary into China, there is a strange parody of the history of Christ.

GERMANY.—Before we consider the idea of God brought before us in the literature of Greece and Rome, with which, of course, we are most familiar, it will be best, perhaps, to glance briefly at other parts of the heathen world. Of most of the Aryan portions of Europe we might affirm with safety something like what Tacitus says of the ancient Germans:¹ “They call by the names of different deities that secret power which they see with the eye of reverential faith alone.”² The philosophic historian remarks that the Germans were so far from confounding their conception of Deity with deified ancestors that they did not deem it “consistent with the greatness of the gods either to confine them within walls or to liken them to any appearance of humanity.”

MONGOLIAN KHONDS.—The religion of the Mongolian branch of the race, who inhabited chiefly upper Asia and part of Europe, and spoke the Tamil or Turanian variety of speech, may be learned in part from what is known of the Khonds, undoubtedly Mongols—

¹ “Deorum nominibus appellat secretum illud, quod sola reverentia vident.”—*Germania*, Ch. IX.

² “As for the religion of the Kalewala” [the *Song of the Race*, the great national epic of Finland], . . . “one Supreme Deity, Creator and Lord of the universe, is called Iumala, a name which, as Castrén proves, is far more ancient than any designation of a god among the Finns and their

congeners. In character, attributes, and powers, this deity occupies precisely the position assigned to Varuna in the *Rig-Veda*, or to Ahuramazda in Eranian tradition; and, on the other hand, to the being recognized, though it might seem unconsciously, in spite of later superstitions, by all branches of the Turanian race.” —Canon F. C. Cook, *Contemporary Review*, Spring, 1885.

aborigines who remained in the northern part of Hindustan. According to the Khonds, says Major Macpherson,<sup>1</sup> "the Supreme Being and sole source of good, who is styled the God of Light [Boora-Pennu], created for himself a consort, who became the Earth-Goddess [Tari-Pennu] and the source of evil; and thereafter he created the earth with all its contents, and man. The Earth-Goddess, prompted by jealousy of the love borne to man by his Creator, rebelled against the God of Light, and introduced moral and physical evil into the world." The non-Aryan tribes, who kept hold of the southern part of the peninsula, the inhabitants of the forests and mountain fastnesses of the Dravidian territories, as well as the low-caste tribes in the extreme south, had a religion which consisted of sorcery and demonolatry, or the worship of evil spirits by bloody sacrifices and with frantic dances. This religion has passed in historic times from the Tamil country into Ceylon, and was the religion of the Ugrian races of Siberia,<sup>2</sup> where it was blended with "Shamanism," which taught the existence of a supreme god, but offered him no worship.

POLYNESIA.—Polynesia is linked to Asia by unmistakable bonds of race and language. The tribes of Oceanica fall naturally under two great classes—the Papuan and Malay-Polynesian. The Papuans are the same as the Khonds, and have their stronghold in New Guinea. They resemble African negroes. The Malay-Polynesians are brown or copper-colored, in physique and demeanor like Arabs. Their career of conquest appears to have begun at Sumatra, then advanced to Java, and then the Tatars of the Ocean swarmed in succession to Borneo, the Celebes, the Philippines, the Ladrones, Carolines, and Sandwich Islands. Southward they occupied Polynesia proper and penetrated to New Zealand.

<sup>1</sup> *An Account of the Religion of the Khonds in Orissa* (i. e., Uriadesa, and the sea-coast). S. C. Macpherson.

<sup>2</sup> "Land of the Urias," lying between the eastern mountains of the Dekkan and the sea-coast). S. C. Macpherson. <sup>2</sup> E. T. Turnerelli's *Kazan*, II., 116, 133.

PAPUANS.—To some observers the idea of God appears to have vanished from among the Papuans;<sup>1</sup> but on closer inspection they are found to believe that “the mysterious power above them is discerpted and diffused in almost every part of nature, animate and inanimate; and, selecting some one form in which this power is thought to be especially active, they embrace it as their fetich and their guardian deity.” This fetich,<sup>2</sup> at one time a rudely sculptured snake, lizard, or other reptile; or, again, a bit of bone or mineral, is, among the Papuans of New Guinea, a small human figure, hideous in expression, holding a shield, and called *karwar*. This *karwar*, they think, must be present on all important occasions, births, marriages, and deaths.<sup>3</sup> Their worship of the waringin-tree, a species of banyan or Indian fig, connects their religion with the old worship in India, by Brahman and Buddhist alike, of the sacred *vata*, “the tree of knowledge or intelligence.”<sup>4</sup>

JAVA.—In Java is a Malay community, so thoroughly penetrated with the influences of the language, myths, and philosophy of India and the Hindu civilization that, Humboldt pronounces, “no second example is to be found of a nation undergoing such a complete infusion of the national spirit of another race, without losing its own independence.”<sup>5</sup> Their highest object of worship was *Batara Guru* (“Venerated Teacher”).

FIJIANS.—The people of the Vitian (Fijian)<sup>6</sup> Islands are the connecting link between the black and copper-

<sup>1</sup> So Livingston remarks of the Caffres and Bechuanas of Africa, that the absence from among them of temples, idols, or sacrifice, or even prayers, might lead a superficial observer to pronounce them utterly godless, but that, nevertheless, “they all possess a distinct knowledge of a deity and of a future state.” Pp. 158, 159.

<sup>2</sup> From the Portuguese *fetisso*, a “magical charm,” or “spell.”

<sup>3</sup> Earl's *Native Races of the Indian*

*Archipelago*, Papuans, p. 61. London, 1853.

<sup>4</sup> Lassen, *Ind. Altherthum*, I., 255–260. Its blossom, according to the Indian tradition, was dropped from heaven by Siva, for the temptation of the first man.

<sup>5</sup> W. von Humboldt, *Über die Karwi-Sprache*, I., p. viii. Berlin, 1836.

<sup>6</sup> So called by the Tongese, who cannot pronounce *v*.

colored races. They are sometimes compared to the Aztecs of the American continent, because uniting the knowledge of some useful arts, indicating civilization, with peculiarly atrocious rites of human sacrifice, infanticide, strangulation of entire families, and cannibalism. Their religion was devil-worship, the highest member of the Viti pantheon being Ndengei,<sup>1</sup> revered under the form of a mighty serpent,<sup>2</sup> though manifesting himself from age to age in the human form. Ndengei, his two sons, and a series of minor spirits descending from them, are invested at times with benignant, and again with mischievous, attributes. The first-born of mankind, according to the Vitian tradition, became black, because of unfaithfulness to his Maker; the youngest son was the progenitor of the white race. The precedence of their island, Mbenga, is explained by a striking tradition of the deluge.<sup>3</sup> The Fijians have proved peculiarly susceptible to missionary influences.

MAORI.—The Maori of New Zealand are said to be one of the branches of the Polynesian family, least “mixed with foreign alloy,”<sup>4</sup> and representing “with singular fidelity” the state of religious feeling “throughout the great mass of the islands of the Pacific Ocean.”<sup>5</sup> The origin of all things in a spiritual essence, superior to matter, called among the Maoris “the First Thought,” and corresponding to “the Absolute” of the speculative Chinaman, can be traced in their myth respecting the moulding of the universe by an abrupt division between heaven (*Rangi*) and earth (*Papa*). The six sons of Rangi and Papa rebelled, severed from their parents, one only, Tawhiri-

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps a corruption of *Tangaloa*, “great Tanga.”

<sup>2</sup> Compare the legend of the wild tribes of North America, in which “the arrow of the philanthropic Manaboyho pierces the heart of the great serpent Meshekenabeh, at the same time striking terror into an enormous brood of demons by which he was attended.”

<sup>3</sup> Wilkes's *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*, III., pp. 82, 83. London, 1845. See also *Report of Mr. Hale, philologist to the Expedition, Ethnography*, pp. 177, 178.

<sup>4</sup> Shortland, *Traditions, etc., of the New Zealanders*, pp. 79, 80.

<sup>5</sup> Sir G. Grey, *Polynesian Mythology*, p. xii. London, 1855.

matea, "the father of the winds," remaining true to them. *Tane* was the progenitor of the trees; *Tanga-roa*, the presiding spirit of the ocean; *Tiki*, the creator of man; *Tahu*, the author of good. Very often *Tanga-roa*, who is the same as *Tanga-loa*, seems to absorb the supreme attributes of divinity, and to become "the Creator, the Sustainer, the Revealer," the self-existent God, "Maker of the earth, or, at least, of the islands of the sea and of the human race."<sup>1</sup> Though having a curious tradition of a great Red-House (*Whare-Kura*), compared by some to Babel, the Maoris in New Zealand have no regular temples, and of their wooden images of the Deity (*atua*), the natives declare "that they do not worship the image itself, but only the *atua* represented, and that the image was merely used as a way of approaching him."<sup>2</sup> The pantheon of this people is said to be more numerous and various than that of India or Greece. To them "every striking natural phenomenon, every appearance calculated to inspire wonder and fear, nay, often the most minute, harmless, and insignificant objects, seem invested with supernatural attributes, and worthy of adoration."<sup>3</sup> The institution called *tapu* (taboo, "thoroughly marked"), by which the contact of anything "sacred" (*tapu*) separates whatever it touches from common uses, is very characteristic of the Maori religion. There is a mythic hero, *Mani*—sometimes called *Potiki*, the Young—who may be called the *Baldur*, or *Prometheus*, of *Oceanica*. He is caught in the womb of *Mother Night*, because the forgetful bird *Piwaka-waka* began to laugh; and so *Death* obtained power over man. When these barbarians attempt philosophy, they are almost as profound as our own atheistic evolutionists. All things, say they, "begin with nothing, which produced something, and that brought forth something more, and generated a power of increasing."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hale's *Report*, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor's *Report*, pp. 16, 17.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor, *Te Ika a Mani; or, New Zealand and its Inhabitants*, p. 73.

<sup>4</sup> Taylor, p. 14. Shortland, p.

London, 1855.

AMERICA.—Two facts appear to be settled about the people of the continent of America: 1. That from the Arctic Ocean to Cape Horn, “the squalid Esquimaux, at one extremity of the chain, the polished Aztec, or Peruvian, at the other; agriculturists, hunters, and canoe-men; tribes frequenting the shores of the great northern lakes, or scattered in the dense savannahs of the South; the stunted Chayma, the athletic Caraib, and the half-clad native of the Land of Fire, exhibit the same general lineaments and constitute together one distinct variety of the human species. They ‘possess alike the long, lank, black hair, the brown or cinnamon-colored skin, the heavy brow, the dull and sleepy eye, the full and compressed lips, and the salient and dilated nose.’”<sup>1</sup>

2. The second fact is that the language, notwithstanding every divergency of dialects throughout this wide region, is held together by a common principle of construction. It is neither monosyllabic, like the Chinese or primitive Malay; nor dissyllabic, like the languages related to the Hebrew; nor analytical, like the tongues of modern Europe; but *polysynthetic*,<sup>2</sup> a peculiarity which permits many ideas and many shades of meaning to be comprehended in a single term. Some of the most perplexing varieties in these dialects can be explained by the processes of *truncation* and *agglutination*.

The American tribes belong without doubt to the “Turanian” branch of the human race, which comprehends Malay, Tshud, Turk, and Scythian, and the religion of its savage and demi-civilized portions varies in a manner analogous to the Aryan religion of the Veda compared with that of the second period of the Hindoo religion. The savage or wild tribes are the Red Indians of North America, the Indians of the Great Antilles, the

<sup>1</sup> Hardwick's *Christ and Other Masters*, P. III., Ch. II., pp. 348, 349. London, 1882. He quotes from Morton's *Crania Americana*.

having first worked out the proof of this. Prichard, *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, V., 305-313.

<sup>2</sup> M. du Ponceau is credited with

Caraibs or Caribbees, and the Indians on the east coast of South America. Among these spirit-worship, or the worship of ancestors, prevails in the high latitudes, and element-worship in the countries nearer the equator. Prescott affirms that "It is a remarkable fact that many, if not most, of the rude tribes inhabiting the vast American continent . . . had attained to the sublime conception of one Great Spirit, the Creator of the Universe."<sup>1</sup> But, as everywhere else among the human race, left to itself, this lofty conception is transferred to the highest member of a crowded pantheon, is subjected to some evil principle, or inexorable fate, and loses his control both of the government of the world and the lives of individuals. The wild man worships the sky, the sun, the woods, the waters. The cloud, the shower, the lightning, the thunder, the *aurora*, leaves, flowers, are his divinities and oracles. In their fetiches, however, they believed particles of true divinity to reside, which made them cease to be merely beast or brute matter, and, rising far above the character of a type or emblem, to be completely identified with the thing they represented. The doctrine of *Manitoes* forms the most original portion of this religion. Manito or Manedo probably meant "a Spirit." The Great Spirit of the old American was called in various tribes Kitchi or Gezha Manito; the name of the evil-minded Spirit being Matchi-Manito. Without such epithets the term meant a minor emanation from the Great Spirit, which, revealing itself in dreams to the excited fancy of the youthful Indian, and inviting him to seek its efficacy in some well-known bird or beast, or other object, is selected by him for his guardian deity, his friend in council, and his champion in the hour of peril. At the same time he fears the rival or malignant Manitoes of neighbors and enemies.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Conquest of Peru*, Ch. III., (compiled for the Government of the United States), Part I., p. 13. Cf.

<sup>2</sup> Schoolcraft, *History, Condition, and Prospects of the Indian Tribes*, I. G. Müller's *Gesch. der Am. Urr.* Basle, 1855.

MEXICANS.—The demi-civilized populations of America comprise the Mexicans and Peruvians, the intermediate families of Mayans and Muyscas of Bogota—though it is clear, from remains in the Mississippi Valley and elsewhere, that the area of civilization was once larger than in the age of Columbus.

The Aztecs, who have been called the Romans of the New World, and who assimilated many of the arts and political forms from the conquered Mayans and Toltecs of Anahuac, had a religion very like the Siva-worship of Hindustan. Their name for God was *Teo-tl*, which suggests *déva*, *θεός*, *deus*, *tius*, and also the *tao* of China, and *tua* (from *atua*) of the South-Sea Islands. The Aztecs recognized the existence of a Supreme Creator and Lord of the Universe. He is called at times “the Cause of causes” and “the Father of all things.” The Mexicans addressed him in their prayers as “the God by whom we live,” “Omnipresent, that knoweth all thoughts and giveth all gifts,” “without whom man is as nothing,” “invisible, incorporeal, one God, of perfect perfection and purity,” “under whose wings we find repose and a sure defence.”<sup>1</sup> Among the prayers addressed to him is the following: “Wilt thou blot us out, O Lord, forever? Is this punishment intended not for our reformation, but for our destruction?” “Impart to us, out of thy great mercy, thy gifts, which we are not worthy to receive through our own merits.”<sup>2</sup>

But, as Prescott says, “the idea of unity—of a being with whom volition is action . . . was too simple or too vast for their understandings.” They did what the rest of the world has done. They broke up the divine Unity into thirteen principal deities (apparently in reference to the divisions of their calendar) and more than two hundred inferior ones, some good, some malevolent. The head of this pantheon, Tezcatlipoca (“Shining Mirror”), often identified with the sun, is worshipped at times

<sup>1</sup> Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, Bk. I., Ch. III., V. I., p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> Sahagun, Bk. VI., Ch. I., *Hist. de Nueva España*.

with language descriptive of the highest attributes, not unmixed with inconsistencies: "merciful and long-suffering," yet "the stirrer-up of strife," "Creator," "Giver of life," "Holder of all things in his hand," "the Giver of inspiration, who laughs at human wisdom," "the Trier and Prover of hearts, who made man in his own likeness," "the Acceptor of vows," "the Forgiver," "the Enjoiner of charity."<sup>1</sup> The high-priest, in one part of the ritual, thus prays to Tezcatlipoca: "We entreat that those who die in war may be graciously received by thee, our father, the Sun, and our mother, the Earth, for thou alone reignest."<sup>2</sup> Yet this same deity is represented in the mythology as married to the primitive goddess and first woman, Cihuacohuatl, or "female serpent," who always gives birth to twins, and, like Eve, "bequeathed the sufferings of childbirth to women, as the tribute of death."<sup>3</sup> Still worse, Tezcatlipoca annually, in the month of May, was worshipped by the terrible sacrifice of a human being (the most perfect that could be found, unblemished), whose heart, cut out by the murderous knife, "was lifted up toward the sun and cast before his image."<sup>4</sup>

The national deity, however, of the Aztecs was Huitzilopochtli ("humming-bird" and "left" [referring to the foot]), the Siva and Mars of Central America. His name, Mexitli, was given to Mexico itself; and on the tableland of Anahuac his sanctuary contained his colossal image, erected on a blue stone, quadrangular in form, and with a snake issuing from each corner; the chains or collars about the idol's neck were ten human hearts, all made of gold; his girdle also consisted of a great golden serpent. One hundred and thirty-six thousand human

<sup>1</sup> Such expressions have led Lord Kingsborough (*Antiq. of Mexico*, IX., 179) and others, though with very little propriety, to compare the Mexican God with the Jehovah of the Old Testament.

<sup>2</sup> Squier's *American Archeological Researches*, p. 162. N. Y., 1851.

<sup>3</sup> "Auf die merkwürdige Uebereinstimmung der Sage in so vielen Theilen mit der Bibel brauche ich den aufmerksamen Leser wohl nicht hinzuweisen."—Lüken, *Traditionen*, etc., pp. 121, 122.

<sup>4</sup> Müller, p. 618. Prescott, I., 24, 25.

skulls, the victims of sacrifice, were found within the precincts of the temple of this deity, by Cortez and his companions. Two thousand five hundred human beings were offered annually in the Aztec dominions. <sup>1</sup>

The third place in what is sometimes called the Mexican Trinity was assigned by some to Haloc, the water-god, but more commonly to Quetzalcoatl, the patron deity of the Toltecs. In the legends Quetzalcoatl ("Feathered Serpent") is represented as the beneficent high-priest of Tula, the metropolis of the Toltecs, where he substituted for human sacrifices blood from his own body. He is driven from the paradise he had formed by the malice of Tezcatlipoca. When Cortez and his companions appeared many Mexicans believed that he was Quetzalcoatl returned. <sup>2</sup> The Spaniards were wont to affirm that they discovered among these people the cross, the rite of baptism (administered to infants), and the picture of the Blessed Virgin. <sup>3</sup> Humboldt says that pictorial representations of the deluge existed among the Aztecs, the Mixtecs, the Zapotecs, the Hascaltecs, and the Michoacans. <sup>4</sup> The Mexicans made five ages in the life of the universe; the ages of the giants, of fire, of wind, of water, of man. The evil spirit who is the enemy of the human race had a name signifying "Rational Owl." <sup>5</sup> In general, as civilization advances, doctrine (concerning the Deity) seems to become the more depraved while ceremonial is elaborated; "seers and medicine-men give place to regular priests and priestesses; the frantic shrieks of former generations are softened into measured chants, and their lawless rites into a pompous and elaborate liturgy." <sup>6</sup>

GREECE AND ROME.—The historian Herodotus says that Homer and Hesiod "created the theogony of

<sup>1</sup> Prichard, V., 365. Prescott, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Fancourt's *History of Yucatan*, pp. 57-59.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Martyr, *Decades of the New World*, III., fol. 157. London, 1555.

<sup>4</sup> A. von Humboldt, *Vues des Cordillères et Monumens de l'Amerique*, pp. 226, 227. Coxcox is the Mexican Noah.

<sup>5</sup> Clavigero, *Storia del Messico*, T. II., p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Hardwick, p. 365.

the Greeks.”<sup>1</sup> Of Homer much more can be said. He was a “maker,” says Mr. Gladstone, “not of poems alone, but of a language, a nation, and a religion.”<sup>2</sup> The supernatural world of the Greeks, as pictured in these poems, was “peopled by beings who exercised a control over nature, but were subject to human passions, and maintained a constant intercourse with mankind.” The chief of the gods, Zeus or Jupiter, is identified in “a hundred places in the poems, with the word θεός, in its more abstracted signification as Providence, or the moral governor of the world.”<sup>3</sup> Jove is the arbiter of war; weighs the contending fates of nations in a balance; distributes good and evil among mortals; and has the care of the guest, the suppliant, and the poor.<sup>4</sup> Yet in Homer he falls short of universal supremacy, alike in omnipotence and omniscience; and with this is combined a radical failure in moral elevation. He presides like an aristocratic chieftain, amid an assembly of twenty deities, for whom Vulcan, one of their number, is once represented as fashioning twenty seats.<sup>5</sup> The twelve leading members of this assembly, known among the Romans as *Dii consentes*,<sup>6</sup> rule the world in a fashion analogous to a human council. Jupiter alone is pictured as a married deity. In Homer the only sacrifices are bulls and cows, sheep, goats, and swine. This is the more notable because the customs in the worship of the gods, in many parts of Greece, in historical times, suggest that they were substitutes for human sacrifices; while it is certain that human sacrifices

<sup>1</sup> ποιήσαντες θεογονίαν Ἑλληνισι.—*Euterpe*, § 53.

<sup>2</sup> *Juventus Mundi*, Ch. VII., p. 176.

<sup>3</sup> Gladstone, *Juventus Mundi*, Ch. VIII., § 2, pp. 225, 226.

<sup>4</sup> *Iliad*, XVI., 387; XXIV., 527. Cf. the phrase Διὸς αἰδοῖα.

<sup>5</sup> *Iliad*, XVIII., 372-377.

<sup>6</sup> Enumerated in the well-known lines of Ennius:

“Juno, Vesta, Ceres, Diana, Minerva, Venus, Mars, Mercurius, Jove, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Apollo.”

Varro (*Antiq.*, L. XVI.) terms the whole twenty—twelve male and eight female—*Selecti*, on which term St. Augustine enquires: “Haec numina utrum propter majores in mundo administrationes selecta dicuntur, an quod populis magis innotuerunt, majorque est eis cultus exhibitus?”—*De Av. Dei*, L. VII., 2.

prevailed even down to the time of the emperors.<sup>1</sup> The Homeric religion is interesting as being the picture, by the greatest poet of the ancient world, of what seemed most real and important, most seemly and true, concerning the greatest of subjects—the being and rule of the gods, as far as tradition or the thoughts of the wisest had hitherto made them known. At times it is difficult to believe that what Homer says of the gods could in seriousness be thought true, or anything like the truth. His poetry belongs rather to literature than to the oracles of religion. In Christian times men for whom the truth is too serious are still found to swear by Homer's deities. These deities are distinguished alike from the old elemental gods and from the later mythology. And still it is curious to observe how in two of the members of Homer's assembly of the gods, viz., Apollo and Athene, the sanctity and dignity wanting in Zeus are in some degree supplied.<sup>2</sup> These two deities are never disparaged, never outwitted, as are all the rest; prayer is addressed to them from every place; and they delight in no sacrifice apart from obedience. They alone directly infuse courage, fear, counsel, into the mind of man. They know the secrets of the future. Apollo is the champion of heaven. When Jove launches his bolt at Athene's favorite, at the end of the *Odyssey*, it falls harmless at her feet.<sup>3</sup> These wonderful facts have seemed to some to warrant the belief that we have here a veritable tradition of the sacred Hebrew teaching respecting the word and wisdom of God.

The following testimonies to monotheism have been gathered out of Greek and Latin authors. God is said to be one,<sup>4</sup> unchangeable through all ages;<sup>5</sup> to be all pow-

<sup>1</sup> Paus., VIII., ii., 1; Theophr., *ap. Od.*, V., 109, 382-385. (Athene causes the wind to blow.) *Od.*, *Quæst. Gr.*, 39; *Them.*, 13; *Arist.*, XV., 526; *Il.*, X., 274. (Prophecy.) 11; *Pelop.*, 21; Strabo, X., p. 452.

<sup>3</sup> *Odyssey*, XXIV., 546.

<sup>2</sup> *Il.*, V., 880; VIII., 39; XXII., 183; VIII., 362-369, 540; XIII., 827. (Were I honored as are honored Athene and Apollo.) *Il.*, I., 473.

<sup>4</sup> Sophocles, *ap. Euseb. Præp.*, xiii. Xenophon, *Max. Tyr. Diss.*, I.

<sup>5</sup> Manil., *As.*, I., 511. "Deus est qui non mutatur in ævo."

erful;<sup>1</sup> one who by speaking the word created matter;<sup>2</sup> everywhere present;<sup>3</sup> dwelling equally in heaven and earth and sea;<sup>4</sup> a Spirit, the author and creator of the universe, the maker and disposer of the heavenly bodies;<sup>5</sup> the preserver of harmony;<sup>6</sup> reigning in men's souls.<sup>7</sup> Though invisible by men, He sees all things;<sup>8</sup> no act is hidden from His sight.<sup>9</sup> He hates perjury and those who prevaricate.<sup>10</sup> He is the disposer of all,<sup>11</sup> giving man health, youth, and life.<sup>12</sup> He exalts one and sets down another;<sup>13</sup> in His will is happiness.<sup>14</sup> To Him man owes prosperity.<sup>15</sup> He whom God assists is able to do all things.<sup>16</sup> He recompenses virtue and punishes vice.<sup>17</sup> He loves piety, and His ears are ever open to the prayers of the just.<sup>18</sup> "Among men," says Cicero,<sup>19</sup> "there is no nation so savage and ferocious as not to admit the necessity of believing in a God, however ignorant they may be as to what sort of God they ought to believe in. From whence we may conclude that every man must recognize a Deity who has any recollection and knowledge of his

<sup>1</sup> Linus, *ap. Iamblic. vet. Pythag.*, Ch. XXVIII.

<sup>2</sup> Herodotus, *ap. Clem. Str.*

<sup>3</sup> Menand. *Frag. ex Aldo.*, 61. *παντιῇ γὰρ ἐστὶ πάντα βλεπεῖ θεός.* Pind., *Pythag. Hy.*, II., 61.

<sup>4</sup> Lucan, *Phar.*, LIX., 578.

<sup>5</sup> Ovid *ap. Lact.*, *Inst.*, II., 5.

<sup>6</sup> Ovid, *Met.*, I., 47. Arist., *De Mund.*, II., 1.

<sup>7</sup> Phocyl., 106.

<sup>8</sup> Philemon tr. *Frag.*, p. 132; Plautus, *Cap.* 319.

<sup>9</sup> Epicharm. *ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.*

<sup>10</sup> Phocyl., XV., 9.

<sup>11</sup> Virg., *Æn.*, IV., 561; Seneca, *Thyest.*, 619.

<sup>12</sup> *Iliad*, IX., 445.

<sup>13</sup> Horatius, *Od.*, I., xxviii., 13.

<sup>14</sup> Menand., *Sent.*, 250.

<sup>15</sup> Æsch., *Sept. c. Theb.*, 625.

Virg., *Æn.*, I., 199; III., 715. Soph., *Ajax*, 383.

<sup>16</sup> Menand., *Sent.*, 237. Soph., *Ajax*, 765.

<sup>17</sup> Sen., *Herc. Ir.*, 384; Menand., 251.

<sup>18</sup> Menand., 146, 246.

<sup>19</sup> "Ipsis in hominibus nulla gens est neque tam immansueta, neque tam fera, quæ non, etiam si ignoret qualem habere deum deceat, tamen habendum sciat. Ex quo efficitur illud, ut is agnoscat deum, qui, unde ortus sit, quasi recordetur denoscat. Jam vero virtus eadem in homine ac deo est, neque ullo alio ingenio præterea. Est igitur homini cum deo similitudo."—*De Legibus*, I., 8. Cf. Aristotle, *de Cælo*, 1-3, πάντες γὰρ ἄνθρωποι περὶ θεῶν ἵχουσιν ὑπόληψιν, καὶ πάντες τὸν ἀνωτάτω τῷ θεῷ τόπον ἀποδιδοῦσι.

own origin. Now the law of virtue is the same in God and man, and in no other disposition besides. There exists, therefore, a similitude between God and man."

Now what do we learn from this survey of man's belief respecting God, extending as it does from China to Peru, from the islands of the southern seas to the Arctic Ocean, and coming down from eldest time to the present hour?<sup>1</sup> We have quoted the best testimony that mankind had to give (apart from Revelation) to this mighty truth: we have not withheld the prevarications, contradictions, defilements, with which they have beclouded and debased it. Looking at the best of these declarations, taken by themselves, one might ask, What need of further revelation to make known a truth already so plainly seen? But looking again at its practical perversions, one might be tempted to doubt whether the high truth of one God, supreme and perfect, had ever really been discerned by the mind of man. The necessity then of Revelation is quite evident, even on the most favorable supposition. It has been truly said that "he alone discovers who proves." If the highest truth remains but as one guess amid many, or as a probable hypothesis amid a multitude of conflicting suppositions, or as one attractive dream struggling with a cloud of wild conjectures, it is practically unknown. The evidence we have cited proves, it will be observed, that the mere announcement of the highest truth among men is not sufficient to put them in possession of it. Nations and communities where it was once freely proclaimed have lost all thought of it in the most degraded idolatry. Even individual sages have been found to

<sup>1</sup> "When was the world without it? have the systems of Atheism or Pantheism, as sciences, prevailed in the literature of nations, or in respect of formation or completion, to compare with that of monotheism? We find it in old Greece, and even in Rome, as well as in Judea, and the East. We find it in popular litera-

ture, in philosophy, in poetry, as a positive and settled teaching, differing not at all in the appearance it presents, whether in Protestant England, or in schismatical Russia, or in the Mahometan populations, or in the Catholic Church."—Newman on *University Education*, Disc. III., p. 99.

put to shame their own clearest declarations by the most inconsistent practice. When we remember, too, the cruelty, the lust, the baseness, the diabolical excesses that have attended the worship of false gods, where it is difficult to tell whether reason, or the finer instincts which form the peculiar glory of humanity—pity, love, sensibility, the natural affections—are the more outraged, we may perceive what was the necessity for a Revelation. If man is to be saved from his own unreason, if he is ever to put in practice what he knows to be right, if he is to have the benefit of his own best thoughts, if he is to escape the destruction of the demon of passion, it must be by the aid of a power external and superior to himself. The merciful Creator that made not in vain His most excellent handiwork, His own image, will not withhold this help. The Father will reveal Himself to His own child. He will not leave man to wallow in his misery, even though that misery has been self-inflicted. And the first step toward redemption is the sure revelation of Himself. The whole experience of the race, and the clearest deductions of reason, prove that such a revelation, to be effectual, to be even sure, must be something more than the good thoughts or clear reasonings of individuals, or divine oracles written in a book. Man is gregarious, political, formed for society. It is absurd, almost impious, to ascribe to the divine wisdom a method of redemption plainly futile, inevitable to fail. His Revelation would therefore certainly be, what in fact we know it was, from the beginning, the germ of a community, a kingdom, a church. The knowledge of God cannot live among men except in an atmosphere of its own. We know how idolatrous tribes and states beat out of their midst, by the force of their evil customs, the stray thoughts and accidental teachings of their wisest and best. It may be granted that, as M. Carrière says, "whenever man thinks clearly, or feels deeply, he conceives God as self-conscious unity;" but these thoughts were never "precipitated into dogma," because there was no authority anywhere en-

titled to speak for human nature. "Dogma" meant first, and in the New Testament, "an imperial decree." The law of self-preservation makes the worship of Satan intolerant of the knowledge of the true God. The Almighty, therefore, constituted upon earth, for the redemption of man, not a school of philosophy, not a library or a printing-press, but a kingdom of mortal men, to whom collectively He thus made known the first and chiefest of all truths: "Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thine house, and on thy gates."<sup>1</sup> This Lord is the Creator, and the only Creator of heaven and earth, and of every existence besides His own, spiritual and material, visible and invisible. Himself a spirit, He forbids His worship to be defiled with any image like the symbols of heathen idolatry; though merciful and gracious beyond human thought or conception, He puts down idol-worship, not simply by showing its folly, but by the penalty of death. He claims the inmost homage as well as the external worship of all human souls.<sup>2</sup> Neither in the Jewish nor in the Christian church has He ever sanctioned a syllable or a gesture in derogation of this high revelation of Himself. The Trinity is the most unmistakable affirmation of the divine Unity. The unbeliever<sup>3</sup> who seeks to rob men

<sup>1</sup> Deut. vi. 4-9.

Ezek. xx. 33-49. John, iv. 21-24.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i. 11. Ex. iii. 14; xx. 3.

1 Peter, iii. 15.

4. Deut. xxxii. 39. Ps. lxxxvi. 9.

<sup>3</sup> H. Spencer in *Study of Sociology*, Ch. XII., p. 298. N. Y., 1875.

Is. xl. 12-31. Ex. xxii. 20. Lev. xxvi. 1. Deut. iv. 15-19; xiii. 1-11.

This author, who constantly claims

again of the truth it contains, is compelled to begin by slanderously ascribing to the creed that defends it the very contradictory of its clearest affirmations. "There are not three Almighty's, but one Almighty." This Almighty governed upon earth the nation whom He made witnesses to the world of the divine Unity, for many generations, by the direct exertion of His miraculous power. And when the theocracy was modified into an earthly monarchy, the divine instruction still went on, till the people who could not be made to recognize their heavenly benefactor in the sunshine of prosperity and earthly happiness, finally learned the high lesson, so as never quite to forget it, amid suffering and exile and ignominy, and the scourges of every temporal loss.

It is not, we may reverently say, in the clearer language of the written Revelation, in its exalted worship of the one true God, surpassing immeasurably, as it does, alike in precision and splendor, the loftiest utterances of human sages,<sup>1</sup> that the strength and reality of God's Revelation of Himself consists. It is rather in that kingdom of human souls,<sup>2</sup> banded together to conserve this unspeakable treasure, and whose continuance and unity are derived from it alone, that the atmosphere has been generated in which faith can live—the divine faith in whose heart "God is the strength and its portion forever."<sup>3</sup>

for himself scientific precision, audaciously asserts that the Athanasian Creed teaches that "one of the Almighty's suffered on the cross, and descended into hell, to pacify another of them." Here three distinct falsehoods are maliciously insinuated: (1) that there are "three Almighty's:" (2) that one suffered "to pacify" another: (3) that one "descended into hell" for the same purpose. Not one of these can be found in any great accredited teacher of the Church. The first is categori-

cally denied by the creed. The second is a malicious exaggeration even of Calvinism. The third is a pure invention.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Chron. xxix. 10-18. Psalm cxxxix.

<sup>2</sup> οὕτω δι' ἐνὸς ἔθνους τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχοντα θύσιν, εἰς τὴν τῆς εὐσεβείας κοινωνίαν ἐκάλει.—Theodoret, *De Providentia*, Orat., x.; *Op.* IV., 454. Paris, 1642.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. lxxiii. 26; xxvii. 1; xxxi. 21.

## LECTURE II.

---

### NATURAL AND REVEALED RELIGION.

#### PART II.

THERE is the less need of dwelling upon the evidence of natural religion with reference to the immortality of man and a future retribution, because, as has often been remarked, man's belief concerning his God invariably determines and accompanies his view concerning himself and his destiny, since he is made in God's image; and the argument once employed by our Saviour in defence of the resurrection commends itself to man's natural reason: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living;" "for all live unto him."<sup>1</sup> I propose to present together the evidence for the two articles of natural religion, immortality and future retribution.

The well-known argument of Bishop Butler, in the first chapter of the *Analogy*, for the continued existence in a future state of the human soul after death, as in harmony with all that the soundest reason can suggest on the subject—whatever be thought of its validity as metaphysics—has the advantage of being confirmed by the fact, as undeniable as any fact concerning man, that the whole

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxii. 32; Luke, xx. 38. rather than that men first proceeded, "Is it not more comfortable to a man as vermin are thought to do, by the sole influence of the sun, out of dirt and putrefaction?"—R. Bentley, Sermon at Boyle's Lecture, *Works*, III., 17, Dyce's ed. Lond., 1838.

to think well of himself, to have a high value and conceit of the dignity of his nature, to believe a noble origination of his race, the offspring and image of the great King of Glory,

human race, with inconsiderable exceptions, have entertained this belief.<sup>1</sup> We may add to this statement another, with equal confidence, viz., that mankind believes the future life to depend upon, to be determined by, the character and conduct of the present life. It is well known how some thoughtful and serious reasoners, grasping the conception that God is just, have argued for the necessity of a future life for the vindication of His justice. Now, of course, we need not expect to find that the clearest expression by human sages of either immortality or future retribution will be consistently maintained, or escape perversion or contradiction, any more than their testimony to the existence of God. It will be enough to show that both beliefs have maintained themselves, have held their ground with perennial vigor everywhere, amid the grossest corruptions of the very conception of spirit, and the deepest degradation of the moral sense. It is almost superfluous to offer proof that men believe that they will continue to exist after death. A learned unbeliever<sup>2</sup> has recently undertaken to prove inductively that every race and tribe in the world have worshipped their deified ancestors. If this be true, men, of course, have believed in the continued existence of their ancestors. It is, in fact, now conceded by believer and unbeliever alike, that the belief in a continued existence is a primary intuition of man as man. We have already shown that man everywhere separates the idea of deity from that of his own nature, even when this is made an object of worship. A review of the evidence will show that the life beyond the present has been realized with most vividness by some of the most degraded races—the Chayma, the Esquimaux, the unimaginative Papuan, or the wildest rover in the forests of Central Africa, who never doubt the presence and participation of their dead

<sup>1</sup> Addison, *Spectator*, No. 111, may be taken as fairly giving the best thoughts of cultivated men, neither metaphysical nor theological, upon this subject.

<sup>2</sup> Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*.

relatives and neighbors at their humble sacrifices and offerings.

In China this belief is interwoven with the natural conception of filial duty. "The humblest Chinaman believes, and has believed from ages out of memory, that his welfare, both in this world and the next, is made to hinge almost entirely on the due discharge of filial obligations, and the offering up of periodic sacrifices to the manes of his ancestors."<sup>1</sup> A commentator on the *Book of Rewards and Punishments*, sometimes ascribed to Lao-tse (B.C. 604), says: "Every wise man ought to be full of respect for this book. . . . Let him redouble his efforts to perform good works, and his anxiety and ardor to correct past failings. Then will happiness spring up within himself to recompense his merits; and his end will be advancement to the rank of the immortals."<sup>2</sup> It is well known that the Buddhism which spread from the first century of Christ beyond Hindustan, its birthplace, with wonderful celerity, through Thibet and Tartary, China and Japan, Cochin-China and Tonquin, was originally atheistic in its teaching of God, and held up annihilation as the end of man. It is therefore a notable testimony to man's indestructible belief in his own immortality, that in the very midst of this Chinese Buddhism, or Fo-ism, in direct opposition to its characteristic tenets, there sprung up a doctrine concerning the paradise of Amitábha (the highest of the "Three Precious Ones"), who had sworn, as is believed in China, that "if any being in all the ten worlds should, after repeating his name, fail to attain life in his kingdom, he (Amitábha) would cease to be a god."<sup>3</sup> This was coupled with the extraordinary declaration: "A Buddha can deliver all creation, yet is powerless in respect of men who have no faith." The following are some features of this paradise: It "includes within it everything most noble and most sump-

<sup>1</sup> See Medhurst's *China*, pp. 213, *Peines*, p. 519, ed. Julien. Paris, 214. London, 1857. 1835.

<sup>2</sup> *Le Livre des Récompenses et des* <sup>3</sup> Medhurst's *China*, p. 207.

tuous; and the city of the gods is all constructed of gold and precious stones, arranged with perfect art. The atmosphere is ever redolent of spices, and resounds with blissful harmonies. The streams again move forward like a tender strain of music. Round about are stately trees of silver with branches of pure gold, all covered by a rich variety of precious stones and the most gorgeous fruits. . . . The tenants of this paradise are all without distinction, rank, or sex; they are all equal, glorious in form and aspect, and exempted from the possibility of future births into a world of misery." "If at the hour of dissolution the vilest sinner have strength enough to supplicate the mercy of O-me-to (Amitábha), and can repeat the supplication ten times, the images of hell are sure to be transformed into a lotus; and the sinner, snatched from ruin, will obtain admission into paradise."<sup>1</sup>

In the Vedas it has been observed that the prayers are usually for temporal prosperity, "large and healthy families, cows and horses, fertile pastures, bounteous harvests," victory over foes, exemption from physical ills; while "there is little demand for moral benefactions, although, in some few instances, hatred of untruth and abhorrence of sin are expressed; a hope is uttered that the latter may be repented of or expiated; and the gods are in one hymn solicited to extricate the worshipper from sin of every kind."<sup>2</sup> The devotee had a misgiving that Yama, the sovereign of the dead, was planning his destruction. Sin "had left its deadly poison in the spirit of the sinner; yet, through lack of some unerring guidance, he could only dream about the cause of his disorder, and could only guess at the appropriate remedy." No traces of the doctrines of caste,<sup>3</sup> of transmigration, or of incarnation, are believed to exist in the Vedic period. But in Brahman-

<sup>1</sup> Translated from a Mongolian source in Schott, *Über den Buddhismus*, pp. 52, 53, 81, 94. Zusätze.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Wilson, introduction to translation of *Rig-Veda*, I., p. xxvi.

<sup>3</sup> The hymn in the *Rig-Veda*, deriving the castes from the mouth, the arms, the legs, the feet of Brahma, is now generally held to be of later date. Langlois, IV., 341. Lassen, I., 794.

ism, transmigration is the most deeply rooted article in the creed of Hindustan. In the Hindu tradition of the Fall, when God determined to project the universe, he gave birth at once to all particular souls. When they broke away from their place of honor with celestial intelligences, a purgatory was constructed, and, of the same material, the human body, to supply instruments of torture and cells for the incarceration of the damned.<sup>1</sup> Then the human spirit, for its recovery, must pass through many a life of pain and penance, ascend by successive births "into the bodies of spiders, of snakes, of chameleons," and the like, until in the human body an opportunity is afforded for liberation from this fatal circle of transmigration, either upward, according to its faithfulness, to the ranks of demi-gods and gods, or, if it has failed, downward again to the lower ranks of existence. It has been remarked that this article of the Hindu creed withstood the most rampant assaults of infidelity.<sup>2</sup> Even Gótama, the founder of Buddhism, retained it, only teaching that the happy escape from transmigration consisted in annihilation (nirvana); and of himself it was fabled that "myriads of ages previous to his reception of the Buddhahood, he might have become a *rahat* [one who is entirely rescued from all evil desire] and therefore ceased to exist; but that of his own free-will he forewent the privilege, and threw himself into the stream of successive existence, for the benefit of the three worlds."<sup>3</sup> This sage, it should be remembered, cultivated the gentle and retiring virtues so rare in the rest of heathendom—meekness, resignation, equanimity under suffering, forgiveness of injuries, and taught his disciple that when assailed by calumny, or open violence, he should restrain his resentment by reflecting "that the blow has been necessitated by misdemeanors committed in some previous existence."<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the purest aspiration toward immortality contained

<sup>1</sup> *Laws of Manu*, Ch. VI., §§ 77, 78.

<sup>3</sup> Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*,

<sup>2</sup> Wilson's Preface to the *Sankhya* p. 98.

*Káriká*, p. x. Oxford, 1837.

<sup>4</sup> *Wuttke*, II., 579.

in the Hindu religion is expressed in a prayer in the Isá-Upanishad, a kind of pendant to the second Veda: "Let the wind, the breath immortal, carry off this body of mine, which is mere ashes; but, O Brahma, remember my intentions, remember my efforts, remember my deeds. O Agni (spirit of fire), conduct us by sure pathways to eternal happiness. O God, who knowest all beings, purify us from every sin, and we shall be enabled to consecrate to thee our holiest adorations."<sup>1</sup>

The Druids of the West (whose name, from Sanscrit Druwidh, "poor," "indigent," would seem to identify them with the Sanniassi, or professional mendicants), it is well known, held (as did Pythagoras) the doctrines of "One Supreme Being, a future state of rewards and punishments, the immortality of the soul, and a metempsychosis."<sup>2</sup>

Herodotus<sup>3</sup> affirms that the Egyptians were the first people in the ancient world to teach the immortality of the human soul. But it is evident that the language of the Greek historian, which cannot be defended as literally true after what we know of the Hindus, has reference to the habitual and unfaltering affirmation of immortality, as connected with the Egyptian doctrine of Osiris and Isis, and to the novel light which it received from the doctrine of transmigration. The Egyptian had no such dread of matter as belongs to the Hindu. His view comes out in the custom of embalming, believed to impart vitality to the disembodied spirit. In the famous *Book of the Dead*, or Ritual, which preserves a fragment of the older Pharaonic times, dating in part back to "the twelfth dynasty," we have a full and minute description of the soul that, after death, escaping the doom of transmigration, stands before its judge in the other world, and affirming its freedom not only from

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Jones's *Works*, VI., 423, 4to ed.; translated under the title *Isá-vasyam*, by Rammohun Roy.

<sup>2</sup> *The Celtic Druids*, p. 305, by Godfrey Higgins. 4to, London.

<sup>3</sup> *Ἡρώδοτος δὲ καὶ τόνδε τὸν λόγον Αἰγύπτιοι εἰσι οἱ εἰπόντες ὡς ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆ ἀθάνατός ἐστι*. II., 123.

sins of ceremonial omission in worship, but of violations of the moral law, asserts that it has "given bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, garments to the naked, and asylum to the wretched outcast." But the soul is not permitted to pass on to the joyous halls of Elysium (Aahlu) till it has cleared itself by strictest trial of forty-two sins, of which the following is a partial list :

- I have committed no uncleanness.
- I have not prevaricated at the seat of justice.
- I have not spoken lightly.
- I have not omitted [certain] ceremonies.
- I have not blasphemed with my mouth.
- I have not perverted justice.
- I have not shortened the cubit.
- I have not done that which is abominable to the gods.
- I have not sullied my own purity.
- I have not made men to hunger.
- I have not made men to weep.
- I have done no act of rapine.<sup>1</sup>
- I have not accused of rapine falsely.
- I have not revived an ancient falsehood before the face of men.
- I have not forged the deeds of sluices, houses, or lands.
- I have not withheld the seven linen garments due to the priests.
- I have not committed adultery.
- I have not been avaricious.
- I have not forged signet-rings.
- I have not cut down on my mother's land the timber that grows thereon.
- I have not falsified the weights of the balance.
- I have not withheld milk from the mouths of the infants.
- I have not driven away the flocks from their pasturage.
- I have not netted the ducks of the Nile illegally.
- I have not [unlawfully] pierced the bank of the river when it was increasing.
- I have not separated for myself [clandestinely] a channel from the river when it was subsiding.
- I have not extinguished the perpetual lamp.
- I have not added anything to any of the sacred books.
- I have not driven off any of the sacred cattle.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Theft* is said to have been the besetting sin of the old Egyptian. <sup>2</sup> Osburn's translation of the *Book of the Dead*, I., 430, *et seq.* Herodotus, II., 121.

The records of natural religion perhaps afford no more striking illustration than this of what has been well called "that secret and self-judging law, which everywhere, in spite of intellectual aberrations, is still active, in the cause of truth and righteousness, among the inmost fibres of the human heart."<sup>1</sup>

The dualism of Persia, and the ever-present contest of the child of Ormazd against the evil Ahriman, kept alive a moral sensibility which honorably distinguishes the Persians from the rest of heathendom. The victory in that contest was not merely escape from physical suffering, or the securing of temporal prosperity, but "purity in thought, in word, in deed," which came to him through the law of Ormazd "as the strong fleet wind purifies the heaven."<sup>2</sup> In the Bundelesh, or Persian "Genesis," a work belonging to the Sassanian epoch (A.D. 226-628), at the appearance of the hero-prophet, Sosiosh,<sup>3</sup> the dead are said to be raised to life; they receive immortality by drinking the sacred *homa*; next follows a grand separation of the pure from the impure; "friend will lose the sweet companionship of friend, the husband will be severed from his spouse, the sister from the brother." A final conflagration annihilates Ahriman and his followers.

Among the barbarous tribes in the islands of the Pacific, and the negroes of South-Central Africa, as among the American Indians, the germs of a belief in some futurity can be recognized in the custom of suspending the favorite bow and arrows of the hunter over his grave, at the time of his burial, that he may enjoy the valued privilege of the hunt when he issues forth at night. The Ajetas, a Papuan tribe in the Philippines, annually deposit at the tomb fresh offerings of betel and tobacco.<sup>4</sup> In the Tonga and Viti islands is a tradition of the extrac-

<sup>1</sup> Hardwick, *Christ and Other Masters*, Pt. IV., Ch. I., p. 477.

"The Benefactor" (*Avesta*, I., 244, n. 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Vendidad*, III., 149.

<sup>4</sup> Earl's *Papuans*, p. 132. Cf.

<sup>3</sup> Derived by Spiegel from *su*, "to profit," and therefore equivalent to

Livingstone, p. 319.

tion of the whole human race from a single pair. The first-born of this first pair became black as a punishment for his wickedness; the second was fairer and better clad; the last and highest in virtue and intelligence was also white. They have too, a notable tradition of a deluge. The human sacrifices, the strangulation of entire families in honor of a fallen chief, infanticide, brutish cannibal feasts on foes and fellow-subjects—which we would more naturally pronounce to belong to devil-worship—form among these poor heathen a striking illustration of the way in which a noble truth, like the immortality of man, is degraded by association with abominable rites, or even perverted into a justification of them; for they actually alleged, as a valid ground for the killing of their victims, that since the future life was a continuance of the present, those fared best who left the present life in full health and strength.<sup>1</sup> In the Viti [or Fiji] islands it is believed that the disembodied spirits, when seeking the presence of Ndengei (the highest god in their Pantheon, and worshipped under the form of a mighty serpent), were repulsed by an enormous giant with an axe, and if wounded had to wander in the mountains. “But,” says Captain Wilkes, “whether the spirit be wounded or not, depends not upon the conduct in life, but they ascribe an escape from the blow wholly to good luck.” What seems still more perverse, when, through certain benevolent deities, acting as champions, the spirits reach the presence of their god, their happiness is not associated with moral qualities, either in themselves or their judge, but is treated as the fruit of chance or caprice.<sup>2</sup> According to the marvellous Polynesian legend of Mani the Young (*potiki*), death came into the world, or kept its hold upon the world, through the failure of this champion of man in his effort to obtain a bath in the life-giving stream that flows through the womb of the great mother, Night (*Hinc-nui-te-po*).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wilkes's *Exploring Expedition*, III., 94, 96.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, III., 85.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor's *Te Ika a Mani*, p. 31. Sir G. Grey's *Polynesian Mythology*,

p. 57.

The loss of connection between the belief in a life for man beyond the grave and the hope of a righteous retribution is, indeed, from one point of view, a very depressing aspect of heathenism ; but, on the other hand, it may be considered a powerful testimony to the indestructible instinct of immortality, which can survive even the destruction of all that makes any life desirable. The North American Indian's Great Spirit, in spite of his grandeur, goodness, and ubiquity, Schoolcraft remarks, exercises no control over the lives of individuals, or upon the government of the world. The priesthood, or jugglers, do not attempt "to impute to the great merciful Spirit the attributes of justice, or to make man accountable to him, here and hereafter, for aberrations from virtue, good-will, truth, or any form of moral right."<sup>1</sup> The world was actually governed, the Indians believed, by malevolent spirits, demons, spectres, fiends, hobgoblins, poisoning human joys and aggravating human wretchedness ; and notwithstanding a tradition of a nobler government and a purer language from which their race had been separated by some dire calamity, and along with this at times the presentiment of a better future under some great deliverer, the Indians worshipped with the ministry of witches, jossakeeds, and medicine-men, the wild and capricious powers who inspired mystery, suspicion, and fear. "Daring as the Indian is at other times," says Müller, "in facing visible dangers under the impulse of passion ; firm and self-collected as he shows himself in bearing the most poignant tortures, he is, notwithstanding, always full of awe, of fear, of horror, at the thought of the invisible spirits who hold rule in nature ; and as soon as he is once mastered by this feeling he becomes the most timid creature on earth."<sup>2</sup>

The human soul bears testimony, in many unexpected ways, to truth and purity. But as the honor paid to the

<sup>1</sup> *History, Condition, and Prospects Amerikanen Urreligionen*, p. 83. of the Indian Tribes, I., 35. Basle, 1855.

<sup>2</sup> I. G. Müller, *Geschichte der*

cross, the Virgin, the baptism administered to children when they were named—rites, among the Mexicans, so startling at first to Christian missionaries—proved to carry with them no Christian suggestions, so there were discovered among them exhortations to virtue and inward purity that seemed almost part of the Sermon on the Mount, yet came from the lips of the same people whose religion was murder, lust, and every heathen abomination. The following are among their precepts: "Keep peace with all; bear injuries with humility; God, who sees, will avenge you." And this almost seems borrowed from S. Matt. v. 27, 28: "He who looks too curiously upon a woman commits adultery with his eyes."<sup>1</sup> The Aztecs imagined three separate states of existence in the future life. "The wicked, comprehending the greater part of mankind, were to expiate their sins in a place of everlasting darkness. Another class, with no other merit than that of having died of certain diseases, capriciously selected, were to enjoy a negative existence of indolent contentment. The highest place was reserved for the heroes who fell in battle or in sacrifice." This place was, at times, declared to be the sun itself.<sup>2</sup> "Awake, awake!" was the address of a Mexican to one dying; "already the morning breaks on you, and now the light is dawning. Already the yellow-plumed birds are singing to greet you; already the gorgeous butterflies flutter about you."<sup>3</sup>

The embarrassment in presenting the evidence of the Greek and Roman writers for man's immortality and a future retribution arises both out of its copiousness and (as a result of this) the more full expression of the vacillation and weakness of the human mind, in its grasp, even in its best natural estate, of these as of all other articles of natural religion. The lesson of this evidence for all honest minds, whether with or without faith, whether they

<sup>1</sup> Sahagun, *Hist. de Nueva España*, XIII., Ch. XLVIII. Prescott, I., L. VI., Ch. I. Prescott, I., 64, 65. 62. Squier's *Am. Arch. Res.*, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> Torquemada, *Monarch. Ind.*, L. <sup>3</sup> Sahagun, X., 29.

believe there has been a Revelation or not, whether they call the discoveries of man's own nature a Revelation or give them another name, whether they trace religious truth to tradition or to evolution—the lesson, we repeat, as we shall have to repeat it again, is that the best minds, in their best moments, believe in man's immortality and in the retributive character of the life after this, and hold these beliefs instinctively and really, in spite of inconsistency, of evil customs and of personal sins, which, in the view of logic, throw doubt on any belief. We say this in order to obviate, by anticipation, objections that may be made to the evidence we are about to present.

It is well known how it became a kind of traditional remark<sup>1</sup> that Pherecydes, first among philosophers, taught the immortality of the soul, even as Herodotus<sup>2</sup> had assigned this honor to the Egyptians as first among the nations. It is not unlikely that both remarks arose in a similar way, and that Pherecydes derived his doctrine from Egypt,<sup>3</sup> and transmitted it, with the adjunct of transmigration, to his more distinguished pupil, Pythagoras. The greatest of the philosophers of the ancient world, Socrates, heard this doctrine from his predecessors, as he imbibed the wisdom of all preceding schools, and he handed on to his successors, without the transmigration, the most deliberate and the most pathetic assertion of immortality which the wisdom of the world ever produced. The literary skill even of Plato never fashioned a more perfect work of art than the dialogue entitled *Gorgias*, wherein the philosopher of the Athenian market-place, before the most intellectual audience in the world, overthrows first the sophistical rhetorician Gorgias, impudently asserting the eminence of the bad art that can produce belief of anything without knowledge, and then vanquishes the two

<sup>1</sup> See Cicero, *Tusc. Quæst.*, I., 16.

<sup>2</sup> See *ante*, p. 141.

<sup>3</sup> There is as little ground for Pherecydes' claim, construed literally, as

for another sometimes made for him, viz., that he invented the sun-dial, which was known long before in the East. See 2 Kings, xx. 11. [713 B.C.]

champions of the sophist ; first, Polus, rushing to his aid with the assertion that injustice is condoned by success, and then Callicles, with the even more shameless defence of the boundless indulgence of appetite ; making, finally, these three men listen in silence, if not with conviction, to the statements that “ rhetoric is flattery,” that “ it is better to suffer than to commit injustice,” and that “ the next best thing to being just is for a man to become so, and to submit to the punishment one deserves.” It cannot be doubted that the charm of this wonderful disputation for the young and ingenuous minds, for whose sake Socrates held it, lay in something beyond its exquisite dialectical skill. That charm, without question, was in the accent, to which the human soul will ever respond, of deep moral conviction, uttered humbly and seriously. “ Such appears to me, O Callicles, the case with the soul ; all things in it become manifest as soon as it is stripped of the body, its natural disposition, and the affections it has contracted by the pursuit of any object during life. When, therefore, they come into the judge’s presence, he attentively examines each soul ; and oftentimes meeting with the soul of some great man, he finds it covered with sores and wounds from perjuries and injustice, such as the conduct of each has impressed on his own soul, corrupted by falsehood and pride, and from having lived without truth. On beholding which he forthwith dismisses it to a place of suffering suited for it. . . . Now I, Callicles, for my part, am persuaded by these accounts, and keep watch over myself that I may manifest to the judge a soul as healthful as possible ; and therefore, bidding adieu to the honors of the world, and looking to truth, I will endeavor to be as good as I can while I live, and to continue so when I come to die. And all other men I exhort so to be, as far as in me lies. . . . Now all these things, perhaps, appear to you to be an old wife’s tale, and you despise such stories. And indeed we might do so if by our inquiries we were able to discover anything better or more true. But now you see that you three, who are the

wisest of the Greeks of this day—Callicles, Polus, and Gorgias—are unable to prove that we ought to live any other life than such as appears to be advantageous hereafter; but among so many arguments, while others have been refuted, this alone remains unshaken—that we ought to beware of committing injustice rather than of being injured; and that, above all, a man ought to study not to appear good, but to be so, both privately and publicly; and that, if any one is in any respect wicked, he should be punished; and that it is the next best good to the being just, to become so, and to submit to the punishment one deserves; and that all flattery, whether of one's self or others, whether of few or many, must be avoided; and that rhetoric, and every other action, is always to be employed with a view to what is just. . . . And suffer any one to despise you as senseless, and to treat you with contumely, if he pleases, and even let him strike you the ignominious blow, for you will suffer nothing dreadful if you are in reality upright and good, and devoted to the practice of virtue. . . . It is disgraceful, being in the condition in which we appear to be at present, to pride ourselves like youths, as if we were something, who yet never retain the same opinion on the same subjects, and these of the greatest moment. Let us use as our guide, then, the reasoning that has now been made clear to us, which teaches us that this is the best mode of life: to live and die in the exercise of justice and the other virtues."

It is well known that the philosopher who spake thus, at length paid the penalty of his freedom of speech with his life. He is justly held to be a martyr for the truth, for although he professed to have no knowledge of God, or of virtue, or of immortality, except as the result of his own observation and reflection, he would not purchase safety, even from injustice, by the violation of conscience, or by any compliance through fear.<sup>1</sup> He took leave of his judges<sup>2</sup> with the calm declaration that he

<sup>1</sup> Plato's *Crito*; or, The Duty of a Citizen.      <sup>2</sup> See the *Apology* of Plato

preferred the death to which he was going, rather than the life he left them to enjoy. He spent his last day<sup>1</sup> in setting forth before his friends and disciples the reasons which convinced him that the soul is immortal. He gave the last evidence of the sincerity of his conviction by calmly accepting death. He rejoiced to go from earthly judges to those who could be neither corrupted nor deceived, and into the society of Homer and Hesiod, Orpheus and Musæus, Palamedes, and Ajax, son of Telamon, and Ulysses.<sup>2</sup>

It is notable that Socrates was wont to rest his faith in God and in immortality, not upon reasoning, but upon tradition;<sup>3</sup> and it is natural that the reasonings of such a man should in turn have had great power upon succeeding generations, both in Greece and Rome, as much from the authority of the reasoner as from the strength of his arguments. Socrates and Plato are virtually one in reference to this matter. Cicero says:<sup>4</sup> "I would rather err with Plato, than be right with other philosophers." And again: "Even though Plato had assigned no reason for his opinion (of the soul's immortality), the weight of his authority would have borne me down; but he has brought so many reasons, that he appears to me to have endeavored to convince others, and certainly to have convinced himself."<sup>5</sup> In another treatise, Cicero puts into the mouth of Cato the words: "Nor have reason and argument alone influenced me thus to believe, but likewise the high name and authority of

<sup>1</sup> Plato's *Phædo*; or, The Immortality of the Soul.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *De Senectute*, XXIII.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Plato, *De Legibus*, Bk. XII. "One must believe these things on the faith of legislators, or ancient traditions."

<sup>4</sup> "A. Errare mehercle malo cum Platone . . . quam cum istis vera sentire. . . . M. Ego ipse cum eodem ipso non invitus erraverim."

<sup>5</sup> *Tusc. Disp.*, I., XVII., XXI. *Argumentor* in early Latin is, "to prove," *i. e.*, "to convince one's self:" a middle verb. Cf. Ch. XV. "Nescio quomodo, inhæret in mentibus quasi seculorum quoddam augurium futurorum; idque in maximis ingeniis, altissimisque animis, et existit maxime, et apparet facillime."

the greatest philosophers." "The arguments were conclusive to me, which Socrates delivered on the last day of his life, concerning the immortality of the soul—he who was pronounced by the oracle of Apollo, the wisest of all men."<sup>1</sup> The following principle, as expressed by the Roman orator, appears to justify this appeal to authority: "If<sup>2</sup> universal consent is the voice of nature, and if it is the general opinion everywhere that those who have quitted this life are still interested in something . . . and if we think that men of the greatest abilities and virtue see most clearly into the power of nature, because they themselves are her most perfect work, it is very probable that he continues sensible after death, and we ought to subscribe to that opinion." Plutarch bears witness to the instinct of immortality in man from another point of view, by the striking remark, that "the generality of mankind, women as well as men, chose rather to endure all the punishments of hell, as described by the poets, than part with the hope of immortality, though immortal only in misery."<sup>3</sup> There is a memorable passage in Plato, at the beginning of his tenth book of "The Laws," where he asks: "How can any one speak without a feeling of anger on the question, whether there are gods? for we are forced to bear ill with and to hate those who have been, and are now, the cause of this discussion." There is something abominable in coolly questioning and debating the most sacred instincts of the human race. In a world which doubts whether justice be preferable to injustice, Plato predicts, in another treatise, that when the holy and just teacher shall appear: "He will be scourged, tortured, fettered, have his eyes burnt out, and lastly, suffer all manner of

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *De Senectute*, Ch. XXI.

<sup>2</sup> "Quod si omnium consensus naturæ vox est, omnesque, qui ubique sunt, consentiunt esse aliquid quod ad eos pertineat qui vita cesserunt . . . et si quorum aut ingenio aut virtute animus excellit, eos arbitramur, quia

natura optima sunt, cernere naturæ vim maxime, verisimile est esse aliquid cujus optimus quisque post mortem sensum sit habiturus, nobis quoque idem existimandum est."—*Tusc. Disp.*, I., XV.

<sup>3</sup> *Moral.*, T.V., p. 339, ed. Wyttenb.

evils, and be crucified.”<sup>1</sup> It is noteworthy that the contemplation of this injustice by a keen intellect, like Plato’s, tends to deflect it from its grasp of the unity of the intelligence that rules the world, the unity which reason craves, towards a dualism not unlike that which prevailed among the American tribes. He asks if this Ruler of the world be “one soul, or many?” And answers: “Let us not then lay down less than two, one the beneficent, and the other able to effect things of a contrary kind.”<sup>2</sup> In the soul of the purest, most heroic

woman imagined by Grecian poetry, the blameless Antigone of Sophocles, striving to vindicate divine laws alike against civil injustice and the cruelty of kindred, the effect is still more tragic, something like the loss of faith, when she is made to feel the wrong that triumphs in the world. “Why does it behoove me, unhappy one, to look any longer toward the gods? to call on whom as my defender? since indeed I have now for my piety obtained the reward of impiety. But if then things are right in the sight of the gods, by my sufferings I may confess that I have sinned; but if the gods shall be in fault, may they obtain no more rewards than they inflict without justice upon me.” The poet, however, soothes the anguish even of this tempted and tortured soul with the hope of an immortal union with her loved ones in the future world.<sup>3</sup> The cry of despair wrung from Antigone is calmly formulated by the philosophic historian of Rome, after his experience under some of the worst emperors. “The more I meditate,” says Tacitus,<sup>4</sup>

“on the events of ancient and modern times, the more I am struck with the capricious uncertainty which mocks the calculations of men, in all their

<sup>1</sup> Plato’s *Republic*, Bk. II., Ch. V. There is a similar passage in Cicero’s *De Repub.*, III., 17.

<sup>2</sup> *De Legibus*, Bk. X., Ch. VIII.

<sup>3</sup> Sophocles, *Antigone*, 897-928.

<sup>4</sup> “Mihī quanto plura recentium seu veterum revolve, tanto magis ludibria

rerum mortalium cunctis in negotiis obversantur.”—*Annalium*, L. III., Ch. XVIII. “Sed mihi hæc ac talia audienti, in incerto iudicium est, fatone res mortalium et necessitate immutabili an forte volvantur.”—*Id.*, VI., 22.

transactions." "For myself, while I listen to these and similar relations, my judgment wavers, whether human affairs are regulated by fate and immutable necessity, or left to roll on at random." He can still see that "many who seem to struggle with adversity, are yet happy; numbers that wallow in wealth are yet most wretched: as when the former bear with magnanimity the pressure of adverse fortune, and the latter make an unwise use of her bounties." But this same historian, when his heart is touched, when he takes leave of one he loved, Agricola, his wife's father, utters the old faith instinctive to man's heart: <sup>1</sup> "If there be any abiding-place for the shades of the virtuous, if, as sages are (with reason) agreed, exalted souls do not perish with the body, mayest thou repose in peace, and call us thy household from weak regret and feminine lamentations, to the contemplation of thy virtues, which allow no place for mourning or complaining. . . . Agricola shall survive."

We have not made use of the Koran or the standard authorities in Muhammedanism in collecting the opinions of the heathen on natural religion, for the simple reason that whatever is sound or clear in the Koran on the unity of God, the immortality and future account of man, is based almost professedly on the Jewish and Christian Scriptures; and Muhammed's system bears to Revelation a relation similar to that of some of the early sects and heresies, Gnostic, Manichæan, etc., to the primitive church. The Koran always claims to be a Revelation. Thus, at its very opening, it declares: "There is no doubt in this book; it is a direction to the pious, who believe in the mysteries of faith."<sup>2</sup> Its conception of God is that of absolute unity, almighty, omniscient, alone,

<sup>1</sup> "Si quis piorum manibus locus, si, ut sapientibus placet, non cum corpore extinguntur magnæ animæ, placide quiescas, nosque, domum tuam, ab infirmo desiderio et muliebribus lamentis ad contemplationem virtutum tuarum voces,

quas neque lugeri neque plangi fas est. . . . Agricola, superstes erit."—*Agricolæ Vita*, Ch. XLVI. The indicative in *placet* fairly implies that Tacitus assents to the opinion.

<sup>2</sup> *Koran*, Ch. II.

unapproachable, the jealous avenger of every infringement on his honor<sup>1</sup>—a conception which nowhere among the heathen has held its place against the encroachments of idolatry. In the modern literature of Islam it is noteworthy that the Mussulman is permitted to comply, as an allowable stratagem against a foe, with idolatrous practices.<sup>2</sup> In the same book the argument from design is stated with great clearness, though not better than in Plato and Xenophon; but it is immediately followed by the declaration: "But we have not found this sure and certain knowledge (of God, of heaven, hell, the vanity of idols, etc.,) through our own learning; a beloved one, faithful and upright, called Muhammed, came from that true Deity and taught us."<sup>3</sup> In the Koran the "belief in God" is usually joined with the belief "in the last day," or "the day of judgment."<sup>4</sup> When enlarging with unhappy invention on the story of man's creation, Muhammed represents God as teaching the angels humility by revealing to man what He had hidden from them, viz., the names of things. And then, in singular contrariety to his own constant teaching, the false Prophet says the Almighty bade the angels "worship Adam." And "they all worshipped him except Eblis, who refused, and was puffed up with pride, and became of the number of unbelievers."<sup>5</sup> But, according to Muhammed's perpetual warning against associating any other, in heaven or earth, with the one God, he has here justified Satan and condemned the rest of the angels. By a still more

<sup>1</sup> *Koran*, XIII., 2, 3, 14, 15, 27.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Story of Jewad*, by 'Ali 'Aziz Effendi, the Cretan, translated by E. I. W. Gibb, p. 197, etc. Glasgow, 1884.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, pp. 208, 209.

<sup>4</sup> *Koran*, Ch. I., II., etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Koran*, Ch. II. If it were possible to give a deep or symbolic meaning to such an earthly composition as the Koran, one might sup-

pose this to be a reference to the Incarnate Son, the second Adam, and the angelic worship mentioned in Heb. i. 6. Cf. ii. 7, 9. In like manner we might see an acknowledgment of the Incarnation in Chapter XXI., entitled, "The Prophets": "Remember her who preserved her virginity, and into whom we breathed of our Spirit; ordaining her and her son for a sign unto all creatures."

unhappy fable the Prophet seeks to show how God convinced Abraham of the resurrection, by causing the patriarch and his ass to die for a hundred years, and then raising both to life; and next repeating the prodigy on four birds.<sup>1</sup> Thus truth itself fares when associated with imposture.

The testimony to man's immortality, to his belief in a survival of death, as well as to some sort of account in the future life for his conduct here, is even more complete, more universal, and without exception, than the testimony to his faith in God. Man's view of his own destiny is indeed inextricably bound up with his conception of his highest object of worship. They are found to be elevated or degraded inevitably together. As certainly as man believes that there is a right and a wrong in affairs, a guilt or a merit in actions, and there is no higher certainty, either speculative or practical, so surely does he expect the award of justice, both for himself and others—an award which he does not believe to be defeated by the grave, but assured by the pledge of Him who is the author of the moral law, as well as the Master of life and death. There is no conviction in the human soul, of every nation, age, sex, or clime, more ineradicable or more instinctive than this. Vain is the shameless sophism that conscience is a bundle of habits or prejudices received in childhood, fostered by education. This is to confound the furniture of a faculty with the faculty itself. It would be not less stupid to deny the existence of the mind because it can be enlarged by information and developed by exercise. Conscience testifies to the reality of those virtues which we name truth, fidelity, purity, courage, self-sacrifice, and to the reality of the justice which, here or hereafter, adjusts the condition of each responsible being to his merits or demerits. And in order that man may receive this justice he must live—he must be immortal. But what stains and slights have

<sup>1</sup> *Koran*, Ch. II.

men thrown on this clearest of truths, by their conduct and words alike! The mass of men live inconsistently, not only with the words of the wise, but with their own convictions and acknowledgments. Even the wise destroy their own authority by their petulance, their vacillation, their impurity and cowardice. Socrates himself was not personally blameless, and his chief eminence over every human teacher lay in the unflinching honesty with which he perceived and confessed his own weakness. His last words to his judges were: "It is now time to depart—for me to die, for you to live. But which of us is going to a better state is unknown to every one but God." It is difficult to assign any other cause than their sense of the moral evil around and within them—a sense deep and acute, though the evil was neither understood nor explained—which impelled minds like Socrates and Plato to declare that even if death were a dreamless sleep, with no awakening, it would still be better than an indefinite continuance of our mortal life. It is true that this feeling, if it led those exalted souls to a logical conclusion, would have inspired the conviction of a future award and punishment, rectifying the inequalities of the present life. But the contagion of evil example, the contradictions of acute minds, the weakness of their own hearts, without doubt relaxed their grasp of the clearest truths. Add to all this the fact that every state in heathendom, though it may not, like the Sassanidæ and the Moslem, enjoin the reclamation of the apostate Parsee or Muhammedan by force, still discourages those who depart from popular usage, if not belief, and quickly passes from passive disapproval to active persecution of those who persistently slight or condemn the gods and the worship of their countrymen.

It is quite plain, therefore, that even a doctrine so generally confessed as the immortality of man required external aid, the aid of Revelation, if it were to remain operative or in any measure effective to exalt or to ennoble human beings. This need has been actually supplied in the Jewish

and in the Christian church. And, again, we must emphasize the fact that the revelation of immortality, like the doctrine concerning God, was not merely written down in a book, but committed to a community, the Kingdom of God, that it might be fostered and acquire strength amid a congenial atmosphere. There alone could it learn the true meaning of such words as: "My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever." "Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me." As faith waxed strong, the soul of the believer could rise even to a higher strain, and apply to its immortal destiny the language of the Jewish exile returning from Babylon to the holy city: "My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God: when shall I come to appear before the presence of God?"<sup>1</sup>

The absence of such language, amid the years of security and plenty in Canaan, is no more matter of wonder than that youth should not utter the thoughts of maturity and age. That the soul's immortality, however, was believed by the patriarchs, and through every period of the Jewish church, wherever faith still lived in the God of Abraham, who formed man in His own image, there is no reason to doubt. The translation of Enoch, we are expressly told, was so "that he should not see death."<sup>2</sup> When patriarchs and kings were "gathered to their fathers," this meant more than placing their bones in the family sepulchre. Job uttered language whose fulness is satisfied by nothing less than the Christian resurrection.<sup>3</sup> The Psalmist plainly expressed this confidence.<sup>4</sup> The prophets beheld, by divine illumination, the receptacle of the dead, where the souls of the departed, high and low, rich and poor, met and recognized one another.<sup>5</sup> The literal resurrection of our mortal frames out of the dust, by

<sup>1</sup> Ps. lxxiii. 26; xxiii. 4; xlii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Ps. xvi. 10, 11. Cf. Acts, ii.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. v. 24. Heb. xi. 5.

25-31; Ps. xlix. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xlix. 33. Job, xix. 25-27.

<sup>5</sup> Job, iii. 13-19. Isaiah, xiv. 9-20.

the power of Him who made them and joined them to the soul, became part of their faith and hope, and itself at one time a symbol and pledge of the church's restoration on earth after her temporal overthrow, at another the stay of individual martyrs and heroes, contending amid mortal agonies against tyrants, for the dearest interests of the soul.<sup>1</sup>

Inspired Scripture contains no metaphysical definitions or abstractions. It nowhere says, for instance, in what precisely personality consists.<sup>2</sup> But it teaches that the image of God in man includes knowledge of self, freedom to do right, control of surrounding matter. Even upon the resurrection-body some of the glory of this heavenly image is reflected.<sup>3</sup> In man the *person* is something more and higher than the *individual*, and implies a glory in which neither plant nor beast can share.<sup>4</sup> Scripture represents man as formed by an immediate breathing from God into a body made from the dust of the ground.<sup>5</sup> It nowhere bases his immortality upon anything like the natural indestructibility or indiscerptibility of the soul, as argued by the Grecian philosophers. Man's immortality in Scripture is invariably represented as a divine gift, without derogation of his native perfection, but rather as crowning it, and turning it into a blessing. It is God who, in the language of Holy Writ, "alone hath immortality," that is, by inherent perfection; but "has brought

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, xxvi. 14-19. Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14. Hosea, vi. 2; xiii. 14. Dan. xii. 1-3, 13. 2 Macc. vii. 9, 11, 14, 23, 36; xii. 42-45; xiv. 46. The three fundamental principles of Judaism are "God, *Eternal Life*, Revelation."—Dr. S. Hertheimer, *Doctrines of Faith and Morals for Jewish Schools and Families*, tr. from German by C. Kleeberg.

<sup>2</sup> In Isaiah, xxvi. 9, we may say that the *Ego* אֲנִי is distinguished both from "the soul" נַפְשִׁי and "the spirit" רוּחִי. Again, in Prov. xxiii.

15, Eccles. vii. 25, the *Ego* appears to be distinguished from "the heart," לֵבִי, πρόσωπον (2 Cor. i. 11) is the outward manifestation, ὑπόστασις (Heb. i. 3; xi. 1), the underlying substance of the person.

<sup>3</sup> Col. iii. 10. Eph. iv. 24. Gen. i. 26-28. 1 Cor. xv. 49.

<sup>4</sup> It has been noted that מין ἰδέα, *species*, "kind," is used in the account of the Creation only of plants and beasts, not of man.

<sup>5</sup> Gen. ii. 7.

life and immortality" to redeemed man through His incarnate Son, proclaimed by the Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The original term for "immortality" in this second text suggests that the Gospel discloses a remedy for that corruption which is the true death of the soul.

The early church set its face resolutely against the Platonic doctrine of the preëxistence of the soul, which had been adopted even in the Jewish schools by Philo, and in the Talmud and Cabbala, and at length found a patron in the learned Origen. The second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 540, declared:<sup>2</sup> "The church, following God's word, affirms that the soul is created along with the body, and not the one before and the other some time after, according to the unsound imagination of Origen." The soul's preëxistence would not only be at variance with the scriptural account of the simultaneous creation of body and soul, but would also cast doubt on the resurrection of the body. Another very interesting question, however, upon which Revelation does not so plainly pronounce, is whether we derive our souls from our parents, even as we derive our bodies—the opinion called *traducianism*, of which Tertullian<sup>3</sup> was a leading champion—or whether the soul is immediately created by God, at the conception of each human being—the opinion known as creationism, of which S. Jerome<sup>4</sup> was the most distinguished defender. S. Augustine is said to have shrunk from the traducian hypothesis on account of its materialism, though it might seem to have offered strong support to his argument against Pelagius. The opposite hypothe-

<sup>1</sup> ὁ μόνος εχων ἀθανασίαν.— νους φρενοβλάβειαν. — *Conc.*  
1 S. Tim. vi. 16. φωτίζαντος δὲ *Const. Mansi.*, IX., p. 396.  
ζῶν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐ-  
αγγελίου 2 S. Tim. i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῖς Θεοῖς ἐπο-  
μένῃ λόγοις φάσκει τὴν ψυχὴν  
συνδημιουργηθῆναι τῷ σώματι  
καὶ οὐ τὸ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ  
δὲ ὕστερον, κατὰ τὴν Ὠριγέ-  
<sup>3</sup> Anima velut sarculus quidam ex  
matrice Adam in propaginem deducta  
. . . cum omni sua paratura pullula-  
bit, tam intellectu quam sensu.—*De*  
*Anima*, Ch. XIX.

<sup>4</sup> Quotidie Deus operatur animas et  
in corpora mittit nascentium.—*Adv.*  
*Ruf. Apol.*, XVI., 1, 3.

sis has since generally prevailed. It is believed to be supported by the contrast in the Epistle to the Hebrews,<sup>1</sup> drawn between "the fathers of our flesh" (τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρες) and "the Father of spirits" (πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων). A celebrated verse in the same epistle shows that God's Word discriminates, in man's inward nature, between that essence that belongs to him as man, the reason that knows itself and can choose between good and evil, and the lower region, that shares the life of sense, appetite, perception, with the brutes, though the union between these departments be as intimate as that which unites the joints with the marrow.<sup>2</sup> This discrimination is not made for philosophical analysis, but that we may realize the completeness of God's saving power, which, according to S. Paul's prayer, will sanctify "the whole body, soul, and spirit."<sup>3</sup> The Gospel makes us realize the unity and responsibility of man's entire nature, vindicated finally and displayed in the resurrection and judgment of its reunited elements in the life to come.<sup>4</sup> "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

Placed by this fact, the moral teachings of the world, the arguments of its sages for immortality, sink into insignificance. God's Incarnate Son, who endured human life that He might redeem us, will finally judge us, and has set to the truth of His words the irrefragable seal of His own triumph over death. Revelation, therefore, brings to the truth of God's existence, and to the truth of man's immortality, the twofold confirmation of external evidence, and such new truth as dispels the most

<sup>1</sup> Heb. xii. 9. This is pronounced "a classical proof-text of creationism" by the learned Delitzsch, a Lutheran writer, in his *Biblische Psychologie*, where he defends traducianism. Klee, a Roman Catholic, in his *Dogmatik*, is also a traducianist.

<sup>2</sup> ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. . . δεικνόμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, ἀρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν. Heb. iv. 12.

<sup>3</sup> ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἡ ψυχή, καὶ τὸ σῶμα.—I Thess. v. 23.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. v. 10.

trying perplexities in which natural religion leaves them. What this world can say of God to one seeking Him by its aid alone, has been expressed in a memorable passage of S. Augustine's *Confessions* :<sup>1</sup> "I asked the earth, and it said: 'I am not He;' and all that is upon it made the same confession. I asked the sea, and the depths, and the creeping things that have life, and they answered: 'We are not thy God; look thou above us.' I asked the breezes and the gales, and the whole air, with its inhabitants, said to me: 'Anaximenes is in error; I am not God.' I asked the heaven, the sun, the moon, the stars: 'We, too,' said they, 'are not the God whom thou seekest.' And I said to all the creatures that surround the doors of my fleshly senses: 'Ye have said to me of my God that ye are not He; tell me somewhat of Him.' And with a great voice they exclaimed: 'He made us.'" Following the spirit of this passage we might question man's nature, and proceed to anatomize his body and analyze his soul; to investigate his history and aspirations, his errors and his triumphs; and thus to seek an answer to the question, Is this being different or the same in kind with the other creatures of the earth? Pursuing a comparative study of the whole animal creation, amid all its wonderful and varied forms, we shall without doubt light upon many startling and marvellous analogies; still they will testify with one voice, Our nature and destiny are not those of man. We labor and rest, we love and hate, we are born and die; but we know neither the reason for what we do, nor any hope or aspiration toward a world that differs from this. The starry heavens, the sun and moon, the majestic mountains, the restless sea, the strange and beautiful vegetation that clothes the earth—all speak of power, of wisdom, of beauty, of the mystery of life; but they have nothing to say of the peculiar glory that crowns human nature, courage, truth, purity, unselfish devotion; which counts even this earthly life a cheap sac-

<sup>1</sup> X. 6. Interrogavi terram et dixit: non sum; et quæcumque in eadem sunt idem confessa sunt.

rifice in behalf of the soul's integrity, for a cause, for a friend, for God; aspiring thus to an immortal life, whose very breath is the charity, the faith, the hope that look beyond the narrow limits of earth. Human nature produced, here and there in every land, a martyr to truth or to virtue; but a Socrates or an Epictetus made no impression on the vicious customs or false religion of their native lands. But Christianity produced a Socrates and an Epictetus in every country, almost in every congregation—if we judge of greatness by the clear apprehension of the most important truths, and their firm maintenance in the face of tortures and death; and the Christian martyrs died not in vain. The Incarnate Son of God, becoming the perfect type of the race He came to redeem, reflects upon His earthly brethren something of that very glory for which He receives angelic adoration: "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The beginning of the Gospel that describes His advent in the world accurately describes the relation of revealed to natural religion: "That was the true Light, that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." †

† Heb. i. 9. S. John, i. 9-12.

## LECTURE III.

---

### THE NATURE OF MAN: UNFALLEN; FALLEN.

WHEN we study any object in nature—a plant, an animal, and, more especially, any variety of man,—we do not think we have arrived at anything like complete knowledge till we have formed some idea of this living creature when it is perfect in its kind; reached, in other words, what in art is called an ideal, according to which, as by a standard, we judge of the nearness to perfection, or remoteness from it, of any individual, and estimate the measure and character of its excellences or defects. We are now about to subject the nature of man to such an examination, to try to ascertain what is its essential excellence when it is perfect, what it wants when it falls short of this perfection. To accomplish this arduous task with any measure of success, we should obtain whatever information concerning this nature can be procured from observation, experience, or history. If we are discouraged in the study by the consciousness of personal faults or incapacity, by the presumption of passing judgment on qualities or attainments above our own reach, let us take heart from the reflection that even the young and innocent are often the soundest judges of character, and that the subject on which we now seek to form correct thoughts is one in which we share by identity of being, and upon which, therefore, it is likely that the most important knowledge will come from ourselves.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "In these provinces of inquiry *mar of Assent*, Pt. II., Ch. X. p. (metaphysics and ethics), egotism is 373. Am. Ed. true modesty."—Newman's *Gram.*

The most familiar description of man is that he is a being composed of body and soul. The unity of this twofold being is, without doubt, intended by the great majority of those who use language, before they give themselves up to analysis and system. Man is one being, though his soul and body are conceived to be as distinct as his breath and his blood. His body is examined; its bones are counted; its muscles, nerves, veins, and arteries traced and described; its flesh weighed; its senses, nourishment, diseases, accurately noted and discriminated, with the relations of subservience and control of the parts to one another, and the conception of them as a whole, well understood. Yet the body is not the soul, nor yet is it the distinctive part of the man. That which characterizes man as man is his peculiar power to know, to feel, and to will. Each of these forms of the soul's activity, though in closest union, exhibits a peculiar contrast with the essential nature of the body.

Knowledge in its most comprehensive sense has several well-defined degrees. In its earliest form it is sensation. With the development of our faculties it becomes more distinctly perception. Memory attends every act of intelligence. Recollection grows with attention and education. Imagination shapes the inner ideal life. Reasoning methodizes and attests every operation of the cognitive faculty. We should mark that if there is anything certain in human knowledge it is the distinction between the being or agent that knows and the thing that is known. To feel this distinction is, in fact, the foundation of sensation, the most elementary act of knowledge. Consciousness, which is but a name to signify the mind's knowledge of itself in every form of activity, attests at the very outset the distinction between the outer world and the perceiving mind, the self and the not-self, and the very name *Intellect*—from *lego*, "to choose," and *inter*, "between," refers to this discriminating power. The existence of an external world, therefore, and of a perceiving mind, distinct from it, is not a hypothesis to account for a fact,

but the primal fact itself, without which every act of knowledge, and, therefore, every hypothesis, is impossible. Knowledge, moreover, is impossible, unless we believe that our faculties, whether of sensation or reflection, give us truth. Nothing can be more absurd than to suspect our faculties and then seek to verify them: because we can prove them only by themselves.

A single illustration will help us more vividly to realize what is knowledge. We will take the case of a young child, nursed by its mother, weaned, and then, say at the age of five, losing the mother by death. The child's first knowledge is of the taste of its food, the touch and warmth of its mother's frame, and the music of the mother's voice. These are elementary sensations. As time goes on, sight is added to them. Soon the child can perceive and recognize its mother's look and eye. It remembers and recalls its mother's tones and gestures. If death sever the tender tie, the imagination, even of a child of five, can form many a pathetic image of the departed mother, how she looked when she did this or that, what she may be now doing, and the like. Finally, with reasoning, often very keen and just, the youthful mind can recall that mother's lessons upon common as well as sacred themes; draw inferences, and accept conclusions upon truth and upon duty, that will affect the whole of life. There are other acts of the soul which accompany all these stages of knowledge; but I desire now to fix attention upon what is strictly knowledge. I take my illustration from the knowledge of a child, to show that even in this elementary stage it is still generically the same as that which in adults is variously described as sensation and perception, memory and recollection, imagination and reasoning. What the child learns in its first years, while it still imperfectly uses language, and can hardly distinguish between a verb and noun, is still generically the same knowledge as is afterward adorned by poetry, and systematized in philosophy and reasoning. Sensation makes it acquainted with hard and soft, sweet and sour,

color and sound; perception with the qualities of all bodies. Memory keeps what it knows; recollection summons it up at will. The child does not raise the question whether the tongue perceives what is sweet, or the *tympanum* knows sound, or the *retina* can see, or whether it is the mind alone that tastes and hears and sees. Nor does the child ask why it believes in the truthfulness of its own memory. We make bold to say that it knows that it is itself that tastes, and that what it tastes is not itself; and it believes without any doubt in the truthfulness of its memory of what it has seen and heard. We do not hesitate to think, moreover, that a man who gravely questions either of these points, has exchanged a child's belief for worse than childish doubt. It seems certain also, that as a young child naturally accepts the thought of its mother's continued existence, even after her corporeal frame has been hidden in the ground, so it readily comes to look upon its own body as rather the house and instrument of the soul, than as part of its very self. The thought exists as a fact among adult thinkers in all nations.

Having, then, laid as the foundation of knowledge the discrimination of ourselves from the world around us, the confidence in the truth of our faculties, the correspondence to fact both of what we perceive and of what we remember that we perceive, the mind asserts with equal confidence certain truths of reason, not as being deduced from any premises going before, or as being proved by anything clearer than them,<sup>1</sup> but as themselves the clear-

<sup>1</sup> "The main principles of reason are in themselves apparent. For to make nothing evident of itself unto man's understanding, were to take away all possibility of knowing anything. And herein that of Theophrastus is true: 'They that seek a reason of all things, do utterly overthrow reason' [*ἀπάντων ζητούντες λόγον ἀναίρουσι λόγον*, in *Metaph.*, pp. 270, 23]. In every kind of knowledge some such grounds there are as that, being proposed, the mind doth presently embrace them as free from all possibility of error, clear and manifest without proof."—Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, Bk. I., Ch. VIII., 5. Cf. Pascal's *De l'Esprit Géométrique*, *Pensées*, p. 359.

est of truths, and the means of proof for all other truths. The following are some of these truths of the reason: For every existence, material or spiritual, fact or phenomenon, there must be a Cause;¹ yet the succession of causes cannot be infinite, but must end in a Cause which is itself uncaused, a *causa causarum*.

Here is another truth of the reason: Wherever there are phenomena, or what we term qualities, it is necessary for us to believe that there is a *substance* in which they inhere; so that when we hear in natural philosophy of essential or of accessory properties, we inevitably think of a material substance; or when we perceive acts of intelligence, affection, purpose, we are constrained to refer them to a person—that is, a spiritual substance.

Reason also compels us to think that every material substance exists in *space*, to which, however, we can give no limit; and that every event, every change, in whatever substance, occurs in *time*; while we must affirm that the uncreated Cause exists in eternity.

Reason, also, looking at the spiritual substance, of which it is the light and the law, affirms that the will of man is free; that he is responsible for his actions, capable of being rewarded and punished with justice.

There is another action of the reason, of so peculiar a character that it should perhaps have a distinct name: I mean the conscience,² which might be called the spiritual

¹ It is curious to observe how the extreme sceptic's denial of cause when he explains it as "conjunction" or "invariable succession" merely (Hume), cuts up by the root the materialist's argument that thought and mind are the result of movements of molecules of the brain. This is confessed by Mill (*Logic*, Vol. I., p. 56. 7th Ed.), Tyndall, and Maudsley.

² "The early missionaries found no word in the Zulu language for 'conscience.' . . . I observed that they would use a saying, in

speaking of a thoroughly bad, wilful evil-doer, as a reason for his abiding evil-doing, 'He has been eaten up by Ugovana.' . . . 'Ugovana,' I inquired, 'who is he?' 'Oh!' it was answered, 'Ugovana is the *bad man* in us, and Unembeza is the *good man* in us.' I found, on inquiry, that the Zulu was speaking, not of a good and evil spirit, but that Ugovana was the personification of an evil heart, and Unembeza of a good heart; 'for,' said my informant, 'every man has two hearts in him,

reason. This also enounces truths, at once the most clear and the most important, because the most practical: that there is a right and wrong in human actions; that virtue and good are a reality for man; that every conscious and responsible being, without regard to nation, education, prejudice, recognizes in the depths of his conscience that reason ought to govern passion; that it is necessary to preserve sworn faith; that we must restore a treasure confided to us, despite the most urgent solicitation of interest. The truths of conscience are not only, like the other truths of reason, the clearest in their nature, and therefore not properly susceptible of proof, since there is nothing clearer; but, on the other hand, they are the ground of proof of the highest truths, and such as most concern us. In conscience the reason commands the will: "Do right; shun temptation." Obedience to these commands not only strengthens the character in general, but in particular gives clearness and confidence to the reason itself. The very etymology of conscience points to the fact that in this power the soul of man recognizes its law-giver, recognizes him as a Person; as one, moreover, who searches the depths of the heart, who loves and hates, and will reward and punish. Reason has no truth of greater certainty than that the intelligence, feeling, and will in the nature of man are a reflection of intelligence, feeling, and will, however exalted, in the maker of that nature. He is, therefore, a Person.

one urging him to do evil, and to leave off good—that is Ugovana; the other, not to do evil, but to do good—that is Unembeza. Ugovana comes to us with a big, blustering, but lying voice. He almost frightens us into doing evil, and calls us fools for not doing what we wish to do and our hearts tell us to do, and asks us why we have wishes and feelings given us, if not to gratify them? But just as we are about to do the evil, Unembeza comes, with a

little, tiny voice—so little that we scarcely hear him amid the noise Ugovana is making—and says: "No, no! do not that wicked thing. You know it is wicked! Do it not." But we usually listen to the more noisy importunity of Ugovana." This is followed by the anecdote of Iabisana and the four-pronged fork.—Bishop Callaway in Appendix II. to Wordsworth's *Bampton Lectures* for 1881, pp. 354, 355.

As the sciences, viewed abstractly, as metaphysics, astronomy, geology, physiology, etc., are referred to the intellect; as knowledge, used to stimulate or soothe, like poetry or rhetoric, is referred to the feelings; and as whatever addresses choice, or is designed to lead us to action, like oratory, ethics, history, is concerned with the will: so the conscience appears to witness to an original supernatural endowment when man heard directly the voice of his Maker and Ruler, his Father and Judge.

If the fact just referred to be admitted,<sup>1</sup> and its consequences seriously considered, it becomes inevitable that a certain weakness and disorder should result in each department of the soul's activity—in reasoning, in feeling, in doing. Let us examine this simply as a hypothesis, and observe whether the facts verify it. We have affirmed that there are certain truths of the reason so clear that they cannot be proved, because there is nothing clearer than they; and by means of them everything else must be proved. If this be true, it is a mark of weakness, not of strength or acuteness, to seek for proofs of these truths of the reason. The sceptical subtleties which affect to throw doubt upon the reality of an external world, upon the truth of our faculties, upon our certainty of cause or substance, should be regarded by healthy minds as the paralysis, rather than a laudable exertion, of the intellect. Not less certain is it that the irreligious metaphysics which affirm that we cannot know God, our Maker and Preserver, because we cannot think of Him as He is, that we can never be sure even that He exists, because He is infinite and we are finite, should be relegated to the domain of mental pathology, rather than seriously argued as a becoming and profitable intellectual gymnastic. It should never be admitted that it stands in need of proof

<sup>1</sup> "A fall of some sort or other— the creation, as it were, of the non-absolute—is the fundamental postulate of the moral history of man. Without this hypothesis, man is un- intelligible; with it, every phenomenon is explicable. The mystery itself is too profound for human insight."—Coleridge, see p. 214.

that the order in the world is the work of mind. It is just as little questionable<sup>1</sup> that the sense of right and wrong and of justice in human souls, was planted there by One who is just, and who commands the right and forbids the wrong. Something like the same might be said of the beauty and superfluous delight that wait here upon life everywhere, viz. : that they come from One who has benevolence and feeling. The difficulties which interrupt the sway of order or of justice, and intercept the purpose of benevolence, are not disproofs of the reality of these things or of their author, but simply indications that the government of the universe is too vast for us to judge of it as a whole. Our unwillingness to submit to this humbling thought, and our readiness, on the other hand, to throw away our certainty of the highest truth, is a proof not of mental health, but of disease; not of progress toward truth, but of a helpless drifting into the twilight, where nothing is clear.

This conclusion, then, we reach simply from examining the nature and attainments of the intellect: that it is fitted by nature and the very intention of its structure to seize and hold securely what we have called the truths of the reason, and many kindred truths, while as matter of fact it is found often to seem but dimly conscious of them, to grasp them feebly; and even as a sick man wanders in thought, confounding dreams with realities, so man's intellect is found confusing primary with secondary truth, axioms with corollaries, vaguely groping for evidence of what cannot be proved, missing in consequence the most important verities, through lack of

<sup>1</sup> Quidam dormitantes, ut ita dicam, qui neque alto somno stultitiæ sopiebantur, nec in sapientiæ lucem poterant evigilare, putaverunt nullam esse justitiam per se ipsam, sed unicuique genti consuetudinem suam justam videri; quæ cum sit diversa omnibus gentibus, debeat autem incommutabilis manere justitia, fieri

manifestum, nullam usquam esse justitiam. Non intellexerunt (ne multa commemorem), 'Quod tibi fieri non vis, alii ne feceris,' nullo modo posse ulla eorum gentili diversitati variari. Quæ sententia cum refertur ad dilectionem Dei, omnia flagitia moriuntur; cum ad proximi, omnia facinora. —S. Aug., *De Doctr. Christ.*, III., 14,

power to estimate their evidence. A fair history of philosophy would prove to be, in fact, a diagnosis of mental pathology. Its endless questionings, running their weary and monotonous round, if viewed apart from the destiny of immortal souls, by a thoroughly healthy mind, would awaken, not perplexity, but only scorn and pity. Such is the difference, then, between the intellect in an ideal condition—or, to use the language of religion, of man unfallen—and the same intellect in man since his fall. It is manifest, besides, that a view of religion mainly the result of the development of the intellect, like that of modern civilization, and ignoring the conscience, will be so partial and one-sided as to deserve to be pronounced false; not coming so near the truth, on the whole, as the simpler view of primitive and barbarous tribes, with their vivid sense of guilt, the need of expiation, etc.

If we look at that province of the soul's energies which we have called the feelings, we shall reach a like conclusion. It should never be forgotten, when we speak of different departments of the soul's activity, that we do not mean in any degree to disparage its unity. It is the same indivisible spiritual essence which knows, and feels, and chooses. We distinguish these things, not to divide them, but in order to study each with more precision. Every great and fruitful truth is, and should be, accompanied by feeling, and lead to choice. What are called the fine arts are in a peculiar way addressed to the feelings. This does not mean that they are divorced from the intellect, which is, in fact, to degrade them; but that they exhibit knowledge, the loftiest thoughts, in such a way as to move us, to excite or to soothe, to mould us by sympathy, to give us pleasure. One of these arts (sculpture) makes use of form merely; another adds the varied play

† The fall of man is acknowledged that he is by nature sinful; and the by unbelieving philosophers. "In sinful nature propagating itself, there the self-assertion of the flesh against arises an *original* sinfulness."—Frauenstädt, *Religion. der Natur.* p. 176.  
since man is by nature subject to this tyranny of the flesh, it follows

of color ; architecture, when a fine art, subordinates even necessity and use to the expression of beauty. Music is the direct utterance of pure feeling. When listening to the voices that execute the melodies of Leo, Durante, or Pergolesi, in the Vatican during Holy Week, the souls of the hearers, says Cousin, "have entered heaven for a moment, and been able to ascend thither without distinction of rank, country, even belief, by those invisible and mysterious steps, composed, thus to speak, of all the simple, natural, universal sentiments that everywhere on earth draw from the bosom of the human creature a sigh toward another world." <sup>1</sup>

Rhetoric presents argument with the charms and splendor of figures and metaphor and pictured expression ; while poetry adds to language the subtle force of the sister art of music, and thus attunes with a new power the most forceful, varied, and delicate instrument by which the soul can be moved in all its parts and depths, whether of intellect, feeling, or will. Poetry may be said especially to address the feelings, because its primary law is to give pleasure, while it imparts the blossom and fragrance of all knowledge, and lends significance and attraction to all science that is real. All the poetry of the world that has the breath of immortality about it testifies to the fact that man cannot be moved to his loftiest efforts, and so reach the perfection of his nature, except through faith and religion, the sentiment of loyalty, where the "law" is associated inseparably with a Person, the acknowledgment of God, the maker and ruler of the world. Pantheism, atheism, sceptical philosophy, have never inspired true poetry, because they are the paralysis and death of generous emotion, as they are the negation of the sound and healthful thinking native to strong and unperverted human souls. The most poetical parts of the *Bhagavad Gita* and of Lucretius are not philosophical at all, but simply sensuous pictures of

<sup>1</sup> " True, Beautiful, and Good," *Lect. IX.*, pp. 172, 173.

nature, or the passionate revolt against certain obnoxious restraints of religion.

We have preferred to look at the expressions of the soul's energy in the department of feeling through the characteristic arts and the forms of rhetoric and poetry in which it thus utters itself, rather than through any abstract doctrine concerning this expression, because the truth thus reached seems more vivid and direct, and less open to prejudice, and because whatever abstract principles we desire to establish concerning feeling are with most propriety directly deduced from such facts. What, then, do we learn concerning the nature and condition of feeling in man, when ideally perfect? Feeling is not a defect; it is not a weakness; it is not something to be discouraged, far less extirpated. On the contrary, it is a true part of the rich endowment of the nature of man, giving that nature both strength and variety; and feeling coöperates powerfully and effectively with the loftiest and most strenuous exertions of the reason and the will. The lesson we learn from the fine arts, and with most emphasis from the masterpieces in each art, is, that feeling is most effective and powerful precisely when it is subjected to rule and exactly expresses some law. Music is sound measured by time: no melody however simple, no harmony however complicated, can escape this law. The instinct of the greatest painters teaches them in their best works—such as are to win lasting admiration—always to subordinate what is lower to what is higher, color to truth of expression or exactness in drawing, cunning to innocence, lust to purity, the trivial and humorous to what is serious and religious. The orator, even when he condescends to wrangle against an adverse cause, gives to his indignation a regulated expression, and in the utmost tension of passion is careful to preserve self-control and something of dignity. For passion ceases to be strength precisely when feeling escapes control; and, as etymology shows us, the true man *suffers* constraint, instead of putting forth energy. The poet, by adding to

language the charm of music, cannot only lend interest to common things, and fix in the memory trivial details, but can enable us to contemplate extremities of effort and of suffering too harrowing for mortal endurance in unadorned prose. And why? Because, no doubt, feeling thus expressed—that is, under measure and law—acknowledges the supremacy of the spiritual and the eternal, and points to the strength that triumphs in heroes and saints. It is a commonplace in literature, and especially among the poets, that the perfection of love consists in self-abandonment, without calculation or restraint. This, which sounds like extravagance in any inferior application, is, in fact, the sober truth in the sphere of religion. We are bidden love God simply without limit: that love is the very life of faith, the substance of our hope. Therefore, we must be,

“ All made of faith and service,  
 All made of passion.  
 All adoration, duty, and observance,  
 All humbleness, all patience, and impatience,  
 All purity, all trial, all obeisance.”

To sum up, then, what the study of the department of the feelings in man's nature teaches us in reference to his ideal perfection and his present condition: it is plain that only in union with God, who alone is worthy of all his love and can satisfy it, can man secure the perfection and bliss for which he was made. It is equally plain that he is now deprived of this union, whether we say, as religion teaches, that he has fallen from what he once enjoyed, or has not yet attained that natural perfection of which he is dimly conscious, and toward which all that is best in him ever strives. To the natural man it should be the mark of truth in any religion that bids him love God and hate himself. To perceive and acknowledge his misery is man's first step in turning toward his true help.

\* “ La vraie religion doit avoir pour ordonné ; la nôtre l'a fait. . . Nulle  
 marque d'obliger à aimer son Dieu. autre religion n'a proposé de se haïr.”  
 Cela est bien juste. Et cependant —Pascal, *Pensées*, Art. III., I, v.  
 aucune autre que la nôtre ne l'a

The mention of this turning naturally directs our thoughts to the third department of the spirit's energies, namely, the will. The action of the will is the most characteristic of the spiritual and immortal nature of man. A celebrated modern definition of character is that it is "a completely formed will."<sup>1</sup> "Choice," or "deliberate preference," Aristotle says, "appears to be most intimately connected with virtue, and even more than actions to be a test of character."<sup>2</sup> The consciousness of one's will, the power to choose, is an immediate, primitive intuition, the inseparable attendant and witness of personality, the very fact which makes us responsible beings. Though most intimately associated with reason and feeling, the will is perfectly separable in thought from either. We can choose after deliberation, or even before it; we can choose with desire, or without it, or even against it.<sup>3</sup> Again, in the will it is probable is the origin of the ideas of power and cause, the basis of all science. Take, for instance, the law most typical of science in its triumphs, the law which is still the glory of the most perfect of the sciences: I mean the law of gravitation. What says the discoverer and formulator of this law, Sir Isaac Newton, concerning it? "It is inconceivable," says Newton, "that inanimate, brute matter should, without the mediation of something else which is not material, operate upon and affect other matter *without material contact*. That gravity should be innate, inherent, and essential to matter, so that one body may act on another at a distance, through a vacuum, without the mediation of anything else by and through which their action and force may be conveyed from one to another, is to me so great an ab-

<sup>1</sup> "Ein Charakter ist ein vollkommen gebildete Wille."—*Novalis*, II., 284.

<sup>2</sup> προαίρεισις . . . οὐκ αἰότατον γὰρ εἶναι δοκεῖ τῆ ἀρετῆς, καὶ μᾶλλον τὰ ἡσθη κρίνειν τῶν πράξεων.—*Ethic. Nic.*, III., 2.

<sup>3</sup> Man will not follow where a rule is shown.

But loves to take a method of his own ;  
Explain the way with all your care and skill,

This will he quit, if but to prove he will.

Crabbe, Tale I, *The Dumb Orators*.

All too late comes counsel to be heard,  
Where will doth mutiny with wit's regard.

Shakespeare's *Rich. II.*

surdity that I believe no one who in philosophical matters has a competent faculty of thinking can ever fall into it.”<sup>1</sup> Sir John Herschell plainly expresses the conclusion to which Newton’s words point. “It is but reasonable,” he says, “to regard gravity as the present effort of a will.”<sup>2</sup> To the same effect is the conclusion of Leibnitz: “The laws of motion are an effect of the will and wisdom of God. Hence these laws are a wonderful proof of the existence of an intelligent and free Being.” If any one should ask in surprise: Why, then, do not all men of science, without exception, draw the conclusion so clear to Newton, Herschell, and Leibnitz? (since these men have never been surpassed, and are never likely to be surpassed, in strength of intellect or in clearness of scientific apprehension.) The only answer is that other men have not drawn the same conclusion for no other reason than that they did not *choose* to draw it; they had not the *will* to do it. To prove this, it is enough to quote John Stuart Mill’s comment on these words of Newton; he simply retorts them upon the great philosopher, and says that they mark the want of “a competent faculty of thinking in Newton himself.”<sup>4</sup> It is, of course, as easy for an atheist to believe that Newton was an idiot as that the world is without an intelligent Creator.

We shall be compelled, I think, here to admit a conclusion which I imagine will seem surprising to many minds, viz., that even the truths most plainly deduced by the reason, and the clearest inductions of science, depend finally, as far as we are concerned, upon our wills. We may, in other words, refuse to see these truths, or to admit these inductions, if we choose. The numerous questioners all around us, of the most elementary truths, prove this sufficiently as a matter of fact. But the point

<sup>1</sup> Playfair’s *Dissertation on the Progress of Math. and Phys. Science.*

<sup>2</sup> *Outlines of Astronomy*, Fifth Ed., p. 291; “the direct or indirect re-

sult of a consciousness or will existing somewhere.”

<sup>3</sup> *Theodicee*, P. II., § 345.

<sup>4</sup> *Logic*, Bk. V., Ch. III., p. 461. Am. Ed.

has been of late articulately admitted by a distinguished writer upon science. "Pure scientific thought," says Joseph John Murphy, "perfectly differentiated from feeling, needs the action of will to make it work."<sup>1</sup>

The numerous facts which exemplify this statement ought not to be regarded properly as additions to knowledge, but rather as pathological cases, indications of our impotency to grasp knowledge. But the denial of scientific truth is not the worst form of the disease. He who can deny the existence of cause, dispute design, confound subject and object, can also question the distinction between right and wrong, cast off duty, resolve conscience into habit and tradition. It is true that the sophist habitually shrinks from this categorical repudiation of duty and right and the commands of conscience, with more sensitiveness than he betrays toward the sophisms of the intellect, because he shuns the indignant rebuke of plain and honest minds that do not enter into verbal refinements. He shelters his moral baseness under discussions about freedom of the will, necessity, motives, environment, and the like. But the will is free. Of this we are as sure as that we exist and are responsible. "Science has not succeeded in showing that human will comes under the rule of the uniformity of nature."<sup>2</sup> It is in fact of the very nature of the will that it can choose, or not choose, or refuse. Real compulsion is nothing less than the destruction of the will. This, besides being a truth of the consciousness, and therefore such as every man can give himself better evidence of than any other can give him, is also confirmed and illustrated by every imaginable kind of proof. It is admitted by adversaries who theoretically deny the freedom of the will, as the great English authority upon the Evidences, Bishop Butler, has shown; for while they deny it in theory, in the business of life they act as if the will were free. Human laws are based

<sup>1</sup> *Habit and Intelligence*, Vol. II.,      <sup>2</sup> Bp. Temple (of Exeter's Bampton Lectures, L. VII., p. 218.  
Ch. XXXIV., pp. 83, 84. Macm.,  
London, 1869.

upon this great fact, which lies at the foundation of every form of the State. In the well-known distinction between legislative, judicial, and executive departments, the executive represents the will. No laws profess to punish or reward an action which is not free. "Wills," in the legal sense, are not valid, and the State refuses to execute them, unless they are made without constraint, and while the faculties are still sound and firm enough to insure responsibility. The institution which lies at the basis of society, marriage, is valid under the sanction of no rite, civil or religious, except through the consent of wills. Such evidence of this great truth from the common sense and practical reason of men of affairs can never be shaken or brought into real uncertainty by the abstractions of sophists or metaphysicians.

It is safe to say that the wisdom of all men, or of mankind, is greater than the wisdom of any one man. We can then see how the ideal man is a reflection of society. The abstract truths, therefore, which have a witness in all language, the elementary duties which lie at the base of all the best and most intelligent laws, should never be permitted to be questioned as if they were obscure or really doubtful. A healthful mind may, indeed, contemplate and unravel the perplexities of casuistry as an educational exercise or for the comfort of some diseased soul, but never precisely with relish or as if really at a loss for the true answer. It is precisely because the will is shrinking from the rule of strict duty that the intellect pleads obscurity or difficulty in drawing the abstract lines between right and wrong. Burke's golden words on this subject are deserving of being often recalled to mind. "It is not right to turn our duties into doubts. They are imposed to govern our conduct, not to exercise our ingenuity; and, therefore, our opinions about them ought not to be in a state of fluctuation, but steady, sure, and resolved." "Every duty," says Burke, "is a limitation of some power. . . . Duties are not voluntary. Duty and will are even contradictory terms. . . . Neither the few nor the many

have a right to act merely by their will in any matter connected with duty, trust, engagement or obligation." <sup>1</sup> The true rule, then, for the typical man is expressed in the words which a great artist at the close of the middle ages took for his life's motto: "Make duty the choice of thy will." <sup>2</sup>

To sum up, therefore, the results of our studies of the reason, the feelings, and the will: The perfection of the reason lies in holding firmly and steadily the truths which are intuitive, in perceiving clearly what admits of proof and what is the basis of every proof, in always refusing to treat original truths as if derivative, or truths of inference as if original, or the results of induction as if necessary and universal. The perfection of feeling lies in being quick and sensitive to every impression, external and internal—the beauty of the world, the delights of society, the claims of duty, the finer appeals to charity, pity, chivalry, honor: and yet, while recognizing the power of every appeal, to sense or to spirit, to be able to put a control upon all, so that in the very height and whirlwind of passion no being shall lose the rule over himself, but that every feeling, however powerful or however subtle, shall have its most suitable and moving expression according to some order or measure. The perfection of the will, lastly, lies in giving fixedness and promptness to the truths of the reason, and the right impulses of feeling, whose very perfections we cannot describe without referring to the action of the will. This is because, as we have said, in the will seems to reside our very personality, not that alone which makes us individuals, but the very fact of our enduring and responsible life. To give up reason is folly, to give way to passion is brutish, but to surrender our wills is to surrender our very selves. Carried out in the strictness of truth, a crushed will is nothing less than personal annihilation. This is, therefore, a literal impossibility so long as the spiritual being survives. The law-

<sup>1</sup> Burke's *Works*, Vol. III., 389-391, 394.

<sup>2</sup> "Vogli sempre chel che tu debbi."  
—Leonardo da Vinci.

yers have a maxim that "the will compelled is yet the will." Every degree of weakness may be imagined compatible with life; but the compulsion which does not kill also, does not destroy responsibility. Hence, force applied to the will is used in language to express every degree of degradation or of exaltation. Intellectual error, however stupid or irrational, is pardonable if produced through lack of cultivation, by evil surroundings, by the force of examples; but there is a peculiar degradation about the sophisms of the reason, when they are paraded with deliberate relish, to confound the simple, to shock the religious, to deprave or confuse the sanctities of right and wrong. So, again, the untrained victim of passion, the coarse, the unreflective, the unwary, are very different from him who makes the gratification of passion or appetite the object of deliberate planning or scheming; and the reason is that the latter puts his will into his excesses. It is instructive, however, to note that, in the eye of religion, one who puts neither heart nor will into the good or the ill that he does, who is lukewarm alike in the service of God and of the devil, is more abominable than even the energetic transgressor. The poison that paralyzes the will may be more fatal than the poison which drives it to frenzy. On the other hand, almost any abstract doctrine of reason, maintained with any consistency or firmness, above all upheld against opposition or at some self-sacrifice, will obtain respect from this very infusion of will. And how exalted become the affections, even when slight in character or unworthily placed, when they are quietly cherished through lapse of time, or amid perils, threatening, and death.

What is it, then, we ask finally, that can win the will of man? Let us understand the importance of this question. Knowledge or reasoning cannot win the will; no abstract philosophy nor doctrine, enforced by whatever charm of eloquence. The will can receive, or reject, or make reasons for itself, without giving account. The will may be assaulted or bribed, through passion

or desire, but never really won. Neither pagan wisdom nor the Muhammedan's paradise of sense can ever satisfy the soul of man. It is quite evident that as reason and feeling are each addressed by what is proper to their nature, so the will must have its own fitting address. The will, then, we affirm, can be won only by another will speaking directly to it. Under the wide heaven, upon the whole earth, there is nothing else that can thoroughly master the immortal spirit that is in man but another Spirit whose image it is. This is the power that can humble the haughtiness of the proud, and lift up the lowly from his despair. The original sin of man, without doubt, lay in his will: for that sin was pride. He separated himself from his Maker: he would be a god unto himself. He lifted his impious hand with impotent malice against the Author alike of his being and his happiness. No wise reasons, no promise of delight can show the soul its folly, or beguile it from its ruin. When the Almighty therefore determined to save His creature, the child formed in His own image, He sent unto him finally an appeal more effective than wisdom or promise or threat: He sent to man His Incarnate Son, in the likeness of men, bearing the burdens and trials of this earthly life. *He* spake directly to man, in whose voice were not only wisdom and power, all the treasures of wisdom and the infinitude of power, but the accents of kindness, of good-will, of love. Here alone is He who can both win and keep the immortal soul of man. Here is something which every soul, of every condition, young and old, pure or fallen, wise and simple, can understand, can feel, can grasp. The youngest child looks up in its mother's face, and reads the character that speaks to it there. Character is a lesson, a message, which every variety of man, cultivated or barbarous, can read without instruction and understand without knowledge. In the face of its Saviour and Redeemer every soul can read the message of pardon, and the ground of its hope of salvation. "He guides us," as Holy Scripture speaks, "with His eye."

He has ordained, it is true, a kingdom of souls, like ourselves, for the education and perfection of our recovered life. But all the way, from the beginning to the close of that recovery, the brightness of that face is the source, the strength, the life of our souls. It turns the very bitterness of our sins and of our despair into a healing medicine. Our Lord can restore us as He restored His great apostle by a look. "What is virtue," asks Hooker, "but a medicine, and vice but a wound? Yet we have so often deeply wounded ourselves with medicine, that God hath been fain to make wounds medicinal. . . . Ask the very soul of Peter, and it shall undoubtedly make you this answer: My eager protestations, made in the glory of my spiritual strength, I am ashamed of. But my shame, and the tears with which my presumption and my weakness were bewailed, recur in the songs of my thanksgiving. My strength hath been my ruin, my fall hath proved my stay."

## LECTURE IV.

---

### THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE object of this lecture is neither to attempt to give an account of the contents of the Old Testament—which would be quite impossible in one lecture, or in many—nor even to pronounce an edifying discourse, taking the Old Testament for a text; for the subject is too great. My object is to weigh certain leading characteristics of this first part of the Bible, such matters as would first arrest the attention, awaken the interest, secure the conviction of a thoughtful mind looking for the evidence of a supernatural Revelation from Almighty God. Before beginning, I would like to make two remarks: one upon the subject, the other upon the inquirer. I direct my attention now chiefly to the Old Testament, not merely because this is viewed with more convenience first by itself, nor as forgetting that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are really a unit—the New, as S. Augustine said—being latent in the Old, and the Old revealed in the New—but because there have been two distinct Revelations, the first preparatory to the second. I remark, next, in regard to the character of the inquirer to whom this evidence is now to be offered, that a certain preparation is necessary in order that it may be appreciated or even understood. Aristotle, you may remember, said: “He, in each subject-matter, is a judge who is well educated in that subject-matter, and he is in an absolute sense a judge who is in all of them well educated.” “A well-educated man will expect exactness in every class of subjects, ac-

ording as the nature of the thing admits; for it is much the same mistake to put up with a mathematician using probabilities, and to require demonstration of an orator.”<sup>1</sup> These words of the wise heathen, after all, suggest the same lesson as our Lord prefixed to His teaching: “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.” “He that is of God, heareth God’s words.”<sup>2</sup> I do not now stipulate for mental cultivation or learning, for knowledge of history or of language; but for a candid mind, for such virtues as natural religion has everywhere taught men, a hatred of impurity, falsehood, cruelty; some humility arising from a sense of sin; a willingness and even an expectation to hear that God has spoken to His creatures. Without some such preparation the evidence for religion will be as sounds to the deaf, or as colors to the blind. Neither the evidence now to be given, nor any part of religious evidence, however splendid and convincing, is of the nature of resistless demonstration, compelling the assent of unwilling or disobedient minds.

The English Bible contains 66 books—39 of the Old and 27 of the New Testament. I do not here reckon the 14 books of the Apocrypha mentioned in the Sixth Article of the English and American church, all of which, save three,<sup>3</sup> are placed among the Canonical Books by the church of Rome, though not by its great doctor and author of the Vulgate,<sup>4</sup> S. Jerome. Fixing our thoughts upon the 39 books of the Old Testament, the first impression that occurs to the mind, upon the most general consideration, is of their very miscellaneous character, that they are rather a collection of different books, than in any sense One Book. The Jews characterized their Scriptures, the same of which we are now speaking, as the Law, the Prophets, and the Sacred Writings—mean-

<sup>1</sup> *Nicomachean Ethics*.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. xi. 15.

<sup>3</sup> The Prayer of Manasses, and the Third and Fourth Books of Esdras.

<sup>4</sup> Except the Psalms, which is the

old Italic Psalter corrected by S. Jerome; and the Apocryphal books of Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the two of Maccabees, which are retained from the old Latin version.

ing by the Law the five books of Moses; by the Prophets, first the Elder Prophets, who wrote the six books entitled Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and next the fifteen Later Prophets, including Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, beginning with Hosea and ending with Malachi; and finally, under the general term Sacred Writings, including the thirteen, the Psalms (which sometimes gave its name to the whole division), Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the two Books of Chronicles.

I have gone into this detail not only to remind you of the miscellaneous character of the contents of the Old Testament, but to call up before your minds some of the very elements of this variety:—that you have here a history of the formation of heaven and earth, of the rise of the tribes and kingdoms of men, and especially of that chosen people and kingdom intrusted with Revelation; the first Covenant; that family of man through whom the Incarnate Son of God was to be born; the civil and religious constitution of the theocracy, its schisms, its judges, its two lines of kings, its prophets, its great men, its private heroes, its typical saints; the most marvellous of earthly histories, the most exalted of earthly literatures, legislation, narrative, the lessons of homely and practical wisdom, the loftiest strains of piety, the adumbration of the Christian character and of the Catholic Church, its teaching and worship, and in particular the miraculous image of Him who is its foundation and its life; and along with law, with annals, with ritual, and intermingled with their details, humble individual histories, the sins of the great, human infirmities, the fortunes of an empire or a mighty city, treated in their great outlines or with homely minuteness;—every part of these compositions flavored with the peculiar characters of their human writers, prophet, law-giver, shepherd, herdsman, king, priest, poet, or seer, yet rising in spiritual insight to a vision of the eternal world, and describing the fortunes and experiences

of men, the past and future of the whole earth, not only with fidelity to facts, but with a dignity, a grandeur, a poetic splendor, that have never been surpassed.

No thoughtful observer, however briefly he may consider the contents of the Old Testament, can avoid the impression, that, in spite of the apparent diversity of the books, their matter, their treatment, their authors, they are still in substance one: I speak not now of the unity of the Old Testament with the New, which will appear further on, but that the Old has a completeness and oneness of its own, as much as if every part had the same Author (which we are convinced it had), and subserved a single end. The unity of the Old Testament consists not only in the fact that it was written in the Hebrew language, but that it was the possession of that one marvellous people, given to them by its Author as the repository among men of His Revelation, the charter of their national and the food of their spiritual life, the law of their worship, the record of the judgments and mercies vouchsafed to them and visited upon them. Nothing could be more absurd, upon the face of the matter, than for any individual to suppose he understands these sacred writings better than the people whose possession they were. Yet because Christians have convicted the Jews of one great perversion, namely, in their conception of the Messiah, persons have assumed without grounds that they knew better than the Jews the authors and the dates of their sacred books. But we are to remember that the first Christians were Jews, and that the Christian interpretation of the prophets once prevailed among the Jews themselves. Their obdurate blindness respecting the true Messiah is itself predicted in the very prophecies, of the letter of which they have ever proved most faithful custodians. But let us cast aside the absurd imagination that pedantic philologists, or so-called theologians, who do not believe in a Kingdom of God, can give us any information respecting the author of the Pentateuch, or overthrow the tradition on any such point of the nation

most jealous of any in history in the preservation of its records.

To examine the Old Testament is to examine a history that can be tested by much of the history of the ancient world, a religion whose immediate Divine authorship is best established by direct comparison with all natural religion, a literature immeasurably above every other in dignity and the marks of genius, a succession of great men comparable to the first in any land, and upon the whole a grand career, shining, memorable, unique, and as little obscure in its evidence and results as anything that has ever happened in the world. The principles of this book lie at the base, and must lie at the base, of every real system of morals, legislation, and religion, because they are founded in truth, and correspond to the nature of things and to the nature of man. This we proceed to make good by considering, in a general way, the history, the religion, the individual men and women, and the literary character of the Old Testament.

I. The first book, the Book of Generations, Genesis, starts off with the origin of our race and an account of the leading branches that have peopled the world. It tells us of a happy beginning, of which all nations have preserved a tradition, a simple, impressive narrative of sin and resulting misery, and the reception of a promise and hope of recovery. After the Flood Noah's sons receive a prophecy foreshadowing the world's future, the religious prerogatives of Shem, the temporal dominion of Japhet, the subjection and slavery of Ham. The unity of the account and the credibility of the details may be realized by remembering, what Pascal<sup>1</sup> notes, that Shem who saw Lamech, who saw Adam, lived to see Abraham who saw Jacob, who saw those who saw Moses, who has described the Creation and the Deluge. In the tenth chapter of Genesis is an enumeration of seventy nations according to the Hebrew expositors,<sup>2</sup> or of sev-

<sup>1</sup> *Pensées*, II., 18.

<sup>2</sup> Jonathan, *Targum*, Ch. VII.

enty-two according to the Christian Fathers.<sup>1</sup> Only two of Japhet's descendants are described, Gomer and Javan; the descendants of Ham, especially the Canaanites, are enumerated more particularly; but the whole catalogue converges toward Abraham, of the family of Shem, and through his seed to Christ. We have thus suggested to us in the beginning of history—for all worldly histories take their rise here, and confirm this outline—how, while the worldly dominions are recognized, the sacred narrative is chiefly concerned with the story of sin, of its punishment and of its Remedy.

The history of Abraham and his descendants is at the same time the longest, the most memorable, and the best preserved historical narrative in the world. Among the confirmations of Scripture history dug out of the sand during the present generation, the site of Ur of the Chaldees is identified beyond all doubt.<sup>2</sup> The Holy Land is filled with memorials of the patriarch and his posterity—from the day when on Mt. Moriah he exhibited in figure the greatest event in the world's history, to the latest visit of a Jew to the ruins of Jerusalem—records which are as enduring as its rocks and mountains. The wanderings of the Israelites from Sinai to Canaan are confirmed by the most exact geographical study of those scenes. So the life of Joshua and the various sites of his battles show “a detailed harmony” with the facts of geography, enough to prove that “we are dealing not with shadows, but with realities of flesh and blood.”<sup>3</sup> Not upon Gibeon and Ajalon<sup>4</sup> alone was the arm of Omnipotence made bare. The Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions have confirmed not merely what the Scripture history says of Hagarites or Hagarenes, “Queens of the Arabs,” Moabites and Amorites, and finally of the kingdom of the Hittites, but also

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Alex., Strom. I., Epiph. Hær., § 5, 39. Cf. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, XVI., 3. S. Jerome on S. Matt. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Sir H. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Vol. I,

<sup>3</sup> Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, pref., p. xviii.

<sup>4</sup> Joshua, x. 12-14.

the fact<sup>1</sup> that the king of Assyria carried Manasseh to Babylon, and the statements in Daniel concerning the last king of Babylon, to the confusion of rationalists (like Kuenen and Wellhausen) who had quoted Herodotus, Berosus, etc., in contradiction. So Bunsen had before been compelled by the same deciphered inscriptions to admit the statement of Scripture about an Asiatic Kush. Natural history<sup>2</sup> has lately contributed the fact that of the nine animals found in the list of the clean and the unclean in Deuteronomy and not in Leviticus, six, viz., the fallow deer, wild goat, pygarg, wild ox, chamois, and gledge (believed to be the same as the babale, ibex, oryx, addax, moufflon, and buzzard), are still found in the wilderness and the Eastern plateau, desert, open plains, or bare rocky heights, but are not and never could have been inhabitants of the hilly, wooded, and cultivated western Palestine. Common fairness, also, will compel the acknowledgment that profane writers,<sup>3</sup> like Moses of Chorene, Procopius, and Suidas, attest the conquest of Canaan by Joshua. What Scripture says of Sidon is confirmed by Homer, Strabo, and Justin; and Homer, Menander, and others agree in the descriptions of Phœnician habits. The books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles bear the marks of contemporary records and eye-witnesses. David's Psalms are a commentary on the history. His Syrian war is described also by Nicolas of Damascus from the records of his native city. The Phœnician historians Dios and Menander prove that Hiram is a true Phœnician royal name. The confirmations from every quarter, old and new, writings and inscriptions, of the Scripture picture of Solomon, are innumerable.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11.

<sup>2</sup> Canon Tristram's paper before Church Congress at Carlisle, 1884.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. Rawlinson's *Bampton Lectures* for 1859, on "The Historical Evidences," etc.

<sup>4</sup> Paley (*Evidences*, Pt. II., Ch. VI.)

has collected from Lardner some of the most striking coincidences in matters of history between facts mentioned "in the New Testament and in foreign and independent accounts."

The great outlines, then, first of universal history in the beginning of the Pentateuch, and then through the rest of the Old Testament, the sketch of the forming of a chosen people to be the seed-plot of the Catholic Church, with glimpses here and there of the great world powers; or, to specify the critical events and periods of the sacred community, the call of Abraham, his sojourn in Canaan; the fortunes of Isaac and Jacob, the descent into Egypt, the history of Joseph, the return through the wilderness to the promised land under Moses, with the giving of the law; the conquest under Joshua, and the rule of the Judges; the kingdom under David and Solomon, the schism of the Ten Tribes, the captivity in Babylon and the return—these events are better preserved than any other past events in the world: first, by the valid history in all nations; next, by specific rites, institutions and express commemorations; third, by written records carefully guarded. The traditions, the race characteristics, the languages, confirm the sacred narrative of the dispersion; the rite of circumcision, the Paschal celebration, the Feast of Pentecost, and the Sabbath, the Sabbatical year, and Jubilee, preserved each its distinct memory. "Great events and great men," says Guizot, "are the fixed points and the peaks of history; and it is thence that we can observe it in its totality, and follow it along its highways."

There are two things which make the history in the Old Testament, viewed simply as history, peculiarly sure and credible. (1) First, its records were apparently written to be recited and kept with a peculiar care. The Hebrew church from a very early period, especially in their synagogue worship, divided "the Law" into fifty-four portions to be read in orderly succession on each occasion of meeting, with a corresponding portion of "the Prophets." Under this latter name, as I have said, the historical books were included. (2) Next, while recounting the history of the chosen nation, it is quite plain that the

<sup>1</sup> *Popular History of France*, pref. to Vol. I., pp. 7, 8. Tr. by R. Black

inspired historian does not mistake its position when compared with the great powers, Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Macedonia, Rome, that sway in turn the temporal affairs of the world. They have a greatness of their own, material, transitory; each discharging a function, at one time persecuting, again protecting, again avenging, and finally propagating, the Kingdom of God. But even in temporal vitality that kingdom outlasts them all, and goes forward confident in its mighty destiny to absorb into itself whatever is worthy to endure.

II. The religion of the Old Testament may be said to find its key-note in its opening words, the first verse of the first book: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The universe is therefore God's still, whatever has happened within it. It is His by creation, though His creature man has turned away and disowned his Maker. The moral world, like the physical, became "without form and void," with darkness brooding over its deep. The Revelation that was sent may be likened to that natural light, the sublime record of whose creation so moved a great heathen teacher:<sup>1</sup> "And God said, Let there be light." The religion of the Old Testament is a Revelation of the presence of Almighty God amid a rebellious world, unseen and dimly felt by the multitude, recognized with increasing clearness by a chosen few, who are trained, educated, tried, by successive disclosures and experiences. They are illuminated by the tests they successfully endure, taught by the discipline of adversity and prosperity. There can be no doubt that the history of the chosen people is part of the Revelation to them. They are taught also by the direct disclosure of facts and doctrines, hidden from the natural reason, by a ritual worship, and by prophecy. In the narrative<sup>2</sup> of the crea-

<sup>1</sup> Longinus.

<sup>2</sup> "Never yet on Egyptian obelisk or Assyrian frieze—where long lines of figures seem stalking across the granite, each charged with symbol and mystery—have our Layards or Rawlinsons seen aught so extraordinary as

that long procession of being which, starting out of the blank depths of the bygone eternity, is still defiling across the stage, and of which we ourselves form some of the passing figures."—Hugh Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks*, Lect. II., p. 136.

tion, described as a slow and solemn march proceeding through great periods of time, God is proclaimed as in every part of it, and as pronouncing it all "very good." We may believe this firmly on His word, though we know little of the real nature of matter or of spirit, save that He is the author of both; and that the Almighty added to insensate matter, as His own peculiar gift, life, which no material thing can still transmit save through a living organism; and that He further crowned His highest living creature here, made in His own Image, with knowledge of Himself and with immortality.<sup>1</sup> When that creature through abuse of freedom turned from the Source of felicity, it lost the heavenly light, and groped in the darkness of mere earthly illumination. Its way back to its true home must then be won by Divine promises, kindling in the heart of faith a deathless hope; and faith, and love, tested through the journey of life by a humble obedience.

The Old Testament as certainly as the New reveals a God who is Almighty, Omniscient, spiritual, just, a Father at once and a Judge, long-suffering and merciful, "yet by no means clearing the guilty."<sup>2</sup> It reveals to man, as the law of life and perfection, the golden rule, "Love thy neighbor as thyself,"<sup>3</sup> no less plainly than the command to love God supremely—the summary of the Law and the Prophets. We find there many of the Beatitudes and much of the Lord's Prayer. Thrice in the Old Testament is the command implied, if not given, "Love your enemies."<sup>4</sup> The Rabbi Hillel is still quoted in the Jewish Catechism as saying, "What you do not wish done to you, do not to others; upon this rests the whole Thorah."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gen. ii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i. 1; xvii. 1; xviii. 25. Ex. vi. 2, 3 (cf. Ex. iii. 13-16.); xx. 22, 23; xxxiv. 6, 7. Deut. i. 31; xxxii. 11, 12. 1 Chron. xxix. 10. Is. lxiii. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Lev. xix. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Ex. xxiii. 4, 5; xx. 22; xxv. 21.

See an exact list of the quotations of the Old Testament in the New in *Horne's Introduction*, Pt. I., Ch. IV., Vol. I., pp. 293-314.

<sup>5</sup> *Talmud*, 20 Sabbath, F. 31. Cf. Tobit, iv. 15. Gibbon says he found the precept in Isocrates.

The seven nations of Canaan, as did all the heathen world, sacrificed their own children to their cruel gods. The Almighty once put His own worshipper, the man of typical faith and steadfastness, to this fearful test: "Do for Me what all men do for their gods: offer in sacrifice thy beloved Isaac"! That faithful heart paused not to commune with itself; it lifted amid blinding tears the hand for the cruel blow. But an angel out of heaven stayed the stroke; and the father's heart was healed with the music of the heavenly words: "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice."<sup>1</sup> I confess, I know not which surprises me more, the stupidity or the malignity which finds in this marvellous and touching story an objection against Revelation. To me it seems all radiant with light from heaven.

It is curious that the absence from the Revelation through Moses of reference to the immortal life of the soul beyond the grave has been made, by some able reasoners,<sup>2</sup> the very ground for a demonstration of "the Divine legation of Moses;" while to others it has seemed incredible that such reference should be omitted, and they have accordingly insisted that the soul's immortality

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxii. 16-18.

<sup>2</sup> Warburton carried out the principle laid down with great bluntness by Spencer (*De Leg. Hebræorum*, I., vi.), who says the Israelites were too gross and sensual to be influenced by other motives. Warburton, while admitting that mankind generally believed in a future life, exaggerates the scepticism of philosophers, and

ascribes a very improbable exoterism to Plato (*e.g.*, in the *Phædo*). Whately exaggerates the unbelief of the multitude: he thinks *because* the Athenians at the time of the plague did not obtain their prayers from the gods, and then cast off their belief, they never could have expected anything but temporal rewards and punishments from their gods (*Essays*).

is certainly recognized in the Pentateuch, even though not brought prominently forward. We hold the latter to be the correct view, and yet allow that Warburton has here shown a marked difference between all other revelations and this true one through the Jewish law-giver, in that Moses places the chief sanctions for the regulation of the life of God's worshippers in the rewards and punishments of this life, rather than in those of the life to come. This Warburton insists is totally unlike the course of Gentile prophets and law-givers. Now, this is not unlike the actual course of God's moral government of the world. Enough can be seen to prove that there is really such a government, that men are rewarded and punished according to their deserts; though we cannot see the whole system, nor how it is cleared from difficulty, and are forced to look to the future life for its completion. The Almighty could make the reality of His presence felt in the system delivered by Moses, by making its sanctions chiefly temporal and immediate. The truth and reality of the temporal sanction should undoubtedly be viewed as a sure foundation and shining evidence of a future retribution.<sup>1</sup>

The foundation of the civil and religious life of the nation lay in Ten Commandments whose observance was easy and natural to every soul that cherished within it true love to God and man.<sup>2</sup> These holy laws have received testimony from individuals and nations of every age and land, even though not often set articulately, as by King Alfred, at the head of a nation's code.<sup>3</sup> Two of the most startling miracles wrought in connection with their obtaining possession of the promised land were done in warning against the sin most at war with God's service as well as with true love to one's neighbor. That sin was love of money. This led to the divinely ordered punishment at Ai of Achan, who secreted the spoil of the

<sup>1</sup> "God is the Lord by whom we escape death" (Psalm lxxviii. 20).

<sup>2</sup> Deut. vi. 5. Lev. xix. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Hughes's *Alfred the Great*, Ch. XIV., "The King's Laws," p.

159.

doomed city Jericho.<sup>1</sup> This sin led also to the rebuke of Balaam in a way unlike to any other miracle in Holy Scripture, yet in a manner calculated to fix in the memory of Israelites the blinding and brutish effect of covetousness: "The dumb ass speaking with man's voice forbade the madness of the prophet."<sup>2</sup> It is a point worthy of notice, though much overlooked, that the divine polity established for the Israelites was adapted to encourage agriculture, rather than commerce wherein perhaps their peculiar danger lay. It is not unlikely that the monarchy in its results gave a strong impulse to the commercial spirit.<sup>3</sup>

The ritual established by Moses, from the great paschal sacrifice to the daily offering, was designed to teach, by type and symbol and ceremonial acknowledgment, the sense of sin, the need of expiation, the nature of the covenant that secured God's favor, and the dependence of the worshipper at all times upon his God for every blessing. The initiatory rite of circumcision showed that blood sealed the covenant, the paschal lamb pointed onward to a mysterious and spotless Victim to be revealed in the fulness of time, incense was the symbol of prayer, the very structure of the tabernacle and temple suggested the passage from earth to heaven through the cleansing of religious discipline. Moses taught as clearly as Isaiah the worthlessness of every material sacrifice not accompanied by a clean heart and a faithful mind in the worshipper. "What doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul?"<sup>4</sup>

Modern pedants, who look upon religion as merely an affair of criticising some ancient books, have, in the very

<sup>1</sup> Josh. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Num. xxii. 2 Peter, ii. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Our Lord's first parable, that of the Sower, recalls His hearers to a peaceful scene of rural life; and one of the first and most notable acts of

His ministry at Jerusalem (at its beginning and at its close) was to scourge the money-changers from the temple.

<sup>4</sup> Deut. x. 12. Cf. vi. 7. Micah, vi. 7, 8.

superstition of pedantry, imposed on themselves and some contemporaries the preposterous assumption that there were no books of Moses, that the Israelites lived in Palestine many centuries without knowledge of the Mosaic Law, without passover, feast of tabernacles, daily sacrifice in tabernacle or temple, but that after their return from Babylon they were persuaded by Ezra and Nehemiah that they had possessed these documents and performed these rites for generations. It is a reproach to learning to be compelled even to notice such absurdities. Whatever impostures are possible, no one ever imposed upon a nation the belief that they had kept an annual commemoration, like the passover, for hundreds of years, when in truth there had been no such commemoration nor any event like that commemorated.<sup>1</sup> Could a learned rabbi of the age of Josephus, like Hillel for instance, have heard some of the rubbish which in our day passes for learning and criticism of the Pentateuch, the "Deuteronomist and priest-code, Elohist and Jehovist, the second Elohist and Redactor, and five narrators"—having reference, it is to be observed, to documents every syllable of which Hillel possessed precisely as we have them—he would have pronounced the author of such things either a lunatic if in earnest, or else a sophist who coated blasphemy with irony.

The career of the children of Israel from Joshua to Samuel, when they were governed by those called judges, shows that in spite of the great qualities of some of their leaders they lost reverence for their law, neglected its observances, as well as disobeyed its command concerning the conquered tribes, and thus constantly declined into the paganism around them. Yet in spite of these tokens of weakness, shared with all mankind, the Jews alone, though not excelling other nations in energy or civilization, still preserved the worship of One God, and the oracles of His Revelation; still alone of all people kept

<sup>1</sup> See this argument stated with irresistible vigor in Leslie's *Short and Easy Method with the Deists*.

God's worship free from auguries and auspices, charms and divination, the fanciful and frivolous tokens of artifice and imposture, which creep into every natural religion. This negative token of truth they owe, under God, to the line of prophets sent into their midst. The founding of the schools of the prophets under Samuel, and more especially under the leadership of Elijah, who is the great type of the prophetic order, was the providential method by which religion was preserved. A prophet, we are to remember, is "one who speaks for God," who recalls people to duty by his divine message, whether this be exhortation, instruction, or prediction. The prophets composed histories and annals. They arranged the temple service. The earliest of the Psalms were written for this place in God's worship, and the art of music is revived by Samuel. For three hundred years, that is from Samuel till the rise of the Assyrian monarchy, the only writings we have of the prophets are the histories and the Psalms. But their inspired words, we may believe, did not fall to the ground, uttered in defence of the purity of Jehovah's worship against idolatry, and on behalf of their country, in what we may call a spirit of sacred patriotism. From the Assyrian period, about 800 B.C., for nearly one hundred years, a succession of prophets appear, whose words were written down in this order: Jonah, Joel, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah,<sup>2</sup> Nahum. From this time of the withdrawal of the prophets from what we may call their political activity, we can observe a marked change and advance in their teaching. Their vision rises from the contemplation of their country as the jealous preserver of the truth amid heathen darkness, to the time when this truth shall spread abroad under a victorious champion and subdue the Gentiles. One of the most shining proofs of Divine Revelation is this unexpected expansion and outburst from the narrow Jewish spirit, which con-

<sup>1</sup> 2 Chron. xxix. 25.

junction, which, though "but" in

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah, ii. 2, is an exact quotation of Micah iv. 1, even to the conjunction, which, though "but" in Micah, is in the Hebrew the same as that rendered "and."

tinued so powerful and remains unsubdued till this day. The same thing had already appeared in the Psalms: "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."<sup>1</sup> But in the prophet Isaiah this tendency appears in a form that must have been startling even to the faithful Jew, since it seemed like a scornful repudiation of the national worship. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord. . . . Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me." "The Lord Himself shall give you a sign." "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth." "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. . . . And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising."<sup>2</sup> It is not needful to pursue at present the same great theme in the remaining prophets of the Chaldean period, beginning with Jeremiah at the commencement of the Captivity and ending with Daniel and the returning exiles. The only book of the Old Testament, that of Esther, which does not contain the divine name, presents an affecting picture of fidelity to the race which was the divinely constituted type and beginning of God's world-embracing kingdom. The glorious image of the Messiah which transfigures the Jewish Scriptures faded from the Jewish heart, and in its stead they clutched at a sordid earthly dream; and because Daniel's visions had revealed an universal empire, dwarfing the littleness of Judaism in the Catholic Church, they removed him from the prophets and placed him among the chroniclers. There are in the Old Testament three books containing what may be called three typical views of human life. The first, the book Ecclesiastes, may be said to present the view of the man of the world, or the man of pleasure. The second, the Book of Proverbs,

<sup>1</sup> Psalm ii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah, i. 11, 13; vii.; ix.; lxii. 1; lx. 1, 3.

is a collection of all the shrewd, practical wisdom, on which depends always and everywhere thrift and worldly success. The third is a book in which it has been thought no trace of Judaism appears. It is the Book of Job, in which the oldest and the deepest problem that has perplexed the intellect and wrung the heart of the wise and holy of every age and land is treated with singular vividness and power. What means the evil that is in the world? the sorrows of the good? the triumphs of the unprincipled? Whence come calamity, misery, despair, involving alike the innocent and the guilty? Does the good God reign? Does He care for His children? Will He ever reckon with His foes? Who shall sum up the answer to all this, unless it be in the very revelation of God Himself to man made in His image, as still and forever amid His creation, and the strength this same thought can supply? "Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts? or who hath given understanding to the heart?" "Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine." "Then Job answered the Lord and said, I know that thou canst do everything, and that no thought can be withholden from thee. . . . I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes."<sup>1</sup> The Lord rewarded this suffering saint with temporal felicity, but His Book assures us that this is not His highest reward. At His "right hand are pleasures for evermore."<sup>2</sup>

No one, however briefly glancing at the religion of the Old Testament, can fail to discern the central figure—at length not dimly bodied forth, though fully revealed only in the New Testament—of that sinless Victim whose sufferings transfigure all mortal experience, purchasing for man all that is worthy of the name of felicity, whether in the mortal or in the eternal life, the explanation of type and symbol, the substance of every religious truth, the only realization of the greatness of every prophet, priest, or king.

<sup>1</sup> Job, xxxviii. 36 ; xli. 11 ; xlii. 1,      <sup>2</sup> Psalm xvi. 11.  
2, 5, 6.

I have left space to speak but briefly of two remaining features of the Old Testament—its great characters and its literary eminence.

III. Much of the Ancient Scriptures derive their shape from two commanding figures, who are the peers of the loftiest in history, Moses and David. The first transmits to us the primitive Revelation and founds a nation; the second attunes to heavenly music the strains of prophecy. There is a tradition that in the days of Roman supremacy in Judæa, the Rabbi Hillel, provoked by the boast of a Roman sophist, compared at length the great men of his people with the mightiest of Rome. Moses he affirmed to be the peer of the first Cæsar; David a match for any of the kings, with the poet's gift besides; and Solomon more than equal to the great Augustus. Sylla does not surpass the Maccabees, nor the best of the consuls the judges. We speak not yet of the place in literature of Isaiah and the Prophets; nor have we mentioned the mighty figures that stand in time even before Moses, viz., Abraham and Joseph, whose names are inscribed not alone in Scripture, but on the records of the old world.

Now, in the first place it should be noticed of the greatness of these men, that it is the product of their religion. Their race and themselves were made great by being made part of the Kingdom of God. It is thus that even their personal qualities are made to illustrate the evidence of religion.

It has not, I think, been enough considered what is the peculiar strength of the evidence brought to religion by two such great men as Moses<sup>1</sup> and David, such mighty

<sup>1</sup> No one has confessed the greatness of Moses more unreservedly than Ewald. "He is the unparalleled hero" ("next after Christ") "who sustains the grandeur of two perfectly distinct yet equally exalted epochs." Ewald speaks contemptuously of those who have "turned the light of history into darkness," and "doubted whether Moses ever lived." "Our life moves in the midst of those very truths which received their first currency and acknowledgment from Moses, and other minds like his; we are sustained and protected by them; we live in the hourly enjoyment of their blessed fruits."—*History of Israel*, Bk. II., Int. Sect. I., Vol. II.;

geniuses, as the world classifies them. Men of this order are not numerous in any age. Neither their personalities can be mistaken when they do appear, nor their works easily be counterfeited. The strongest argument for the personality of Homer or Shakespeare is not felt to be the historical record, but the commanding character of their productions themselves. It should not be forgotten that, besides their works as law-giver and ruler, we have precisely the same kind of evidence in the exalted qualities of the writings of Moses and David. Such writings, considered in themselves, are not easy of imitation. It is not in the least probable that they could be the work of many hands. The style of the great master in literature is inimitable. I think most persons feel the absurdity of supposing Homer or Shakespeare to be names for the fortuitous results of the labors of many ballad-writers or unknown hands, even more keenly than they feel the folly of attributing the order of the world to chance and not to God. The absurdity is little less of ascribing the Psalms of David or the books of Moses to nameless fabricators. Consider, also, what a multitude of trifling questions and groundless doubts raised by pedantry are put to rest by the great and shining facts of these personalities, as they stand in their luminous splendor irradiating the records of the past. Whatever can be mistaken, it is not easy to mistake the work of a David, the music of whose words has thrilled more souls than those of any other human being, and are sung not in Judæa alone, but in every land under the sun, with more frequency and more devotion than the most popular native productions of those lands. If man can transmit anything with fidelity, we may be sure of the records and the works of Moses, the founder and law-giver of a

pp. 15-17. It is hard to realize that these words precede a suicidal fouling and pollution of the only springs of real knowledge concerning Moses and his Revelation. The same rationalist says also: "We must recognize in David the glorious originality of a creative spiritual power, such as rarely shows itself in any people."—*Id.*, Vol. III., p. 56.

nation, every household in which cherished those works as its most precious treasure, and identified the certainty of their own family records, on which their place and property depended, with the integrity of their sacred books.

Let me offer you an illustration of this argument. When the authorship of *Waverley* and the novels that followed was still discussed, a young scholar<sup>1</sup> of an English university published an argument to prove that Scott must be the writer of the novels, because, (1) Their author was certainly a poet; (2) and very familiar with Scotch law; (3) a gentleman—never making his heroes and heroines do unbecoming things, like listening behind doors, opening letters, etc.; (4) fond of dogs, hunting, etc.; (5) a great historian and antiquarian, etc., etc. All these points he copiously illustrated by comparison of the romances with Scott's acknowledged writings, and with what the public well knew of the author. This may serve to illustrate how definite is the image which a man of genius imprints upon his time. It is not unbecoming to believe that the Almighty makes use of the great natural gifts of those whom He honors as vehicles of His inspiration, in order to give at once impressiveness and fixedness to His message. The works of Homer, of Shakespeare, and of Scott inspired many similar efforts of composition, some of them of great excellence. It would not perhaps be easy to prove that the historical novels of Scott have not had rivals and imitations of nearly equal merit. But no one believes that a new member of the *Waverley* group could now be palmed upon the public.<sup>2</sup> Or, again, how little effect upon the received conception of Shakespeare has the belief that in certain plays he merely retouched large portions of

<sup>1</sup> John Leycester Adolphus in his *Letters to Richard Heber*, London, 1821.

<sup>2</sup> One difficulty in such an attempt, which might at first seem inconsiderable, would probably prove most

troublesome of all, viz., the imitation of the little snatches of real poetic inspiration, songs, verses, and lines given as quotation but really original, scattered throughout most of Scott's novels.

previous works! It seems to be right in a similar manner, apart from the question of inspiration, to view the high personal gifts of Moses, of David, of Isaiah, as a providential guard of the authenticity and genuineness of their works for all coming time.

IV. This naturally introduces finally a remark upon the Old Testament viewed as literature. It is not meant that any part of it is simply literature; but that while conveying a divine message, and such human information as is needful for its purpose, the Scripture has a dignity, a sublimity, a condensation, sometimes a simple pathos and poetic exaltation, not excelled, and hardly with any parallel, in human writings. The primitive simplicity and rigor of the Hebrew idiom render the triumph of this style the more marvellous. Can anything be more sublime and deep, and at the same time more simple and condensed, than the narrative of the creation in the beginning of Genesis? The science of geology has since glanced through the Palæozoic, Secondary, and Tertiary periods. Their characteristic products may be viewed in three successive compartments of the British Museum.<sup>1</sup> There one can distinguish more specifically the Azoic, the Red Sandstone, and the Carboniferous day; and again, the Permian, the Oolitic, and the Tertiary or Mammalian day. And there is not in all this scientific history a single fact out of harmony with the simple inspired record. The Nineteenth Psalm is a fit celebration of this by the royal prophet. The Geologic period was a preparation for man; the Historic period of the Old Testament a preparation for the God-man. Again, the twenty-second chapter of Genesis contains a narrative, the most pathetic and touching the heart can conceive, while yet a symbol of the most wonderful truth in the whole universe. The history of Joseph,<sup>2</sup> again, is perfect as a simple human narrative. The fidelity of love hallowed by religion finds its expression in Ruth.<sup>3</sup> David's prayer (1 Chron. xxix. 10-19), when consecrating his wealth to the building of

<sup>1</sup> *Testimony of the Rocks*, by Hugh Miller, Lect. III., pp. 163-169.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxxvii.; xl.-xlv.

<sup>3</sup> Ruth, i. 14-18.

God's temple, stands alone in its sublime exaltation. The like may be said of many of the Psalms, among which the one hundred and fourth and the one hundred and thirty-ninth may challenge comparison. What mortal harp was ever attuned to such strains as those of Isaiah (the forty-fifth, fifty-third, sixtieth chapters) or of Habakkuk?

Of the Old Testament we may say, in brief: "Though various in its parts, it forms a whole, grounded on a few distinct doctrinal principles discoverable throughout it, and is in consequence, though intelligible in its general drift, yet obscure in its text, and even tempts the student to a lax and disrespectful interpretation of it. History is made the external garb of prophecy, and persons and facts become the figures of heavenly things."<sup>1</sup> Try to gather into a single view the nature of the varied contents of the Old Testament, its history, its religion, its great men, its great style. The beginnings of knowledge; the doctrines most worthy of God and man; the examples, alike to encourage and to admonish, of the choicest of our race; the speech most awe-inspiring and most winning, because at once truthful, simple, exalted, and sympathetic—leave no avenue to the soul untried. If there be a God, if we are God's children, if we have strayed from Him, if He still cares for us—and how can we admit any of these thoughts without the rest?—then assuredly in this first part of Holy Scripture is the foreshadowing of our redemption. Assuredly He has here spoken to man, if any kind of evidence can make us sure of that blessed certainty. Not once alone, but many times; not to individuals here and there, but to a selected, typical race; not fitfully, as though we were forgotten, but with the steady development of a large system, as man speaks to man, friend to friend, parent to child, teacher to pupil; not as overawing us with power, or crushing us with proof, yet not without mighty miracles, both of judgment and of mercy, He here prepares us for the final revelation of His Incarnate Son, who alone is worthy of the full allegiance of mind, and heart, and will.

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Arians*, Ch. I., Sect. III., p. 31. Lond., 1854.

## LECTURE V.

---

### CONTENTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. CHARACTER OF CHRIST.

THE substantial unity of the Bible is indicated even by a certain external correspondence between the contents of the Old Testament and the New. Thus the Four Gospels answer in some sort to the Pentateuch, the Acts of the Apostles to the Historical books, the twenty-one Epistles to the Prophets, and the Book of Revelation to portions of Ezekiel and to Daniel. The New Testament, or Covenant, as we may interpret this title of both parts of Scripture, relates first the origin and constitution of a world-embracing kingdom, its propagation in spite of Jewish prejudice and Gentile indifference or political jealousies, the instructions of its apostles and prophets to churches and to individuals, and finally the mysterious visions of the future, which even yet remain mysteries because they refer to what is still future. The very language in which the New Covenant was written, the most perfect ever spoken by man, was providentially prepared for the great end it was to subserve. The early Scriptures were translated into it, and many of its most characteristic phrases reappear in the New Testament. The Gospel according to S. John has the same opening words, "In the beginning,"<sup>1</sup> as the Book of Genesis. The natural creation and the new creation are thus intro-

<sup>1</sup> *ἔν ἀρχῇ* alike in the LXX. of Gen. i. 1, and in S. John, i. 1.

duced alike. The Eternal Word put forth His power in the first, and comes Himself in person in the second. So the "Book of the Generation"<sup>1</sup> with which S. Matthew begins the human genealogy of the Divine Word is the same phrase which the Septuagint employs at the commencement of what may be called the second account of the creation of man, in the fourth verse of the second chapter of Genesis. So the words descriptive of Noah's sacrifice, "the Lord smelled a sweet savor,"<sup>2</sup> suggest to us in the Greek of S. Paul's application of them, that all sacrifice was typical and figurative of the one Sacrifice offered on the cross. The commendation of Abraham's offering of his son Isaac<sup>3</sup> supplies in the Septuagint version the very Greek words by which the Holy Ghost inspires S. Paul to set forth the Almighty's surrender of His well-beloved Son as a sin-offering for man. Again, the Evangelist, quoting the Prophet, applies to Christ the words, "out of Egypt have I called my Son,"<sup>4</sup> spoken first of Israel's deliverance commemorated by the Passover, the great type of Christ. And so S. Luke, describing the Transfiguration when Moses and Elias, the types of the Law and the Prophets, met Christ upon the Mount and "spake of His decease,"<sup>5</sup> or exodus, uses the same Greek word which became the name of the second book of Moses, recounting Israel's Exodus. And

<sup>1</sup> βίβλος γενέσεως, S. Matt. i. 1. Cf. Gen. ii. 4; LXX., ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως.

<sup>2</sup> ὄσμην εὐωδίας. Cf. ὄσμην εὐωδίας, θυσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. Phil. iv. 18.

<sup>3</sup> οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, Gen. xxii. 12, 16. Cf. ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, Rom. viii. 32. "The silence observed concerning the evangelical import of the sacrifice of Isaac is perhaps that we might not neglect the instruction still conveyed in the literal narrative, the definite and permanent moral lesson, as a

matter of fact, however clear may be its further meaning as emblematical of our Lord's sufferings on the cross." —Newman's *Arians*, Ch. I., Sect. III.

<sup>4</sup> S. Matt. ii. 15, from Hos. xi. 1. "Christ is one with His Church in all ages of her history"—is a canon of Tichonius, approved by S. Aug. III., 100-103. "In qua [Ægypto] primum occisione agni salutiferum Crucis signum et Pascha Domini fuerat præformatum.—Leo M., Sermon. XXXII.

<sup>5</sup> ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, S. Luke, ix. 31.

once more the adoption by S. Matthew<sup>1</sup> of the Septuagint word that describes our Lord's mother, "the Virgin," that "shall conceive," determines the sense of a celebrated verse in Isaiah.

When the Author of Revelation left the rugged depth of the Hebrew for the intellectual precision of the Greek, a language adapted to convey the most precious truths to all mankind, He in no degree broke the continuity of an historical religion. All history, whatever is found from Genesis to Malachi, in some way foreshadowed the Gospel. The creation was at once history, prophecy, and the adumbration of spiritual mysteries. Adam was a type of Christ;<sup>2</sup> the Flood prefigured a Christian sacrament; the ark symbolized the Church.<sup>3</sup> The Deluge and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and in particular the end of the Holy City, foretold by Moses as well as by Christ, were divine prophecies of the universal Judgment to come.<sup>4</sup> Circumcision suggested the work of the Holy Ghost upon the heart.<sup>5</sup>

It is a commonplace<sup>6</sup> to expound the symbols of the Evangelists to indicate that S. Matthew was to show how all prophecies were fulfilled in Christ; S. Mark, how He was the Lion of the tribe of Judah; S. Luke, how His merciful mission was to go forth beyond the limits of the chosen people, in blessings to all mankind; while S. John revealed the deep mysteries of heavenly truth, disclosed only to the heart aflame with love. The first

<sup>1</sup> ἡ παρθένος, S. Matt. i. 23, from the LXX's version of Isa. vii. 14. This version we are to remember was made by Jews and read in their synagogues. Tertullian, *Apol.*, 18. But two Jewish proselytes, Theodotion and Aquila, perverted the meaning and changed the rendering to "Young woman," as we are told by Justin Martyr (*Dial. cum Tr.*, § 67), Irenæus, III., 21; Eusebius, V., 8.

<sup>2</sup> τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, Rom. v. 14.

<sup>3</sup> 1 S. Peter, iii. 21.

<sup>4</sup> 2 S. Peter, ii. 5-9; S. Jude, 7, 15; Deut. xxviii.; S. Matt. xxiv.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. ii. 29; Col. ii. 11.

<sup>6</sup> Circa thronum majestatis  
Cum spiritibus beatis  
Quatuor diversitatis  
Astant animalia.

Formam primum aquilinam,  
Et secundum leoninam;  
Sed humanam et bovinam  
Duo gerunt alia.

Quoted in Trench, *Hulsean Lectures*, Lect. III., p. 62.

martyr, S. Stephen, was slain for declaring that the Jewish temple was destined to pass away. His blood, spilled upon the ground, proved the seed of a glorious harvest, amid which shine the manifold labors of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.<sup>1</sup> S. Paul wrote three epistles—to the Romans, to the Galatians, and to the Hebrews—to define the relations of Gentiles and Jews to each other and to the Church of Christ. The Epistle to the Romans gives an outline of God's dealings with mankind, the degradation of the heathen, the calling of the Hebrews, Abraham's exaltation as "Father of the faithful" and "Friend of God," but his true seed is found among Gentiles as well as Jews, and then the faith, the love, the unselfish life which are the only sure signs of election and justification. To the Galatians the Apostle recounts his own conversion, and struggles against Judaism even among his brethren, including S. Peter; then describes the preparatory character of the Law in reference to the Gospel, and shows how the liberty of Christians leads not to license, but to true godliness. It has been noted also that an outline of our Lord's life, such as is preserved in the Gospels, from the Birth to the Ascension, could be distinctly made out from S. Paul's Epistles, or from four of them, say those to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians.<sup>2</sup> In the Epistle to the Hebrews we may have (as in the First Gospel) a Greek translation of a Hebrew text. It shows at once the superiority of the Christian to the Jewish dispensation, because its Author is superior not only to the angels, but to Moses and to the Aaronic high-priest. Even humanity is exalted in the Incarnate Son above the angels, who minister to the heirs of salvation. The legislation of Moses, the servant, is perfected by the Divine Son, the true builder and master, in his own house. The typical sacrifice of the high-priest gives place to the real sacrifice of the One True Priest. The

<sup>1</sup> Acts, vii. 48, 49, 58, 59. Cf. xxii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> See H. Footman's *Reasonable Apprehensions and Reassuring Hints*, pp. 127-132. N. Y., 1885.

communion of man with God is no longer indirect, but through the direct union of God and man in Christ, present in His body the Church, in her worship, on her altars,<sup>1</sup> while the world shall last.

The Lord Himself, the substance and embodiment of both dispensations, gives all possible honor to the first, by declaring that He came "not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it," by affirming that "the Scripture cannot be broken," by expounding to the last "in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms," "the things concerning Himself."<sup>2</sup> He makes His Apostles twelve in number, after the Twelve Tribes of Israel, whose number is still mystically complete at the consummation of all things. His own teaching might have been introduced by the words of the Psalmist<sup>3</sup> of old: "Hear my law, O my people: incline your ears unto the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in a parable: I will declare hard sentences of old: which we have heard and known, and such as our fathers have told us." Like His forerunner the Baptist, His first preaching was the plain announcement, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand;" the world-embracing kingdom, no longer confined to Jews; a kingdom of souls, placing the cleansing and regeneration of the immortal spirit above perishable wealth and dominion, and therefore first proclaiming, "Repent." When the Lord had made this announcement, and had laid down the fundamental laws of His kingdom in the Sermon on the Mount, in words which though plain have a fulness of meaning not yet exhausted by the wisdom and experience of men, He proceeded to teach by parable the outlines and the elements of the heavenly polity, as willing hearts and minds were prepared to receive it. A parable is a spiritual enigma, conveying no lesson except to souls alive with interest and searching for its meaning.

<sup>1</sup> ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον, Heb. xiii. 10. In Heb. vii. S. Paul reveals the evangelical scope of the account of Melchisedek in Gen. xiv.      <sup>2</sup> S. Matt. v. 17; S. John, x. 35; S. Luke, xxiv. 44.      <sup>3</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 1-3.

In seven parables,<sup>1</sup> four to the multitude and three to His disciples alone, the lowly King, the Incarnate Word, put forth the nature of His kingdom, with more or less of explanation as they were able to bear it. These parables are at once prophecy, history, and legislation. In the first of the four the Sower scatters seed—that is, God's Word—over the different kinds of soil, that is, the varieties of human souls. One yields the seed to Satan, another entertains it briefly, a third chokes it with worldly cares, but the honest and good bring from it in due time their respective harvests. The second parable, that of the tares of the field, forewarns how the Enemy of souls will imitate the true Husbandman, and that the mischief of his sowing cannot be remedied by force or human means, nor until the harvest. The third parable, by the similitude of a great tree that grows most quickly from the smallest seed, predicts the rapid extension from humble beginnings of the Divine Kingdom, and the power of its branches to protect and shelter. The fourth exhibits the hidden but real and pervasive power of the new organization among men. When the Lord has thus instructed the mass of His hearers, He opens in private to His selected disciples three aspects of His kingdom to encourage and strengthen them in their deeper consecration to its service. It is the one treasure which gives its value to the world's field. It is the goodly pearl for which every other jewel may be exchanged. It is, finally, a net which draws from the troubled sea of time both bad and good; but the separation, though delayed, is made at length upon the shore of eternal life.

It is difficult to decide which is more wonderful, the calm comprehensiveness with which the lowly Teacher by the Galilean lake thus outlines the kingdom that is to embrace the world, and prepares His humble instruments for the mighty task, or the divine pity and mercy which shine in that other parable, recorded by S. Luke

<sup>1</sup> S. Matt. xiii.

alone, the story of the Prodigal Son, with its resistless appeal to every child of God, Gentile and Jew alike—the parable that has been called “a Gospel within the Gospel.” When He made membership of His kingdom the beginning of a new life, and continuance therein the condition of that life, and love to God and man the substance of its law, and personal purity and unselfish labor the only evidence and ground of its faith and hope and love, He framed a legislature in germ, for a polity more comprehensive and more enduring, though not less real, than any yet known among mortal men; He gave to it in the Golden Rule a guide of conduct practical for communities and for individuals; and in His own prayer a form of devotion, brief, simple, yet deep enough to attune the heart of every age, sex, or capacity found on earth, with the worship of saints and angels in heaven.

It does not lessen but rather heightens the wonder to find fragments, chords as it were of the heavenly music, of the Beatitudes, the Golden Rule, the Lord’s Prayer, amid the books of the Jewish Scriptures; nor, on the other hand, should we fail to note how in the books of the New Covenant are recognitions of all the aspects of wisdom, the earnest search, the pathetic and moving presentation, which make the Grecian philosophy, as some of the early Christian Fathers held it to be, a real preparation for Christianity. The New Testament expressly tells us that God “left not Himself without a witness, but that in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him.” “The Word and the Sacraments are the characteristic of the elect people of God; but all men have had more or less the guidance of tradition in addition to those internal notices of right and wrong which the Spirit has put into the heart of each individual. This vague and unconnected family of religious truths, originally from God, but sojourning without the sanction of miracle or a definite home as pilgrims up and down the world, and discernible

and separable from the corrupt legends with which they are mixed by the spiritual mind alone, may be called 'the Dispensation of Paganism.'"<sup>1</sup> Clement of Alexandria believes that we may read in this pagan wisdom the steps of a divine education of the world. "All men," he says, "belong to God [*θεῖος παιδαγωγός*]; some with consciousness of what He is to them, others as yet without it; some as friends, others as faithful servants, others barely as servants."

A classification of Grecian philosophy, the very flower and prime of all human culture, has been at times attempted, by showing that it has four typical masters, or schools, who address respectively the Conscience, the Intellect, the Feelings, and the Will. Plato, who in this is one with Socrates, speaks to the Spiritual Reason, or Conscience, in that he subordinates all abstract discussions, all research into Nature, to the high supremacy of duty. Aristotle primarily addresses the Intellect, analyzing, exploring, sifting, weighing, pointing out the bounds of proof and the conditions of certainty, and though on the whole warning against unlimited scepticism, yet still making the way easy, and whetting the instruments, while providing no sufficient barrier against temptation. Then comes Epicurus addressing to the Feelings the doctrine that pleasure is the supreme good, giving thus to the passions the supremacy over man, in spite of plausible sophisms about the pleasures of knowledge or even of self-control. This extreme gave energy to the opposite extreme, when Zeno, making his appeal to the Will, bade men trample under feet pleasure and pain alike, accounting no perfection comparable to the calm of the steadfast soul, seizing as the primal and final truth of the intellect the doctrine of Fate, and learning duty not from conscience, but from Nature.<sup>2</sup> Of these schools,

<sup>1</sup> τὴν φιλοσοφίαν Ἑλλήσι διαθήκην οἰκείαν δεδύσθαι, ὑποβάθραν οὐδα τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν φιλοσοφίας. Clem. Alex., Strom. VI., p. 648. In Newman's *Arrians*, Ch. I., Sect. III., p. 47.

<sup>2</sup> ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν.

the Academic, the Peripatetic, the Epicurean, and the Stoic, each presents in turn an aspect, sometimes a very important aspect, of truth; yet none, nor even all together, can regulate the life of man. Each has been illustrated at times by the doctrine of brilliant teachers and pupils, and the influence they have had was due alone to the measure of truth they had seized. Representatives of two of the schools, the Epicureans and the Stoics, encountered S. Paul at Athens.

Now, two tokens of Divinity shine upon the head of the religion of Christ, if we compare it either with these systems of philosophy, or with the religions of Greece and Rome, of Egypt, India, Persia, Hindustan, or China. First, while all these philosophies and religions alike are simply speculative systems, and the religions make no serious claim to an historical basis, Christianity is the consummation of a majestic history going back to the origin of the race, while its own historical foundation is unassailable; among the most striking evidences of which is the argument from the undesigned coincidences apparent on a close comparison of S. Paul's Epistles with the narrative in the book of Acts—the argument so convincingly presented by Paley in his *Horæ Paulinæ* and later by Blunt. And secondly, it still makes the same comprehensive appeal to every part of man's nature, intellect, feelings, will, and conscience, vivifying each, however, with a new energy, both practical and effective, and offering the hope of a restoration of the whole being to unity and to itself.

Let us glance at a brief comparison of the teachers of the Gospel with the masters of the Grecian schools. S. Paul found Athens as full of idols as any heathen city. The philosophers who encountered him affected to regard Jesus and the resurrection which he preached merely as two new gods proposed for their pantheon. The Apostle quietly remarking upon their recognition of religion, and taking for his text an inscription on one of their altars, "To the unknown," or, as it might be understood, "To

the unknowable God,"<sup>1</sup> addresses them very much as he might address a modern agnostic. He admits their claim to be "the offspring of God." And since the offspring is like its parent, the Godhead must be something different from wood or stone or metal. It must be the Fountain of the intellect, the conscience, the will, the sense of right and wrong, the expectation of judgment, the distinctive attributes of man. This God, whom they have put out of their knowledge, is also the Author of the food that sustains, and of the beauty that delights, His creature. They must surely confess that it is an affectation to pretend that they do not know Him who is thus present to their apprehension more directly, more evidently, more closely, than any other object of knowledge. Man is higher in place than the stones, the vegetation, the living things of nature, though he can neither make nor fully comprehend them; he alone is in possession of a self-judging law by which he can weigh and sentence himself; he is impelled therefore to seek—to grope even though for his sins he do not find—another nature as his Author, whose image he bears, and which is above all other. The same profound and able reasoner, who could put into the hands of the heathen, out of the shreds of their own wisdom, the clew to the Author of eternal life, could also, before his own countrymen, argue with even more energy, out of their prophets and out of their history, for the claims of that Divine Messiah whose humiliation was "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness," but to the fervid Apostle the crowning proof of "the power of God and the wisdom of God." He could shake the soul of a king whose religious knowledge was founded on "the Prophets;" he probed to the quick the conscience of the Roman ruler "as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." How resistless in the mouth of this Apostle is the logic of the resurrection! And again, coming to practical matters, with what vigor and pathos, and at the same time homely sense, does he

<sup>1</sup> *Ἄγνώστῳ* , Acts, xvii. 23.

reiterate and enforce his Master's unearthly teaching in the Sermon on the Mount! He mingles with the solicitude of the ruler the patience and self-sacrifice of the father and friend. To the spiritual children who tried him most, he pens the praise of that charity which combines and transfigures earthly and heavenly virtue, and is the finer essence and immortal crown of prophecy and knowledge, faith and hope. Such is the Apostle of Christianity who is the type at once of the able reasoner, the ready controversialist, the profound and loving teacher; who could not only enlighten men, but, where all earthly teachers failed, could convert them from their sins.

We have, on the other hand, in S. John the typical theologian, one whose thoughts dwelt habitually in the contemplation of the highest truth. This pure and loving heart found its strength rather in looking upon God, upon His Word and Holy Spirit, than upon the works of creation or the fortunes of created beings. The wonder that the world was made by the Divine Word is surpassed for this soul by the wonder that this its Maker could be in the world and that "the world should know Him not," that He could come to His own and that His own should not receive Him. S. John, and his brother S. James, were first known as "sons of thunder;" their anger at times burst forth from apparent calmness like thunder amid the brightness of a summer day. The Samaritans who were discourteous, even the worker of miracles who slighted their Lord, they would have instantly destroyed. When S. John had learned patience from his loving Master, he still had exchanged the indignation that flamed against those who infringed his Master's honor, for unflinching severity against the teacher of false doctrine. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." This is the language of one who is in sure possession of the truth, and who cannot confound or exchange that truth for any counterfeit. But it is not

less surely the language of one who truly loved his brother man ; for it is the same Apostle who says, " If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar." He had lain upon the heart, and shared the inmost confidence, of Him who came to redeem all men, and who was their Elder Brother. The Apostle S. John hated error because he saw that it separated men from Him who is at once Truth, Light, and Life. The subtle theories, the cosmogonies, the fanciful speculations, which amused men who would not receive the Gospel, were to him neither attractive nor even tolerable, but like the colors of the serpent, whom the painters are fond of representing the Apostle expelling from the poisoned chalice. Hence S. John in his Gospel and his Epistles represents the simple sight of Christ as first a divine gift, then as the sufficient answer, to every doubt and misgiving ; telling his spiritual children, in lieu of all arguments and proofs, what his eyes have seen and his hands have handled of the Word of Life ; unbaring, again and again, the well-spring of his own spiritual strength in the words, " God is Love." Then, in the wonderful Revelation with which the canon of inspiration closes, how lurid, how fearful, how changeful in colors and pictures, are the scenes adding new portents to the marvels of Ezekiel and Daniel, through the long history of earthly probation and judgments, till the vision of peace descends out of heaven, and the discords of time are ended !

In S. Peter again, as contrasted with S. Paul and S. John, we have a type of the teacher who is at the same time ruler and pastor. S. Peter's ardent soul had enabled him in a peculiar personal experience " to taste of the Lord as gracious," to attain most promptly to the certainty that his Master was " the Christ, the Son of the Living God." His ready and sympathetic heart prompted him to appeal respectively to husbands and wives, masters, servants, elders, juniors, as feeling for each, and beholding them collectively in the pastoral relation as " beloved." With him Christ living, toiling, suffering, bleeding, dying,

is the "precious" ransom, the precious example, the resistless call to everything generous, tender, earnest, or deep in the soul of man. Most suitably in such a teacher, to whom the sin of the world was so real and only to be faced in the answering reality of divine grace, while urging and helping his brethren and children to make this life a pilgrimage to their heavenly home, through discipline in the State and in the Church, through watchfulness, through help of friends and resistance to foes, the outline of a Christian's course from his escape from pollution to his union with God begins with faith and ends with charity: "Add to 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 charity."

Our enumeration of the typical teachers of the Gospel would not be complete without S. James, who stands in the fourth place as the mouthpiece, which must not be unheard in the Catholic Church, of that protest against exalting mere knowledge of the truths of Revelation, wonderful and overpowering as they are, or doctrinal precision, above the plain duties alike of natural and revealed religion, mercy, purity, honesty, truth, in word as well as deed. Seasons arrive periodically when the tendency to this perversion seems to grow well-nigh irresistible; when fanatics join with the self-indulgent children of the world in decrying works in comparison with faith, and put lip-service and party shibboleths in place of self-restraint and self-sacrifice, curbing of the tongue, and helping the poor. On more than one occasion (Luther furnishes one<sup>1</sup>) in the history of the Church, the Epistle of S. James would have been scornfully expelled from the sacred canon, if the petulance of individuals could have prevailed against the majestic comprehensiveness of the whole body. But while the Lord's Sermon on the Mount shall stand, this letter of His apostle will remain.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> He termed it *epistola straminea*.

<sup>2</sup> See the uses that have been made of it by Bishops Butler and Bull.

If, then, to summarize this comparison, Plato and Socrates could address the conscience, the Church, too, in S. John has a teacher who could add a new power to this appeal by bringing the soul face to face with its Maker and Redeemer; if Aristotle could analyze and describe the worlds of mind and of matter, laying bare secrets, anticipating future discoveries, exhibiting the strength and the weakness of the intellect, S. Paul, thoroughly equipped with natural gifts and the training of worldly schools, approached the problems of the soul armed with the advantage of new and certain knowledge, which gave to his psychology, his ethics, his logic a depth, a force, a precision—the power to convince resulting at once from truth and earnestness—which left his writings, considered as literature, above all human comparison. If, again, human philosophy produced a teacher who asserted the claims of feeling, though with ineffectual protest, the Church, in her great Apostle S. Peter, had one, who, with feelings intensely human, showed how all that is noble and tender and unselfish and loyal, in every department of human life, can render acceptable service in the noblest of causes; if, finally, Zeno held up before the will the choice of a heroic apathy to pain and pleasure alike, S. James, without forsaking the modesty of nature, proclaimed a nobler steadfastness, in the firm and unshrinking practice of simple and primitive virtues—mercy, truth, justice, patience—amid the self-indulgence with which wealth and ease tempt heathen and Christian alike.

We come now to that which is the very heart of our present course upon the internal evidences. The New Testament presents to us One whose greatness was indeed heralded by the prophets, but who is fully disclosed only in the second volume of inspiration. Around His central figure kings, prophets, heroes, priests, the learned, the eloquent, the gifted, martyrs and saints, revolve, as reflecting His glory, while confessing their immeasurable distance from Him. The character<sup>1</sup> of Jesus Christ is a

<sup>1</sup>“In modern language ‘character’ or the absence of some side or sides generally implies the predominance of that great whole, which we picture

thing apart in Scripture, as it is in history. In nothing is the unity of the holy volume more manifest, from its earliest to its latest page, amid annals, prophecies, psalms, biographies, maxims of conduct, letters, marking the mind of one Author in every external diversity of expression, than in its picture of Him who is as certainly God as He is the Son of Man. It is no part of our present task to pause to answer those to whose minds such a conception is simply incredible; but what we have to say will, we think, abundantly show the folly of those who professing in some sort to receive and to interpret the Scriptures refuse to see this conception of the Messiah in them.

In the earliest portion of the Hebrew Scriptures the Messianic predictions,<sup>1</sup> beginning with a general promise of man's victory over the Evil Principle, and narrowing by degrees the field to which faith and hope should look for the Deliverer's appearance, at length announce His likeness to Moses when He comes, but at the same time suggest His superiority to the Jewish law-giver. In the age of David and Solomon He is announced as the ideal David, King of the world's future history. But the son of David is David's Lord.<sup>2</sup> In the great period of Prophecy, from King Uzziah's reign to the prophet Malachi, especially in Isaiah, the details of the Messiah's human life are fully given, along with the loftiest assertions of His Divinity, His humility, His sufferings, His triumph, His world-embracing kingdom.<sup>3</sup> One of the things prophecy says of the Messiah, not least wonderful

to ourselves in the background of each individual man as the true and complete ideal of human nature. . . . Character is that whereby the individual is marked off from the presumed standard or level of typical manhood. Yet the closest analysis of the actual human life of Jesus reveals a moral portrait not only unlike any that men have witnessed before or since, but especially remarkable in that it presents an equally balanced and entirely harmonious representa-

tion of all the normal elements of our perfected moral nature."—Liddon's *Bampton Lect.*, Lect. IV., p. 192. He quotes Young, *Christ of History*, p. 217.

<sup>1</sup> Gen. iii. 15; ix. 26; xxii. 18; xlix. 10. Num. xxiv. 7. Deut. xvii. 18, 19.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Sam. vii. 16. Ps. lxxxix. 36, 37; ii. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. Ps. cx.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. xi. xlii.; xlix. 6; lix. 20. Jer. xxiii.; xxxiii. 15. Ps. xxii. Dan. ix. 24. Zech. ix. 9, 10.

if we consider it seriously, is: "He did no sin."<sup>1</sup> The Lord Jesus Christ throughout the Gospels plainly, deliberately, and consistently makes this claim for Himself. This, if we consider it well, is a most wonderful fact. No merely human teacher worthy of respect ever seriously claimed freedom from sin. Our Lord at the beginning of His preaching bids men be like God: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." This is accompanied by no intimation that He Himself falls below the standard. The greatest of the prophets, on the other hand, when entering on his great office, cries: "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts."<sup>2</sup> Christ never confesses sin; He never asks pardon; yet He sharply rebukes the sin of self-righteousness, and makes the Prodigal's confession the typical one suitable for all mankind; in Him is never anything like remorse, or that dread of a coming judgment with which His own words are so well designed to fill the sinner's soul. He says positively: "I do always those things that please the Father;" "I know Him, and keep His saying." He challenges His foes to convince Him of sin.<sup>3</sup> This is not dulness in One who could probe the subtlest failings of the human heart; nor can we deem it a form of pride when we recall His equally marvellous humility.

The claim to sinlessness is not a thing apart in the Lord Jesus Christ, but in simple and complete harmony with all His words and acts. Upon His own authority he corrects the glosses and interpretations of the Jewish teachers of highest authority, and even explains, suspends, or completes the Mosaic law itself. "Ye have heard that it hath been said to them of old time.<sup>4</sup> . . .

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. Peter, ii. 22, which is evidently a quotation from Isa. liii. 9, although the Apostle says *ἀμαρτίαν*, while the Prophet in the LXX. has *ἀνομίαν*.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. v. 48, compared with Isa. vi. 5.

<sup>3</sup> S. John, viii. 29, 55, 46.

<sup>4</sup> On this translation of S. Matt. v. 27, consult Arbp. Trench on Auth. Vers. of N. T., p. 79.

But *I* say unto you." The greatest of the prophets never thus lifted himself above Moses. With our Lord, "I say unto you" became the equivalent of their "Thus saith the Lord." Again, His miracles are in the same way distinguished from the wonderful works wrought by all other messengers and prophets sent from God. The Lord Jesus Christ puts forth His hand and cleanses a leper with the words, "I will; be thou clean." He raises the dead by the mere command, "Arise;" "Come forth." His voice is potent at a distance, as when near at hand. He withers a tree by speaking to it. He calms a tempest by saying, "Peace, be still." He throws a chain upon demoniac fury. On one occasion, the memorable miracle recorded by all the evangelists, He fed thousands with five loaves and two fishes. The discourse which He uttered immediately afterward showed that what He then did was but a symbol of the standing marvel, ever more to be repeated in His kingdom till time should end, by which His Flesh and Blood should be the Life of that new spiritual world.

In His miracles, and in His enactments as Law-giver in His own kingdom, His manner is not so much that of One bringing proofs of Revelation, arguing, convincing, persuading, as of a superior bestowing from his bounty upon the objects of his favor and pity. If we might use an earthly comparison, it is more like the rich, the charitable, the powerful, dispensing gifts and blessings of their own impulse amid the needy, the forsaken, the friendless, than the action of a teacher or prophet who astonishes or silences by splendor of demonstration, or unveiling of Divine Power.

Consider what is implied in the surrender which Christ claims for Himself of human beings. It is difficult for us to do this correctly, because of the very familiarity of the words we are to consider. But in this relation of Christ to man lies the force of this part of our argument. Christ's message is simply a proclamation of Himself. "Come unto me." "I will give you rest." "Learn of

me." "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." All light, all strength, all encouragement, are centred in Him. If He cannot save us, we are indeed without hope. But His voice is potent, amid despair and human forsaking, in prisons and in exile. His voice will be heard by each one of us in the deep silence of the grave. We shall hear it and come forth. All that are in their graves shall hear His voice, the voice of the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee. The dead, small and great, shall be judged by Him.

Yes, there is no doubt that this claim is distinctly made by Him. The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son of man.<sup>1</sup> He identifies Himself with the august figure of prophecy, who with this title ascends the throne of universal dominion and judgment. He promises to return to the world at the end of time, upon the clouds of heaven, with His court of angels, to gather the tribes of men before Him, to award to all and each an unerring and irreversible judgment. Think of the nature of this claim in a teacher of religion. Is He merely man who can probe all human souls, and explore without hindrance or mistake the thoughts and intents of the heart? He makes by one sharp line eternal separations. No cases are reserved as too hard for Him. He disposes of those who in human eyes are "too good for hell or too bad for heaven." And still the claim to be universal Judge, tremendous as it is, is in simple consistency with His dealing while on earth with individual souls. He forgave sins absolutely; He empowered His Church also to forgive. Human souls are His possession; they are "given to Him" absolutely. His are the eyes that nothing created can escape. He knew, He alone knew fully, what was in man; and while He did not commit Himself unto men, He still loved them and sought their love. He says, "Follow me," and every claim must yield to that. He promises to dwell in the souls of those that love Him. He abrogates a defective conception of the Sabbath; He confirms

<sup>1</sup> S. John, v. 27. Dan. vii.

the true, by placing Himself with the Author of that law as the beginner of a new creation, the giver of an eternal rest. He exercises here in His kingdom the power that flowed from the oneness of His nature with the Father. Belief in Him opens the way to every spiritual gift ; to rescue from misery, temporal and spiritual ; to cleansing, to hope, to life. Unbelief dooms to spiritual death. But He lays bare not only the sins of those who reject and oppose Him, but of those who love Him, who cling to Him, who are destined to accomplish great results in His kingdom. He was born, He is in the world, to bear witness to this divine, this searching, this cleansing, this all-embracing truth.

This, who is sometimes called "the Christ of dogma," is the only "Christ of history." This is the Christ who stands out alike upon the page of the New Testament, witnessed by the heart and adoration of the Church to whom the sacred books were given, and before the world, Jewish and pagan, astonished and subdued by a new Presence upon earth. The Christ who is not God is a dream of stupid pedants, putting their own folly into inspired Scripture, while putting themselves out of the divine kingdom in which they do not believe. The Christ who is man as well as God embodies all that is ideally perfect in human nature, without defect or excess, wise and loving, sensitive yet patient, indulgent to the weak and erring, while firm and unshrinking in the path of self-sacrifice.

He who moved eighteen hundred years ago through the streets of the Holy City, through the highways of Palestine, had before Him a preparation, had after Him a history, unlike that of any human being. And still the Jewish nation and the Catholic Church themselves are wonders of little moment compared with Him who is the centre and strength of their significance and life. He is in garb an humble Jew. In His earthly form we are permitted to believe were united the strength of man, the tenderness of woman, the simplicity, the humility of

children. He sought for the love of souls. He opened at times without display the storehouse of the divine mercy. He bestowed gifts wherever there was faith to receive them. His mercy, His help, His prayers, His sympathy, were the simple instinctive impulse of His own power and goodness. He put aside force; He rejected stratagem. He sought not to win the learned by demonstrations, nor the ambitious by armies or legions. When His work was done, He permitted rude hands to break the casket of His humanity, whence issued on the world the fragrance of His forgiveness, His pity, His sacrifice, His intercession, His love conquering death, to be realized forever among perishing men, in a deathless kingdom, the unfailing home of faith and hope, while the world should last, while there should still be a soul seeking guidance, a wanderer from his Maker and Redeemer.

The power of the wonderful fact that the Author of this religion was in simple truth God and man, united in one Person, moving on the earth, has never been withstood by plain and earnest souls. Its light has been hidden only to the disputatious, the eclipse of heresy, the rending of schism. Its truth, however, is witnessed by an inward and an outward testimony alike irresistible: 1. Its own majestic consistency: if Jesus Christ be not the very God whom the heart of the Church adores, He is nothing and less than nothing; He is not one of the good men or sages whom men honor, but a being whom our tongue refuses to describe even in hypothesis, but whom the logic of unbelief is compelled to accept.<sup>1</sup> 2. The truth concerning His nature has the attestation of its effects upon the external world as witnessed by the cold, observant sense of those who merely describe the facts before them. The following is such an attestation from a worldly politician, who, though with heart untouched by religion, was widely and deeply learned in literature and in history. "It was before Deity embodied in a human form, walking among men, partaking of their infirmities,

<sup>1</sup> Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*. See esp. Lect. IV.

leaning on their bosoms, weeping over their graves, slumbering in the manger, bleeding on the cross, that the prejudices of the Synagogue, and the doubts of the Academy, and the pride of the Portico, and the fasces of the lictors, and the swords of thirty legions were humbled in the dust." <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Macaulay's *Milton*.

## LECTURE VI.

---

### CHANGES IN INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER : WONDERFUL CONVERSIONS.

NOTHING more forcibly calls attention to a new movement in religion, or in any other matter, than to observe it taking possession of strong and leading natures, changing their lives, inspiring exertion, giving them a new view of the world without, and reversing the currents of love and hatred within them. We believe that what can command a few choice and ruling souls is likely in the end to exert its influence over the many. We form our estimate of a new doctrine by a few typical spirits on whom it lays hold. The elements of character are alike in all men. It is not so much the presence or absence of this or that trait, as the greater or less strength, the predominance or subjection of some faculty or tendency, which forms the difference between individuals. It is something nearly the same that produces the unlikeness between one period of the same person's life and another period. Human characters and human lives are, for the most part, what they are as the result of hereditary influence, education, surroundings, leading examples. Still none of these things act like natural forces on the human spirit; that is, as we say, of necessity or even invariably. The human will constantly, even in the humblest and most obedient of the race, puts forth a disclaimer of its subjection to the uniformity of nature. But, besides the great constant educational influences at work, we speak now of the effect

upon an intelligent, sensitive human soul of bringing it on a sudden into relation with the mighty forces, kindred though lying external to its own proper being, some intellectual view, some appeal to passion, some incentive to choice, some sting of conscience, which, one or all, in an instant disturb the old balance of character and almost form a new man. Thus something like this, according to tradition, took place in what might be called the conversion to patriotism, or to ambition, of the young and dissolute Themistocles, after his thoughts had been directed to the deeds of the hero of Marathon, so that henceforth "the trophies of Miltiades would not suffer him to sleep." The change was great from the life of pleasure to the life of labor, from frivolity to earnestness, from self-indulgence to anxiety and danger; and gleams of the nobleness of the change are believed to shine forth even in his defeated life at its ignoble close, when as the pensioner of his country's foe he jested on his own outward ease,<sup>1</sup> while inwardly stung at the rising glories of Cimon, in whom he recognized the renewal of the same impulse that had produced all that was really great in his own career.

The argument we now desire to present may be stated something after this fashion: If there has appeared among men a religion addressing itself to every condition of man in every race, with such power that it cannot only mould the lives of those trained in its precepts, but, addressing itself directly to the most intelligent, the religious, the cultivated, the educated, men and women whose opinions are developed and whose habits are formed, produce a complete subversion of habits and opinions, putting certainty in place of uncertainty on the most momentous questions, replacing old habits by new ones of an opposite but even firmer kind; and while effecting this great transformation, not destroying the general balance or soundness of the character,<sup>2</sup> nor giving undue promi-

<sup>1</sup> "We should have been undone if we had not been undone." See Plutarch. on "The Character and Conduct of the Apostles," etc., Lect. VII., p. 283, etc. 1827

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Milman's *Bampton Lectures*,

nence to any lower element over a higher, but rather the reverse:—if, I affirm, any religion can be shown to effect such results, it brings with it a mark of truth and reality; it is such a religion as we should believe will be disclosed by the merciful Maker of men to His creatures and children. We are prepared to prove that the religion of Christ is illustrated by this token of truth, not once merely nor at a single period, but in instances without number, habitually, invariably, notoriously, through a succession of ages. Every powerful and generous influence is limited by the nature of the material upon which it operates. The truth acts upon human souls according to the measure of fidelity it finds in each. The truth remains the same, though one soul receives it and another rejects it, though it saves one and condemns another. Every human being that has even momentarily acknowledged a truth of religion has given its witness, though this has been immediately neglected or forgotten. The Old Testament brings before us men in various stages of religious illumination, and in different degrees influenced by religious fear and love, and these may be viewed as instances of partial conversion. Thus Esau, awakened to the results of his careless profaneness, sought in vain, though with tears, a place of repentance. Thus Balaam, though illuminated with the divine disclosures of prophecy, clung to his own sordid habits and dreams. And thus Saul could not cast self-will and ambition from his soul, even after he too had received “a new heart” from God, and been allowed to utter heavenly oracles with God’s prophets. But David, though stained most deeply with human infirmity, was permitted to secure God’s lasting favor, and, while relieving his own burdened soul, to give expression to the religious aspirations of souls in all ages. Under the new covenant a society was formed which spread itself throughout the world, in cities, villages, and country, setting up everywhere a little community which directly addressed human beings in their

Maker's name,<sup>1</sup> converted them, caused them to live new lives, exhibiting the sensibility of those who lived only for feeling combined with a self-control and contempt of pain which gave a new idea of heroism to the world. The only support and animating motive of such effects were found in the disclosures made from the unseen world, and in a real communion with that hidden source of strength.

The New Testament places before our eyes two memorable and typical conversions. The first is that of the Apostle S. Peter, who fell, through self-confidence and in spite of plain warnings, into open denial of his Divine Master, but was restored by the loving patience of that Master as He turned and looked upon His conscience-stricken disciple. S. Peter afterward showed an analogous weakness when he yielded to the prejudices of his countrymen against the Gentiles, but was brought back to the sounder position in which he had been instructed by vision, through the instrumentality of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

The conversion of S. Paul (which has been honored in the Church by an especial commemoration) is of so peculiar and marvellous a character, as to be able, almost by itself, to stand as an unassailable and complete vindication of the divine origin of Christianity.<sup>2</sup> The conversion of the original apostles is without doubt to be viewed as a miracle of divine power; and the peculiar attestation it gives to our religion, according to the well-known statement in the most classic of English works on the evidences, has almost the force of a mathematical demonstration: "There is satisfactory evidence that many professing to be original witnesses of the Christian miracles passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings, volun-

<sup>1</sup> Deum quilibet opifex Christianus enarrari in omnes difficilem."—Tertullian, *Apologeticus*, Ch. XLVI.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Lyttelton's *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of S. Paul*, S. P. C. K. 1848.

et invenit et ostendit et exinde totum, quod in Deo quaeritur, re quoque assignat; licet Plato [in *Timæo*, p. 28] affirmet factitorem universitatis, neque inveniri facilem et inventum

tarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motives, to new rules of conduct.”<sup>1</sup> This statement, I say, is a description of the effects of a true conversion, but it is a view of those effects rather from what might be called a legal stand-point; *i.e.*, so that if the evidence be once admitted there is no choice about receiving the conclusion: it is absolutely forced upon us. But the conversion of S. Paul, while containing the same elements of strength, possesses features of what is called, for distinction, probable evidence, soliciting our belief, meeting and anticipating objection, appealing at once to our reason, our sympathy, and our wills, by all the urgency which the spectacle of a good man triumphantly surmounting obstacles of every kind can bring to bear upon the human heart and soul.

Saul of Tarsus, we are to observe, when converted to the religion of Christ, was a Jew, already in the maturity of his natural powers. He had never been a dissolute or careless liver. On the contrary, he was religious and conscientious in the system in which he had been trained; and his training appears to have been an intelligent and peculiarly careful one. Such a person is least likely to undergo a sudden and radical religious change. But another circumstance seemed to pledge steadfastness to his position. He had become an active asserter and defender of his Jewish convictions; nay, more, he had proceeded to persecute the rising sect which threatened what his nation held dear. Every one knows the effect, even upon a well-balanced mind, of adopting such a course: the passions stimulating the judgment, the man begins to find it difficult to see anything but good on his own side, anything but evil in his adversaries. There can be no doubt that Saul felt the usual effects of such a position, protecting and hardening him against a sudden change. His natural characteristics, moreover, were a kind of defence or

<sup>1</sup> Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*.

pledge against any sudden or rash revolution of conviction or action. There can be no doubt that he possessed by nature the firmness and determination of a leader. He had the mind which clearly grasps the principles of a cause, and he had the courage to act upon them. He could not hold convictions loosely and indecisively. His moral earnestness would make him disdain to palter alike between truth and falsehood as between right and wrong. The liberal education he had received would free him from the fetters of all narrow and vulgar prejudice. It is plain, besides, to any impartial student of his writings, that this wonderful man possessed in large measure what the world calls common-sense. No better established maxims of homely and practical wisdom can elsewhere be found. Yet amid, with the plainest admonitions against, sloth, improvidence, selfishness, or lying, are mingled the tender touches of sympathy, the evidence of a soul alive to all that is gentle and noble, spiritual and unselfish. Here were an intellect and heart naturally incapable of being enslaved (at least permanently) by anything sophistical, or narrow, or groundless, or sordid. It had a natural guard against deception in its own soundness and sagacity; it could not deceive others because of its own transparent truthfulness and sincerity. An instinctive prudence withheld it from rashness; a general enlightenment shielded it from prejudice.

And yet the change by which Saul of Tarsus became S. Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, was both sudden and thorough. He saw, it is true, what is not ordinarily granted, a miraculous vision from Heaven. But we know, without the testimony of Scripture, that such visions come not with effect upon souls unprepared. This great convert, however, in touching words tells us how the vision affected him. "I was not disobedient," he says, "unto the heavenly vision." There can be no doubt that the first movement toward the mighty transformation in that great soul is to be traced to the moment when he beheld the martyrdom of S. Stephen. "And

when," he cries, in accents which come from the very depths of his soul: "And when the blood of thy martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by, and consenting unto his death, and kept the raiment of them that slew him." There was something in that sight more awful and moving than the visions of worldly fame which disquieted the sleep of the young Grecian hero. The dream of Jewish ambition, the fond hope of a worldly empire for their Messiah, glided from that young and earnest soul, and was replaced by a nobler vision wherein shone the splendor of that truer kingdom, the kingdom over souls,<sup>1</sup> far-reaching, all-subduing, whose foundation is sacrifice, whose pillars are love and faith and hope, ever defended and ever upheld, and growing, amid mortal failure, defeat, and weakness, by the power and favor of God. This vision was complete when the new apostle beheld with his own eyes the exalted King, Jesus, and heard the gracious voice appealing to him, and finally commissioning him to his glorious place and work in that kingdom, the conversion of the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me." Throughout the world, from age to age, till the end of time, in every land, in every town, in souls of every age and sex and enlightenment, the miracle wrought upon the great apostle was to find its image and renewal. Let us fasten our thoughts once more upon that marvel in its evidential aspect. It seemed so improbable at first that Christians themselves refused to believe it. Ananias, who received the convert by baptism into the Christian fold, had to be assured by express revelation of the reality of the change. Only the large-hearted charity and patience of Barnabas contended for a time against the persistent incredulity and

<sup>1</sup> Compare the account of the conversion of Norbert of the court of Frederick and of Henry V., A.D. 1114. Neander's *Hist. of the Church*, IV., 244, 245. Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of Monastic Orders*, p. 210.

distrust. Its suddenness was without doubt the chief ground of suspicion. And yet every conceivable proof of thoroughness was afterward afforded. S. Paul exhibited what even the uncharitable world has always admitted to be a sufficient evidence of sincerity, viz., a consistent life. Having put behind him what he had hitherto prized, and the friends that are dearest to the natural heart, he went forward in the strength of his new faith, amid new scenes and friends, in an unparalleled career of trials and labors, without once faltering or turning aside or looking back, to the very end. Amid his journeyings and perils by land and by sea, in the wilderness and in the city, among his countrymen and among false brethren, with the care of all the churches weighing upon him within, and the threatening of the heathen power always around him and above him without, he still refuses to lose courage or to abate a jot of heart or hope. He is not blind to the fact that the Gentiles are by nature no better, but rather often much worse, than his own countrymen. He is neither disheartened nor soured by treachery and betrayal. He is simply and always loyal to the Master that has revealed Himself out of heaven; he is anxious only to preserve in his own life and to enforce upon others a perfect obedience to that Master, in thought, word, and deed—"bringing into captivity," as he says, "every thought to the obedience of Christ." The thorough subjugation of a mind and heart like S. Paul's to a new religion just before deeply suspected and hated—a subjugation not attended, even according to the world's standard of judgment, by any deterioration in that nature by any bias toward fanaticism, or rancor, or bitterness, but rather by a ripening and development of all nobler traits—is surely a marvellous spectacle, well suited, if anything can be, to constrain and convince all candid souls. This strong man fights his battle with Jewish bigotry, then with heathen insolence and indifference; he takes the blows of the high-priest, the scourging of the Roman tyrant, the stoning of the senseless

mob; at one time asserting his civil rights, at another his knowledge of the law and of his oppressors, sending trembling into the bigot's and the tyrant's soul alike—yet always accepting ill-usage and scorn and injustice from men as a kind of wholesome discipline, viewing whatever is personal only as bearing on his great work, and so ever growing toward that standard of charity and patience shown by his Master and by S. Stephen, to which in the outset Saul of Tarsus seemed least likely to attain. Out of the chords of this strenuous and storm-tossed spirit is breathed finally that melody which of everything in the New Testament seems to bring us nearest heaven: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. . . . And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing."

We affirm that the conquest of a soul like this is a sufficient proof of the divine origin of the Christian religion. The power that effected it is beyond nature. The result attained is better than any nature has to show. That soul alone that has looked upon its Maker and Redeemer, that has felt His power, that has yielded itself to the transforming, cleansing, strengthening energy, could live as this one lived, could struggle and not be overcome, could rise from defeat, could pass from the prison and the scaffold in triumph into paradise.

In S. Paul our religion made a conquest which became part of her own divine message to the world. The writings of the Apostle to the Gentiles were assumed into the sacred canon of Scripture, and form a larger portion than any delivered through another single writer of the New Testament. It was fitting and needful that he who was thus honored should be at once a Hebrew and also acquainted with the culture in the Greek tongue, and hence able to utter faithfully the accents of the ancient tradition, while furnished with the intellectual ability to explain, unfold, and defend the truths of Divine

Revelation in their various relations to human knowledge and the problems of duty and of life. To this high function the Holy Spirit exalted the human gifts and the earthly experience of the Apostle S. Paul.

But God's Revelation to man, we can never permit ourselves to forget, is not a book alone, though it is contained and attested in a Book separated by its inspiration to an infinite distance from all other books. Not a page of inspiration, either of the Old Covenant or of the New, was committed to writing until after the formation of the divine kingdom, in whose existence alone the divine oracles find their meaning and interpretation. The relation of S. Paul's epistles to the various churches founded by him may be viewed as a type of the relation of all Scripture to the heavenly kingdom; at first Jewish, then the Catholic Church, which is the real Revelation of God to men. The eternal oracles delivered to Corinthians, to Ephesians, to Galatians, derive their force and significance and efficacy for perennial instruction from the existence before them of those seed-plots of immortal souls, whose existence here and there, and exuberant fertility throughout the world, was a miracle and a Revelation far more wonderful and significant than any marvel that could be contained in ink and parchment. The life, the unity, the all-subduing faith, the supernatural charity of the growing Church precede and prepare for, as they preserve and attest, the teaching of Holy Scripture. It belongs of necessity to the Church to pronounce what is and what is not Holy Scripture, and she alone can attest with certainty what is the substance of its meaning. When the sacred canon was closed, the divine claims of our religion were attested by a new series of conquests.

In the Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, which ratified the list of Canonical Scriptures, there sat one whose voice was potent then, as often, among his brethren, and whose history is also typical amid the wonderful conquests of the Cross.

Augustine was brought by his conversion from a worldly, dissolute life to a thorough and religious consecration of body, soul, and intellect, to purity, to morality, to self-denial, to charity, and to labors for bringing other men to the obedience of the Faith. The transformation that passed upon him is one of the most shining testimonies to the true religion, because of the marvellous personal endowments which place him by himself in the history of the Church, and because his Christian principles were beyond question the ground of whatever became admirable in him, correcting natural and acquired faults, developing and ripening his rare and unique gifts, preserving the balance of his varied powers, and affording them a worthy field for their exercise.

He was the child of a Christian mother, whose influence was restrained by a pagan father, and during youth and manhood lived in almost pagan license; directing his own education with capricious wilfulness, flying to philosophy, but refusing to study Greek; superficially despising Holy Scripture, because of its lack of philosophy, then falling into the snare of Manes, who gilded Persian dualism and real licentiousness with the gloss of Scripture language and the profession of asceticism. Augustine is finally redeemed from the snares of heresy and the power of the world by the preaching of S. Ambrose, and his conversion was once connected by tradition with the first use of the *Te Deum*.

Well might the Church utter her most exalted strains at the recovery of such a soul. In the moulding of the nations of Europe to the religion of Christ, S. Augustine represents her mightiest force. He stands as one of the four great Latin doctors: S. Augustine, S. Jerome, S. Ambrose, and Gregory the Great. He is inferior in learning to S. Jerome; he might not move a multitude by eloquence and personal magnetism like the great soldier-prelate, S. Ambrose of Milan; he found little in his obscure African diocese that could be compared to S. Gregory's functions as ruler and teacher in the Imperial

City. Yet beyond doubt it has fallen to the lot of the Bishop of Hippo to exercise a wider, a firmer, a more lasting sway over the minds and souls of his brethren than any other of the four, or perhaps than any uninspired teacher since S. Paul.

His influence may be viewed as threefold : First, in its personal aspect, as the thorough and successful recovery to purity and holiness of a nature that had wallowed in sin in the service of the world and the flesh. The directness, the sincerity of this change, the struggle with the enfeebled will, the humility which remained after grace had triumphed, are set before us in his Confessions with a moving power which renders that book unique in Christian literature. It has none of the morbidness that attaches to almost every other effort at self-analysis. The second aspect of S. Augustine's influence is as the organizer of the ascetic life, which in the subsequent career of Christian Europe looked to this great teacher more than to any other for instruction and regulation. The regular and secular and White Canons, those of Sempringham (that is, the men) and the Friars Eremite, among many others, and finally the two great military orders of the Knights Hospitallers and Knights Templars, adopted the rule of S. Augustine. The third and perhaps leading aspect of the influence of this great man is as teacher and writer, explaining and defending the faith of the Church against deniers and adversaries of every kind. He makes no claim to infallibility. In writing to S. Jerome,<sup>1</sup> he strongly contrasts the authority of his friend's writings and of his own with that of Holy Scripture, to which he yields unreserved obedience; and yet he elsewhere affirms that he should never have received the Gospel, unless moved thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church.<sup>2</sup> He composed, toward the close of his long career, a volume of Retractations, in which he sought to withdraw or correct whatever was unsound or mistaken in his numerous writings. These writings, which are of

<sup>1</sup> Ep. lxxxii. ad Hieron.

<sup>2</sup> *Cont. Ep. Manich.*, Ch. V.

the most miscellaneous character and touching upon almost every subject—scientific, religious, literary, practical, expositions of Scripture, letters to friends, the lives of religious communities, polemics against heresies and schisms, pagans and Jews, as well as apologies to the rulers of the day for the Christian view of secular life—contain, in particular, four leading topics and lines of teaching bearing on them, which will be forever associated with S. Augustine's name and work. The first is the Manichæan error in which the saint had been once himself ensnared;<sup>1</sup> the second is the Arian controversy, in the aspect it took in the West; the third is the Donatist schism; and the fourth, the Pelagian heresy, and the questions it started. The last, perhaps, is more than any other peculiarly identified with S. Augustine's name. All of the works of this great man, written subsequent to his conversion, bear the impress of the mighty change which then passed upon him. That change might perhaps be characterized as the restoration to self-control, and the proper balance of the elements of a nature of marvellous endowments in heart and mind and conscience and will, which had been seriously disordered, but which lived henceforward for a most serious practical aim. This practical character of S. Augustine's works, however abstract his theme, however remote or intricate the speculation into which he diverges, might be called their leading trait, and would first occur to a purely literary taste. Though marked with the most varied literary power, his mind produces nothing that would be termed distinctively literature; *i.e.*, composition in which form is the pre-

<sup>1</sup> Many of the statements which S. Augustine says were constantly made to him by the Manichæans to allure him in his early years have a marvellous resemblance to the favorite teaching of many in the present day, who, professing reverence for Scripture, still reject the Church. "Setting aside the terrors of authority, they would lead such as would listen

to them to God by the plain and simple way of reason. . . . They alleged that we were terrified by superstition, and that faith was enjoined to us before reason, while they urged no one to believe until the truth had been sifted and cleared." —On "The Benefit of Believing," Pref. to *Honoratus*.

dominating impulse. His object is always to warn, to persuade, to remove difficulties, to arouse conscience, to quicken the life of religion, to show the weakness of the mere speculative intellect, to vindicate the truths of Revelation, to bring all persons and all minds into subjection to Christ's kingdom on earth. We must never forget what was never absent from the mind of the saint in all his preaching and teaching, viz., that he professed not to speak with the authority of Scripture, but simply as a loyal son of the Catholic Church. He submitted all speculations and every statement absolutely to her authority. He wrote a letter (Ep. xxviii.) to his friend S. Jerome, remonstrating against an interpretation of Holy Scripture which seemed to sanction falsehood. This faithful humility has caused him, since he was found most nearly of all to be worthy of such an honor, to be almost her mouthpiece and oracle upon many of the most important questions discussed in the history of the Church. To men of the world his writings present as little of attraction as the words of "a field preacher."<sup>1</sup> To sectaries, unbelievers, and adversaries, who neither think of nor believe in a Kingdom of God, and hate the conception, the words of this effective champion are a constant theme of distortion and misrepresentation. He is at one time too rigid, after being too lax. He is too subtle, they say, too abstract, too logical for human nature. Then they affect to consider the Church committed to every position and sentence in his writings. The truth, on the other hand, concerning Augustine, seems to be something like this: seeking to atone for his wasted youth, he threw all the energies of his manhood into the strengthening of the only institution he discovered on earth having any claim to be in possession of divine truth, or to be the home and refuge of virtue. He exposed the false pretences of the paganism and wickedness sheltered under Manichæism. The opposition he made to Arianism peculiarly marks his mental char-

<sup>1</sup> This is Macaulay's comparison. See *Life* by Trevelyan.

acter and training. He had early refused to study Greek. With a mind peculiarly qualified for metaphysical discussion, he was without that especial discursiveness which the Greek literature imparts. He handles, therefore, the various subtle and profound questions raised in the Arian controversy with a certain directness, and at the same time seriousness and thoroughness, suited to the Western mind. He brings back to the unity of the Church the schismatical Donatists not by writings merely, but by personal conference, in which his power appears to have been wonderful, and his success oftentimes marvellously complete. This fact significantly stamps the true character of the man. His logic was not marked by the petty and technical character calculated rather to tease than to convince. It was the instrument, skilfully and patiently wielded by a calm and comprehensive intellect and a heart of abounding charity, to shake the pride of reasoning, to bring into view the different sides of a difficult subject, to wring confessions from unwilling disputants, but only as preparatory to that victory over them which consisted in making them see and own the light of the truth. It is affirmed that Augustine in 417, during the Donatist troubles, defended before the Governor Boniface the principle that heretics might be restrained by temporal punishment.<sup>1</sup> Yet over against this letter should be set the fact, renewed all through his career, that he constantly interceded for those likely to suffer hardships for their wrongdoing.

The statements most frequently reproduced for his discredit are such as he uttered in the different stages of the Pelagian controversy in reference to predestination, reprobation, the loss of the unbaptized, the natural corruption and helplessness of man's nature. Now, first, it

<sup>1</sup> In modern factory legislation, parents and employers have had to be restrained by law from systematic cruelty and injustice toward their own children and employés—not being able to be trusted with the protection of those most near to them and needing their care, when themselves were influenced by love of money and business competition.

should be remembered, in reference to these statements, that the words of S. Augustine, the honored doctor of the Church, cannot be interpreted in precisely the same sense as similar words in the mouths of teachers like Luther and Calvin, who had repudiated the authority of the Kingdom of God. And the reason is plain. The holy doctor finally submitted all his utterances to the Church's authority, and never put metaphysics in the place of revealed religion. And another reason for such a judgment of extreme statements in the writings of this author is to be found in that same practical character already insisted upon. They can, most of them, be balanced by other statements, which should in fairness qualify and complete their meaning. And it may finally be affirmed with confidence, that no man who wrote and uttered so much during a long and conspicuous career, in so many fields of controversy, throwing habitually his whole mind and heart and soul into the contention, can with any show of justice be convicted of so little, not only of inconsistency or of vacillation, but of haste or prejudice or narrowness or bitterness. His works became the great treasure-house for many generations to preachers and theological instructors, seeking either to edify their brethren, to expound Scripture, to defend the truth against error, or to lay the foundations of theology in a distant age, and almost in a new world. The Church has ever believed that S. Augustine was saved and restored to the Faith through the persevering prayers of his mother, S. Monica; and after-ages of believers recognized the fact that his new mother, the Church herself, obtained in her gifted son an intellectual and spiritual force, able to renew and repeat the work of grace wrought first in him and then a thousand times through many generations. Perhaps one might sum up the instruction which the Church, through S. Augustine, offers to the world for all time, as lying in the threefold affirmation: first, of the

<sup>1</sup> See, *e.g.*, how one of Bossuet's great sermons is evolved out of S. Augustine's *spe desperati*.

reality of a supernatural revelation recorded in Scripture, witnessed by the Church; secondly, of the comprehensiveness of the control of revealed truth over the mind and heart and will of the individual, and over the governments and kingdoms of the world; and thirdly, of the superior importance for the preservation of this sacred truth in the world in power and efficacy, of the unbroken unity of the holy Church over all individual and personal gifts, however shining or exalted. The last years of this gifted man were employed in the composition of a comprehensive work on "The City of God," designed to show how immortality was secured in this heavenly community to all that deserved to live in the history and achievements of men.

The evidential force of S. Augustine's conversion may be stated in this way: Here is a mind with a clear, calm, comprehensive, and yet practical view of the problems of the world, of life and of duty, who yet beholds in the religion of Christ a sufficient solution of them, and having accepted that solution, adheres to it firmly, intelligently, through temptation, through opposition, making it triumphant in controversy, and an unflinching personal stay and comfort to the end. Has any false system such a conquest to show us? What could the truth do more with the best human material than this?

Modern times present us with a wonderful conversion of so peculiar a character that it may serve to give completeness to the view we have endeavored to present of this evidential power of the Christian religion. It is the conversion of a poor, untaught mechanic from reckless living and profaneness to a devout life, where the images of his spiritual experience took such deep possession of his mind, that, although uneducated, he wrought them into a book that took its place among the masterpieces of literature, having a charm for every class, but a peculiar power over the simple, and uneducated, and children, and the religious poor. Scott describes with inimitable pathos how the memory of the religious images of this

book abide in a poor girl's mind, shaken by madness and the experience of sin and wrong, and break forth in song in her death agony (Madge Wildfire in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*). The *Pilgrim's Progress*, by John Bunyan, is not free from the marks of the obscure sectaries to whom he belonged, a certain coarseness and crudeness of spiritual conception inevitable to those who are separated from Catholic culture. But these blemishes are very trifling in the work viewed as a whole—a work that makes the great outlines of Christian conversion a story as real and vivid as the story of any series of events that ever occurred to mortal man; how the sinner escapes from the City of Destruction through the warning of a heavenly messenger; how he passes the wicket gate, the desolate swamp, over the straight road to the Interpreter's house; the cross and the sepulchre, the steep hill and the pleasant arbor that meet his view; the enchantment of House Beautiful, the Valley of Humiliation; the spiritual foes that start up to bar the way, the dread Apollyon, the breathless combat, the high precipices, the black clouds, the dens of horror; the passage through the pitfalls of Vanity Fair; finally, by the silver mine and the meadow of lilies, to the sheepfolds and orchards of the Delectable Mountains; thence through the Enchanted Ground, by the cold river that all must pass, into the land of Beulah, whose delights fail not. In this marvellous allegory, which can charm the young soul that knows nothing of a second meaning, all the great realities of the Christian life, known with more or less vividness to every one who is a Christian indeed—the restlessness of conscience, repentance, confession, amendment, the struggle against temptation within and without, the combat of the flesh against the spirit, the vision of faith—assume a definiteness, a proportion, an air of real life and being, which cannot easily be cast away. We affirm that no other save the true religion can present us with such a token of truth as this work in connection with its author's history. In

literature it is the peer of works of the loftiest genius, and has been compared to *Paradise Lost*. But it derives its power simply from the truth, which always makes the great experiences of the soul of deepest interest to every other human soul, from its life-like picture of that path of spiritual discipline over which the merciful Physician and Redeemer of the soul leads His own erring creature back to felicity and to Himself.

## LECTURE VII.

---

### EDUCATIONAL POWER.

A REVIEW of the power to educate manifested in the Christian religion suitably follows the subject of wonderful conversions which we have just considered, because its ordinary and usual mode of action may be described as educational, while it still holds within its grasp, and can put forth upon occasion, the marvellous energy that can in an instant transform human souls.

Holy Scripture sets before us certain typical examples of persons consecrated by the Author of religion to some great work in His service by a special training from their very birth. Moses, the founder of the divine polity on the earth, by a marvellous providence is saved from the death which threatened his people in Egypt, and at the same moment given back to his true mother to be nurtured and trained, and his safety secured by the word of the princess, who "pays the wages" of his instruction also in all the wisdom of Egypt. The child Samuel, lent by his mother to the Lord from his birth, we are told "grew" amid the hallowed services to which he was consecrated, "and the Lord was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground." And so S. John, that was to be "the prophet of the Highest," "grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel." And in this, these and all other forerunners were but types of Him before whom they were sent. For of Him too we read: "And the Child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon Him." "He went down with His parents to Nazareth, and was subject unto them." "And Jesus

increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."<sup>1</sup> The Incarnate Son, that is to say, exhibits to us the first period of His life upon earth as a growth toward perfection in obedience to parents, country, and religion. The exhortation to Christians to make their religion an educational power is an habitual one with the Apostles. "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise." "Giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge." "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith."<sup>2</sup>

These texts may serve in a general way to set forth the fact that the true religion is peculiarly a power fit to educate the soul of man, and next, that the principle to which it primarily and continually appeals in the process is faith. As S. Paul says in the last text quoted, it is a mighty truth *revealed*, and instinctively seized upon by the prepared soul, Jew or Gentile, as soon as heard; then all after experience of the world, viewed by the soul that has had this glimpse of its God as a righteous judge, increases the faith then lodged within it. It is thus an educating principle, not less logical than induction, for instance, in physical science, which proceeds on the principle that "what in our investigations is ever tending to be universal, may be considered universal." What becomes more and more like truth the more we try it, we may call, if not simply a proof, perhaps a growing proof. Its final proof is, in fact, "the salvation" of the faithful soul that has received it.

<sup>1</sup> Exod. ii. 9, 10. Acts, vii. 22.   <sup>2</sup> Eph. vi. 1, 2.   2 S. Peter, i. 5; 1 Sam. i. 28; iii. 19. S. Luke, i. iii. 18. Rom. i. 16, 17. 76, 80; ii. 40, 51, 52.

Education, whenever treated seriously, was felt, even among the enlightened heathen, to involve something of peculiar exaltation, and to be degraded if considered as simply, or mainly, directed toward securing bodily strength, or dexterity, or wealth, or indeed any special aptitude, physical or mental. Plato usually treats of it in connection with the welfare of the State, making light of what is confined to the mere individual. In the *Laws*<sup>1</sup> occurs this passage: "Let us consider that each of us is a sort of divine animal ['divine animal wonder'], either a plaything of the gods, or compounded with some earnest intent; for on this point we are ignorant: but this we do know, that these passions are inherent in our nature, and that they pull us, like nerves or ropes, and being themselves contrary, draw us to contrary actions, where virtue and vice are situated apart from each other." Certainly Plato, who treats the subject of education as seriously and worthily as any uninspired writer, and has put forth as many brilliant and profound suggestions upon the matter as can be found elsewhere, habitually declares that true education can be found only in that ideal state which was rather the subject of his dreams than the object of his confident hope.

That dream of the musing sage of the Academy has never been, and will never be, realized, save in the Christian Church. She educates, and she alone can educate, because within her is the presence of Him who made the soul of man, who still regenerates it and renews it, the loving Creator, Redeemer, and Saviour of our race. Next after the parental relation, there is upon earth no relation more important than that of the skilful and loving instructor. His duty is to teach the young soul to know itself and the world about it, and the Maker of both; to

<sup>1</sup> Bk. I., Ch. XIII. *Θαῦμα μὲν ὅτι ταῦτα τὰ πάθη ἐν ἡμῖν οἶον ἕκαστον ἡμῶν ἠγγίσθηκα τῶν νεῦρα ἢ σμήρηνθοι τινες ἐνρῆζώων θεῶν, εἴτε ὡς παίγνιον σαί σπῶδι τε ἡμῶς καὶ ἄλλήλαις λεινῶν, εἴτε ὡς σπουδῇ τιπὶ ἀνθέλκονσι ἔναντια οὐσαι ἐπ' ἐναντίας πράξσεις, οὐδὲ διωρισ- γιγνώσκωμεν· τὸδε δὲ ἴσμεν μένη ἀρετῆ καὶ κακία κείται.*

make this soul committed to his charge in love with knowledge, to thirst for it, and to learn to satisfy its thirst; to make it discriminate between different kinds of knowledge, preferring one to another, while despising no real knowledge; to cause it to put forth the exertions of self-denial, to labor with patience, to accept pain without shrinking; to lead it to realize by degrees that the abstract knowledge itself is most valuable which is the fruit of one's own experience, or has been tested by something in our experience analogous to it, or has been taught, or been suffered for, or cleared from doubt in our own minds or in the minds of others. Education covers knowledge, duty—in its most extended sense, to God, to our neighbor, and to ourselves—and some initiation into the principal functions of life. No education can be complete if in the instructor there be wanting either, first, information on any leading branch of knowledge, or, second, the power of imparting self-control, or, thirdly, the ability to make his pupil take some steps in the principal paths of exertion. Now, the Christian instructor is of course not cut off from any knowledge which any other teacher has; but he has, besides, real and important knowledge on the most important of subjects—subjects concerning which the wise of this world affirm that no knowledge exists or is attainable; *e.g.*, concerning the being and attributes of God, the future life of man, the expiation for sin, etc. In the Christian Church it is no vain boast, but tested by constant experience, that man can be taught self-control; and from the beginning the world beheld, at first with amazement, then with indignation, that the Christian education was a very real and enduring one. It was not a mere profession of wisdom and new illumination; it produced in young and old, the lettered and the unlearned, nobles, slaves, and artisans, a quiet but firm habit and action in worship and daily life, which threatened the subversion of the religion and manifold customs founded on it in the pagan world. This was the astonishing power put forth by Christianity from its very

beginning, and as open to the observation of the ordinary observer as to that of the philosopher or historian. What is here maintained is not that the Bible contains all knowledge, secular and religious, or that the Church was acquainted with sciences, with astronomy, geology, electro-magnetism, unknown then to the learned world: what is maintained is that the Church possessed in the Scriptures, and in her own sure knowledge of their meaning, a body of religious truths revealed directly from God, undiscoverable by human reason (nor of such a nature as men could find out for themselves), and that these truths upon the highest and most important of all subjects were not only not unfriendly to any other truths, but, on the contrary, gave to their possessor an inestimable advantage even in the search after natural truths. We maintain that the lofty and majestic truths concerning God and the angels, the creation, the nature of man, his fall and restoration, the future world, in the calm and sure possession of the plainest Christian, were the best preparation of mind for the reception of the grandest discoveries of modern science; and that the spiritual knowledge which the Christian alone knows with certainty is necessary in order that any one may hold in their integrity the various branches of knowledge which the human sciences have now disclosed to us. Herein lies the educational power of the Christian religion, and the proof that "Theology is the queen of the sciences" is no empty boast. This may be studied either as a fact seen in the actual historical rise of the different sciences, or recognized in the logical coherence of what religion teaches of the Author of the universe, and whatever science discovers in the investigation of His works.

As a matter of fact, it is within Christendom alone that the idea of education has ever received any adequate fulfilment. The science of the most inventive pagan nations, China or India, has lain in their midst for ages like a withered seed, dormant or unfruitful. It may be transmitted, like the hymns and rites of their idolatrous

worship, but without development or movement, or anything like an adequate cultivation of mind or heart. The Greeks themselves could not organize or preserve their best knowledge.<sup>1</sup> Education among the Jews, which seemed to come nearest the Christian idea, impressed indeed the monotheistic conception indelibly upon an Oriental nation; but for the rest, owing to their perversion of the sense of their Scripture, degenerated into simply a zealous guardianship of the words and letters of the sacred text. Ofttimes now an intelligent Jew of the old type appears in some Christian university and astonishes his instructor, first by the zeal and accuracy with which he gathers the facts and principles that glorify Christianity, and next gives his teacher a still keener astonishment by his utter insensibility to the logical meaning of these same facts and principles. The science of the Mohammedan Arabs of Saracenic Seville, for instance, has been thrown in the face of Christians, as better than their own, and as the source of much of the best of theirs. But without dwelling on the fact that the Moslem stole from Jew and Christian whatever is true in his religion, and from Aristotle and elsewhere the substance of his philosophy,<sup>2</sup> it is enough to ask, in what, after all, did his knowledge of science result? The Arabs transmitted as little of the fruits of education as the Turks themselves; and they can now receive no permanent benefit from the superior knowledge and great

<sup>1</sup> "A century before the reign of Alexander the Great, there sprang up and flourished in Greece a species of learning, or science, totally unlike to anything before known in the world. This science was carried to its highest perfection by Aristotle: it decayed with the loss of his writings, and revived with their recovery." Dr. John Gillies' *Life of Aristotle*, p. i. Pythagoras' anticipations of modern astronomy (he is said to have known the sphericity of the earth, and its

revolution around the sun) were actually displaced by the crude Ptolemaic theory two and a half centuries B.C., and not rediscovered till modern days by the Christian priest Copernicus.

<sup>2</sup> The so-called Arabic numerals and the denary system were really the invention of the Brahmins in India, and were unknown to the Arabs before the twelfth or thirteenth century. See Brooks' *Phil. of Arithmetic*, Ch. II., p. 24. Lanc., 1880.

discoveries of the Christian nations, of whom some apostate Christians would persuade us, forsooth, that they were the real teachers!

The very conception of a Christian, if we attempt to throw it into an abstract form, may be said to be an educational one. One of the very earliest notices of the rising Christian community amid the heathen world is that contained in the celebrated letter of Pliny to the emperor Trajan, where the substance of the account was, that the Christians met before day in some retired spot, united in a sacrament which involved a pledge to abstain from every wickedness, sang a hymn to Christ as God, and then separated. To be a Christian, then, involves personal examination, self-rule, purity, the reception of revealed truth, a united worship, a consistent life. Always a single act, any deliberate sin, conformity to idolatry, it was felt might cast a Christian from his place, and make him once more as other men. His life was a discipline and education, not of the intellect alone, but of the heart and feelings also, and of the will. When the recognition of the State enabled Christian worship to expand into publicity and splendor, its substance still remained the same. There was the recognition in the stately ritual of the same fixed and majestic truths, made known by divine revelation to faith alone, of God, the Maker, Redeemer, and Sanctifier, coming near in baptism to regenerate, in holy communion to feed and sustain, peculiarly present in the thrilling worship. And beside the treasury of truth upon which the intellect and the heart were habitually stayed, there was the instruction of the preacher, applying to the various experiences of life and the changing times, the principles of action, old and yet ever new, stirring up the indifferent, answering doubts, challenging objections, confirming the weak, making use of the very learning and eloquence of the world, its heresies and partial truths, to illustrate and set forth the one truth which came from God. Here, I say,

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, Draper in *Intellectual Development of Europe*.

in the very worship of Christians, amid the Church's basilicas and cathedrals, was an education for the complete man; for his intellect, in the loftiest truth; for his heart and will, in the resistless appeal to what is noblest and most tender and most moving in the way of example; and, finally, even to the art impulse, in the worship which disdains not the choicest efforts of music and poetry, of painting and all the sister arts.

Out of the bosom of Christianity came forth institutions, I mean the university and colleges, which are unlike any that the world had yet seen, or that the most accomplished nation ever produced, not as being instruments to preserve and diffuse learning, for there were such long before, but as being able in some sort to organize learning, or, to employ a technical expression, to give it *integrity*, to combine a certain degree of fixedness with the impulse of progress.<sup>1</sup> We may compare Friar Bacon in his tower by the Isis, Newton amid the severe meditations of his private study, with Plato in the grove of Academus, or Aristotle in his twenty years' preparation under Plato, in some such way as this: the latter two left their great achievements to a learned world that could neither appreciate nor retain them; the first two, on the other hand, were in the midst of a circle of learning that could not only receive and keep their precious acquisitions, but could improve them, and finally add to them. The University of Bologna, in the dawn of the modern educational day,<sup>2</sup> was without doubt an institution whose function was to teach knowledge as such—knowledge of whatever kind, provided only it was real. The meridian of Cassini, that can be still seen traced on the floor of the great church of San Petronio, is a proof of the enthusiasm with which the Church welcomed what we call secular knowledge.<sup>3</sup> The typical university

<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt that certain virtues, courage, patriotism, chastity, charity, humility, were held in very different estimation, *proportionately*, or were emphasized very

differently in various periods even of Christian history.

<sup>2</sup> Savigny's *History of Roman Law*, Vol. III.

<sup>3</sup> Here are some more examples:

of Europe that arose half a century later, A.D. 1200, in Paris, embraced four nations, French, Picard, Norman, and English, but really all Europe; for the first comprehended the students from Italy and Spain, and the last from any part of Northern Europe.<sup>1</sup> The *Universitas*, at first the name of the mass of students and teachers, viewed as a corporate body, existing for education, protected by law, with by-laws of its own, was by degrees in every country regarded as a national institution, because its degree qualified for various offices and professional situations in these countries. Next, the name "Universitas" was held to imply that all branches of study were taught there. At Paris the subjects taught were arranged under faculties, namely, theology, law, medicine, and the seven liberal arts, rhetoric, logic, grammar, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music, what were called the Trivium and Quadrivium.<sup>2</sup> The faculties to whom the respective subjects were intrusted were themselves corporate under their own dean, or presiding officer. The colleges at the university were royal or private foundations for the benefit of poor students. In the universities of England, Oxford and Cambridge,<sup>3</sup> the colleges were developed into peculiar importance; the tuition of the fellows superseded the instruction of the professors in the university hall. At length it became necessary for the student to complete

Outside of Notre Dame, Paris, the zodiac is sculptured. But Virgo is rejected, and the Virgin Mary is put above all the rest. Abbé Dupuis relates that "the portal of the great Church of St. Denys, that of Strasbourg, and several others, present the zodiacs differently modified."

<sup>1</sup> See a sketch of the rise of the University of Paris, and of William of Champeaux, "the column among teachers," in Ch. de Remusat's *Abelard*, T. I., pp. 9-11, 40-44. Paris, 1845.

<sup>2</sup> Gram. loquitur; Dia. verba docet; Rhe. verba ministrat; Mus. canit;

Ar. numerat; Ge. ponderat; As. colit astra.

<sup>3</sup> See the interesting account of the development of the University of Cambridge out of the Abbey of Croyland, in Ingulphus's *Chronicle*, pp. 234-239. London, 1854. The true beginnings of the University of Oxford, Bp. Stubbs maintains, belong to the Plantagenet era, and not to that of Alfred the Great.—Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern History, Lect. VII., by Wm. Stubbs, D.D., Bp. of Chester. Oxford, 1886.

the curriculum of his own college before he was entitled to the degree of the university. In Germany, on the other hand, the peculiar university instruction never yielded to the rivalry of that of the college. And in different countries one or the other system chanced to prevail, according to the impulses swaying the world of learning; Scotland, for instance, following the German, Spain the English system. Now, it should be observed that the function of the university, whether in its primitive form collecting crowds of students to the lectures of some able professor,<sup>1</sup> or later, when colleges sheltered each their own foster-children and gave them more personal attention, was always substantially the same; viz., not to discover but to teach knowledge, to find a place for the knowledge of every kind that was real, and thus to recognize and to keep whatever acquisition had been once made. The real discoverers are apt to shrink from crowds, and even the drudgery of daily teaching. In modern days particular societies of the learned—like the Royal Society in England organized in the reign of Charles II., or the British Association of more modern times, the Ashmolean, or the Architectural Societies of Oxford, or the Academy of France, and similar associations in every country—are found first to attract and receive the discoveries of the pioneers of knowledge, and these are then taken up and incorporated into the college or university curriculum.

We call attention now to these familiar distinctions to remind you that the Church organized the university and the college not so much for the sake of the knowledge which they convey, as for the sake of the educational value in the acquirement, in due order and proportion, of all sound and real knowledge. The souls to be educated, the habits they form, the unprejudiced eye, the calm, clear vision, the humility that comes from having felt and

<sup>1</sup> Toward the end of the thirteenth century were founded the Universities of Avignon and Perugia, and these were followed by those at Cahors, Grenoble, Pisa, and Prague. It was the date at which Oxford in consequence lost its especial preëminence in science.

measured one's own powers, the becoming self-distrust, the gentleness toward others who may be ignorant or slow to learn, the refusal of rash and new, and the dislike of rude and irreverent, methods of teaching or learning—such are the things of supreme value in the true teacher's eye, even amid the utmost splendors of doctrine and discovery. The Church is not afraid of any new knowledge—it is hardly worth while to say—she is not afraid of any knowledge, because she knows and loves the Author of knowledge, both of the intellect that knows and of the wonders that delight and charm the intellect. The Church is not even afraid of the knowledge, or science, “falsely so called”; but she will not expose her children to its deceits, without preparation.

I have just been using some of the language of those who believe that the university and the college, or whatever educational efficiency they represent, can be employed apart from the Church, and that education can be carried on, and all practically useful results secured, without the aid of religion. The subject we have been considering offers a very convenient method of examining the feasibility of this position in a negative way. We ask, then, Is a college or university education possible apart from religion? And we answer, No, for this plain reason: the university proposes to teach knowledge of every kind; but a university without religion has dropped from the circle of knowledge not only a very important branch of knowledge, but precisely that which was held by the founders of universities to be of chief importance. Has, then, theology been proved to be unreal knowledge? If so, who has proved this? Has God been proved not to exist? Or has it been demonstrated that He never has made, and never can make, any direct revelation to man? If neither of these things has been done, it is certainly a radical defect in an institution, it is nothing less than a false pretence, to proceed on the supposition that it has been done, or to ignore the matter altogether.

But if a university or college may not safely attempt

to do without religion altogether, can it not adopt the view of some sect, and so become denominational? This can be and has been done, but the result is in substance the same. It destroys the idea of a university, because in lieu of a great subject it substitutes a particular view of that subject, the teaching of a sect instead of the more comprehensive teaching of the Catholic Church. This would be like putting the Baconian system, for instance, in place of the department of "Intellectual Philosophy." There remain persons who, unwilling to give up altogether such a branch of knowledge as "religion," ask, Could not some of it be taught which all sects, including the Church, would agree with, or at least would not positively reject? This doubtless, though difficult, is possible; nevertheless, it would still destroy the university, which, professing to teach all knowledge, allows itself in a leading branch to forbid the teaching, not of what has been shown to be false, but of any view of religion to which any sect, for good reason or bad, or for no reason at all, shall object.

I submit, then, that I have made out a good evidential argument for the divine origin of the Christian religion from its educational power, if I have shown that the most important agencies in education, the university and college, were the direct product of that religion; that their life is bound up with hers, and that what wounds her wounds them, and that apart from her they inevitably die. Even while I am writing this we have a striking illustration of these principles in our own country. The president of a leading college issues a pamphlet inculcating the oldest university in the United States with deliberate abnegation of everything that can be considered a reason for its being at all. "From the close of freshman year on," says President McCosh, "it is perfectly practicable for a student to pass through Harvard, and receive the degree of bachelor of arts, without taking any course in Latin, Greek, mathematics, chemistry, physics, astronomy, geology, logic, psychology, ethics, political economy, German,

or even English. I would rather," says the president, indignantly, "send a young man in whom I was interested to one of the old-fashioned colleges of the country, where he would be constrained to study Latin, Greek, mathematics, etc." For, the president justly argues, a *Studium Generale*, or university, should, if its name mean anything, "aim to draw forth the faculties God has given us. The powers of the mind are numerous and varied—the senses, the memory, the fancy, judgment, reasoning, conscience, the feelings, the will, the mathematical, the metaphysical, the mechanical, the poetical, the prosaic (quite as useful as any)—and all these should be cultivated; the studies necessary to do so should be provided, and the student required so far to attend to them that the young man by exercise may know what powers he has, and the mental frame be fully developed. To accomplish this end, the degrees of bachelor of arts and of master of arts were instituted." Now, how does it happen that a learned institution, furnished with wealth, numbers, prestige, could have brought itself thus deliberately to commit *felo de se*? The answer to this appears also to be furnished in the same pamphlet, and to consist simply in its repudiation of religion and religious training; first the Puritan type in which it was founded, then every type, form, or shred whatever. The motto of the original college was *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*. Now neither is any religion taught, nor any worship required, nor any attempt made to foster even a decent, moral life. "A student may pass through the once Puritan college of America without taking a single class of philosophy or a lesson in religion." Every form of literature, even to French plays and novels, is recognized and taught somewhere in this volunteer course, except the Holy Scriptures, about whose poetry even, or morality, or spirituality, it does not appear that any one has anything to say.<sup>1</sup> No

<sup>1</sup> The system appears to be logically developed by Dr. Joseph Royce, "Instructor in Philosophy in Harvard College," who in a book just published, on *The Religious Aspects of Philosophy*, avows that "he has no

one is required to be present regularly at any lecture. No one gives account of his hours on week-day or Sunday. In the midst of "saloons, gambling-houses, and temples of Venus," no officer of the college raises a warning voice to these young souls, to point out the danger, to shield them from temptation, to stimulate conscience. Some father, predicts President McCosh, will yet say to this institution: "I sent my son to you believing that man is made in the image of God: you taught him that he is an upper brute, and he has certainly become so. I sent him to you pure, and last night he was carried to my door drunk."<sup>1</sup> A curse and not a blessing awaits you.

It would be difficult to find, or even to imagine, an illustration at once more melancholy and more complete, of the intimate and indissoluble union between religious failure and intellectual chaos—the loss of the highest knowledge and the resulting disorganization and confusion in every other branch of knowledge. My duty here is not to draw lessons and warnings from so serious a fact, but rather to point out how it confirms that bright evidence of her heavenly character, offered by the bride of Christ, in her power to educate human souls committed to her when she first appeared upon the stage of the world.

In another lecture I shall endeavor to show how some of the most important seeds and principles of true science were, in fact, contained in her divine message. But now I conclude by simply calling your attention, in a general way, to a certain resemblance between the method of religion, or rather of the Author of religion, in dealing with the human soul, and the process in all sound education, whatever branch of knowledge be taught.

The skilful teacher of language, for instance, implants first in his pupil's mind the idea of rule and exception,

present connection with any visible religious body, and no sort of desire for any such connection."

<sup>1</sup> *The New Departure in College Education.* Being a reply to Presi-

dent Eliot's Defence of it, in New York, Feb. 24. By James McCosh, D.D., etc., and President of Princeton College. N. Y., 1885.

a harmony governing all the rich diversity of speech. When the learner can trace out the fixed elements for himself, and recognize the conformities to, and deviations from, a few leading laws, real progress has been made. Great accuracy, minuteness, and even subtlety are compatible with this phase of education. If, again, the subject of teaching be mathematics, the root idea might be once more expressed as "a conception of development and arrangement from and around a common centre." He who learns history must apply to it the two sciences of time and space, chronology and geography, in order to make its lessons real and lasting; and if in literature he would master the principles of poetic composition, he must himself endeavor to produce, finding that only when he puts his own knowledge and feeling under the law of harmony it ceases to be passive and acquires life. Starting thus from fixed points, making good each step of progress, distinguishing what it knows from what it does not, true education advances upon its course.

Similarly, the human soul in the presence of the true religion<sup>1</sup> is made to recognize, first, that the true God is here, unveiling Himself and uttering truths and facts unknown and undiscoverable to human beings; yet requiring of us nothing impossible, nothing unreasonable—only simple faith, love, obedience, patience; the effort to look upon ourselves, and then to take the healing and cleansing of the good Physician; to put our returning strength to use, not selfishly, but in acts of sympathy and service to our brethren; to listen to heavenly truths and then to repeat them, and, if we can, to teach them with fidelity and with constancy; to check the swellings of pride; to be watchful, humble, prayerful, thoughtful. The firmness which insists that there is a revelation of divine truth

<sup>1</sup> "By relieving the mind from the distractions and importunities of the unruly passions, Christianity improves the quality of the understanding; while at the same time she presents for its contemplation objects so great and so bright as cannot but enlarge the organ by which they are contemplated."—Coleridge, *Works*, I., 225. N. Y., 1853.

above and beyond the power of man to discover ; that we must receive this upon authority ; that the Church can command her children in this matter—is as necessary in religion, as in science it is necessary to insist that there are terms and axioms which need not be defined or proved. Till these be admitted, no progress can be made. But after they have been firmly settled, the soul may, without distraction, go on unto perfection. The events of life are a part of divine education. And as the best results in the most approved human schools are not obtrusive or peculiar, or perhaps easily described—since they are rather in a general soundness and clearness of mind, an intellectual sobriety and steadiness of view, an interest in truths of various kinds, and a love of exact and careful investigation—so we doubt not that the souls whom the Saviour will number among His jewels are the pure, the humble, the steadfast, the peaceful ; souls to whom prophecies and visions, and eloquence, and miracles, and knowledge, if these have been vouchsafed, are still inferior to charity, to self-restraint, to the redemption of a brother, to the spectacle of a repenting and returning child of God, repeating amid tears and misgiving the confessions of sin, the hymns of thanksgiving, the love, the confidence, the joy, whose preludes here are echoed by the angels from the very courts of heaven.

## LECTURE VIII.

---

### INFLUENCE ON NATIONS.

THE view we propose to trace out in this lecture as part of the internal evidence of Christianity can be distinguished from those historical triumphs of the religion of Christ which form part of its external evidence, by considering, first, what is the idea of the State presented to us in Holy Scripture, and next how this idea has received aid, has prevailed, or been depressed by revealed religion. The simple narratives of patriarchal times suggest to us the natural rise of all governments out of the discipline of the family, and the authority of the Father gradually expanding into that of the chief of a tribe and the head of a state. Man by his nature requires society, and human beings cannot live together, in the simplest combinations, unless some rule and the rest obey. Thus under the same necessity, though with results varied by circumstances, spring up monarchies, aristocracies, republics.

Without doubt, God's people, many or few, might live with good conscience under a human government of any of these forms, or any combination of them, and pray for the peace and prosperity of the power over them, as long as it ordered them to commit no act in violation of God's law. The blameless Joseph<sup>1</sup> was invested by Pharaoh with ring and chain of gold in token of a delegated sovereignty over Egypt; in like manner, the prophet Daniel in later times had authority in Babylon. And

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xli. 42, 43.

we know how peculiarly in Scripture Egypt and Babylon are symbols of the world. The Almighty, it is true, founded a nation, a theocracy, in which He for a time was sole and immediate King; but this presently gave way to a kingdom of the ordinary type, with lines of succession varying much according to natural laws. One of the first injunctions in reference to the civil magistrate is the verse in the Book of Exodus, afterward quoted by S. Paul in reference to the Jewish high-priest: "Thou shalt not revile the judges, nor curse the ruler of thy people."<sup>1</sup> Again: "According to the sentence of the law which they [the priest and the judge] shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, to the right hand, nor to the left."<sup>2</sup> Our Lord and His Apostles very plainly enjoin obedience to heathen rulers: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's." "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. . . . Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. . . . He beareth not the sword in vain. . . . Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well."<sup>3</sup> The Spirit of Wisdom is represented in the ancient Scriptures as crying aloud: "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice. By me princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." And the

<sup>1</sup> Exod. xxii. 28. Acts, xxiii. 5. 3, 4, 7. Tit. iii. 1, 2. 1 S. Peter, ii.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xvii. 11. 13, 14.

S. Matt. xxii. 21. Rom. xiii. 1,

prophet Daniel proclaims to the king of Babylon that the judgment sent upon him will continue, "until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." Nay, the proud king is told that the Almighty may at times set over this earthly kingdom "the basest of men."<sup>1</sup> The creaturely symbols, the lion, the bear, and the leopard, the first and the last with eagle's wings, or those of other fowl,<sup>2</sup> by which the great empires of the earth were indicated in the prophet's vision, may well suggest how each, under Providence, filled up a career as fixed and peculiar as the animal life that is regulated by instinct. Our Lord represented the general elevation of the spirit of His followers by asking, "Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" And to this He subjoined a promise: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." The especial blessing of the meek (or the peaceful) He had already pronounced to be that "they shall inherit the earth." This pledge was, in fact, contained in the Book of Psalms: "Those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. . . . The meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace."<sup>3</sup>

The Roman world, for two centuries after the birth of the Prince of Peace, offered a strange commentary upon His words. The Roman Empire, for which in his vision the prophet had found no one symbol that was suitable, because "it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it," was not only the most comprehensive and most powerful of the dominions that had yet appeared, but through its organization crushed and absorbed into itself

<sup>1</sup> Prov. viii. 15, 16. Dan. iv. 17, perhaps than other great military powers, but as bad."—R. Payne

<sup>2</sup> Upon the fertile plains of the Euphrates were vast earthly empires, cruel, merciless, the robbers and

oppressors of mankind; not worse  
<sup>3</sup> Dan. vii. 4-6. S. Matt. vi. 25, 33; v. 5. Psalm xxxvii. 9, 11.

every other earthly power. No opposition could stand before it; and it seemed to have secured every pledge that man can have of perpetuity, of being what its capital was called, "The Eternal City." The two centuries first after Christ, notwithstanding the tyranny of some of the Cæsars, which fell upon the rich and noble more than the multitude, and was forgotten in the prosperity under the five good emperors that followed, were marked, it has often been alleged, by greater temporal blessings—peace, health, wealth, the spread of agriculture and the liberal arts, plenty of every kind among high and low—than during any period of the world before or since. The only exception to the general happiness lay in the cruel persecutions of the Christians, kept up under the philosophic Antonines as they had been begun under the bloodthirsty Nero. If they were protected in one quarter from the inquisitions of spies or the assault of the mob, they were still liable everywhere to the calm discountenance of the magistrate. It has been said: "The more the heathens prospered, the more they scorned, hated, and persecuted the true Light and the true Peace. They persecuted Him for the very reason that they had little else to do; happy and haughty, they saw in Him the sole drawback, the sole exception, the sole hindrance, to a universal, a continual sunshine; they called Him 'the enemy of the human race;' and they felt themselves bound, by their loyalty to the glorious and immortal memory of their forefathers, by their traditions of state, and their duties toward their children, to trample upon, and, if they could, to stifle, that teaching which was destined to be the life and mould of a new world."<sup>1</sup>

It seems to us that the fall of the Roman dominion, and the rise, amid its ruins and the fierce tribes of conflicting and conquering barbarians, of the different states and kingdoms of modern Europe, afford the most striking and affecting lessons in the history of the world, first of the weakness of human power, under the greatest advantages

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Office and Work of Universities*, Ch. IX., p. 159.

of organization, when fighting against morality,<sup>1</sup> and when also the declared foe of God's kingdom; and, secondly, of the inherent power in that kingdom, and in the principles of revealed religion, to organize the most stubborn and intractable tribes of men into powerful and enduring states who have had a great career in the world. The day of prosperity at length began to darken over the entire Roman world; the vindictiveness of persecution culminated under Diocletian, and made its final and despairing effort under the apostate Julian, even after the imperial power had acknowledged the supremacy of the Cross. The proud rulers of the world began to tremble for the empire of Rome; at times they even cried to the religion they had despised and trampled upon, for temporal aid, as column after column of their great dominion tottered and fell. The Goths rushed upon them from the north and east; Vandals and Huns followed the Goths; province after province, east and west, were plundered and re-plundered; and by the time the Lombards appeared it seemed as if, throughout the fairest districts of the empire, the very seeds of recovering civilization had been destroyed, as by a fire again and again rekindled, or as by a flood that had penetrated everywhere and drowned every living creature. Not merely were the old Roman government and the very municipalities on which it had been founded, destroyed, but literature and the traditions of the old civilization were wiped out. Justinian's pandects was an unknown volume;<sup>2</sup> along with the liberal arts, architecture and engineering were lost. It is curious that the only hope of saving the empire, by the conversion of some of its earlier foes—the Goths for instance—through the Christian religion, into allies and children of Rome,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This weakness was seen and described even by the heathen:

"Saevior armis  
Luxuria incubuit victumque ulsciscitur  
orbem.  
Juvenal, VI., 292, 293.

<sup>2</sup> With the accidental discovery at Amalfi, A.D. 1130, of a copy of Jus-

tinian's pandects, the study of the civil law revived and came into vogue in Western Europe.—See Blackstone's *Comment.*, Introd., Vol. I., p. 18 (10).

<sup>3</sup> The sons of Theodoric the Visigoth were taught Virgil and Roman law in the schools of Gaul.

was defeated by the dissensions of the Arian heresy, fostered, as it often was, by the imperial rulers. Thus the malice of Satan, when it seemed to have found lodgement in the dissensions of God's kingdom itself, could not avert the punishment and utter overthrow of that relentless worldly power, his instrument for so long a time in oppressing God's Church. Pagan Rome fell, though recanting in its death agony its paganism, and confessing, as did Julian, the victory of the Nazarene.

It is no exaggeration, it is plain historical fact, that the vitality, the organizing principle of every state that afterward arose in Europe, are to be found in the religion of Christ. This might be shown by recounting what is known of their beginnings and history, one by one. First, the organization of the ascetic life, which to Christians of modern times seems a perversion of religion, was, in that corrupted age, of similar necessity with the stricter discipline of an army in the country of a watchful foe. Christians, says Gibbon scornfully, "seriously renounced the business and the pleasures of the age, abjured the use of wine, of flesh, and of marriage, chastised their bodies, mortified their affections, and embraced a life of misery, as the price of eternal happiness. In the reign of Constantine the ascetics fled from a profane and degenerate world, to perpetual solitude or religious society. . . . The monks might, indeed, contend with the stoics, in the contempt of fortune, of pain, and of death; the Pythagorean silence and submission were revived in their servile discipline; and they disdained, as firmly as the cynics themselves, all the forms and decencies of civil society."<sup>1</sup>

When the waters of the flood that submerged the profane world began to subside, it was found for several ages that the sanctuaries and monastic homes of these despised men were the only refuge, the first for life and honor against the cruelty and lust, and the second for learning, amid the ignorance and barbarism, of the sur-

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Ch. XXXVII., Vol. III., pp. 520, 521. Am. ed.

rounding darkness. "Whatever reproach may, at a later period, have been justly thrown on the indolence and luxury of religious orders, it was surely good that in an age of ignorance and violence there should be quiet cloisters and gardens in which the arts of peace could be safely cultivated, in which gentle and contemplative natures could find an asylum, in which one brother could employ himself in transcribing the *Æneid* of Virgil, and another in meditating the *Analytics* of Aristotle, in which he who had a genius for art might illuminate a martyr-ology or carve a crucifix, and in which he who had a turn for natural philosophy might make experiments on the properties of plants and minerals. Had not such retreats been scattered here and there, among the huts of a miserable peasantry and the castles of a ferocious aristocracy, European society would have consisted merely of beasts of burden and beasts of prey."<sup>1</sup>

The Church without doubt laid the foundation of her most fruitful principle in the constitution of states when she set herself with determination to the extirpation of slavery. Though Homer proclaimed that the day which reduced man to slavery took away half his manhood,<sup>2</sup> yet the great writers and the great states of antiquity both justified and practised slavery. The Church, on the other hand, first strove to protect the liberty of the enfranchised by forbidding under ecclesiastical censures their reënslavement, and by often making their emancipation a religious act, performed in churches.<sup>3</sup> Next she encouraged the zeal of all who labored for the redemption of captives. Some of her greatest saints did not hesitate to sell the sacred vessels for this hallowed purpose. It is curious how eagerly the Jews availed themselves of the power put into their hands by the odious system of slavery.<sup>4</sup> The Church consecrated to God those whom

<sup>1</sup> Macaulay's *England*, Ch. I, p. 6. Canon of Fifth Council of Orleans,

<sup>2</sup> *Odyssey*, XVII., 322, 323. A. D. 549.

<sup>3</sup> See Seventh Canon of Council of Orange, held A. D. 441, and Seventh <sup>4</sup> The Thirteenth Canon of the Third Council of Orleans, A. D. 538,

she had redeemed. She also, in various places, pledged liberty to those who desired to enter the monastic state. The Spanish Church regulated by canon the admission to the holy ministry of those who had been enfranchised.<sup>1</sup> The noble doctrine of S. Augustine on the subject of slavery became the accepted teaching of the Church. It was, that slavery was simply the punishment of the sinner; that in the order of nature the Creator<sup>2</sup> "ordained that reasoning creatures, made according to His own image, shall rule only over creatures devoid of reason. He has not established the dominion of man over man, but that of man over the brute." This doctrine is repeated by S. Thomas Aquinas.<sup>3</sup> Slavery finally disappeared from amid Christian civilization, to be revived in modern times only through the detestable greed which violates all laws alike, whether of natural right or revealed truth.

Reviewing some of the leading instances of the influence of the religion of Christ upon states, especially those that have risen in Europe since the fall of the Roman Empire, one of the first and most striking that meet the view is in the well-known history of Ulphilas,<sup>4</sup> a bishop of the fourth century, who gave to the Goths not only religion and civilization, but, as a powerful aid toward these, literature from its very beginning; for he first formed the alphabet of their language, and then translated into it the Bible, the good bishop omitting for a time from the Old Testament the Books of Samuel

is directed against them. See Milton's *Hist. of the Jews*, Bk. XXI., XXII.

<sup>1</sup> Fourth Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, Can. 74; Ninth Council of Toledo, Can. 11; Council of Merida, A.D. 666, Can. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Rationalem factum ad imaginem suam noluit nisi irrationalibus dominari; non hominem homini, sed hominem pecori. . . . Conditio quippe servitutis jure intelligitur im-

posita peccatori. S. Aug., *De Civit. Dei*, XIX., 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Summa* I., *p. q.*, XCVI., art. 4. Milton has put into verse the thought of S. Augustine and S. Thomas:

"But man over men  
He made not lord; such title to Himself  
Reserving, human left from human free."  
*Par. Lost*, L. XII.

<sup>4</sup> Philostorgius, H. Eccles., II. 5; Socrates, H. E., II. 41, IV. 33. Sozomen, H. E., IV. 24, VI. 37.

and Kings, lest they might inflame the already too war-like character of his proselytes. Bishop Ulphilas, though his name suggests a Gothic origin (being explained as a diminutive of Wolf), is believed to have been one of the Christian Greeks carried off by the Goths from Cappadocia. In the reign of Valens, A.D. 376, he obtained permission from the emperor for two hundred thousand Goths to pass the Danube and settle in Mœsia. Notwithstanding the subsequent infection of these converts with the heresy of Arianism, we have an express commendation by Athanasius of the effects of Christianity upon the pagan Goths. "Even now," he says, speaking of these Goths, "the barbarians, to whom savagery of manners is a nature so long as they worship dumb idols, rage against each other, and cannot remain one moment without the sword; but when they hear the doctrine of Christ, immediately they turn away from war to agriculture (Isa. ii. 4); instead of arming their hands with the sword, they lift them up in prayer; and in a word, from henceforth, instead of carrying on war with each other, arm themselves against Satan, striving to conquer him by the bravery of the soul." "Who is it that hath wrought this? that has united in the bonds of peace those who once hated one another? Who else than the beloved Son of the Father, the common Saviour of all, Jesus Christ, who, through love to us, suffered everything for our salvation?"<sup>1</sup>

In the sixth and seventh centuries the hope of Europe, both for religious and secular learning and cultivation, lay no longer in the schools of Rome or Athens, of Antioch or Alexandria, but in the two fair islands of the North, Hibernia and Britannia. "The schools in the Irish cloisters were at this time the most celebrated in all the West. . . . Whilst almost the whole of Europe was desolated by war, peaceful Ireland, free from the invasions of external foes, opened to the lovers of learning and piety a welcome asylum."<sup>2</sup> "In the schools of

<sup>1</sup> S. Athanasii, *De Incarnatione Verbi*, §§ 51, 52.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Dollinger.

science England has no name to rival Erigena in originality, or S. Virgil in freedom of thought." According to the well-known beautiful legend, Gregory at Rome was incited to send missionaries to convert Britain by the sight in the market-place of the fair pagan slaves from the great barbarian host, whose right wing, as it swept westward over Europe, had just desolated Britain. The efforts of the Roman missionaries in recovering the island to faith and to civilization were powerful, aided, as is well known, by the Celtic Christians from the West and North, the schools of Ireland and of S. Columba and S. Columbanus. "Ireland cannot boast of a doctor such as the Venerable Bede, or of an apostle equal to S. Boniface, . . . or of a list of royal devotees so extended as that of the thirty male or female Saxons who in the course of two centuries resigned their crowns, or as the roll of twenty-three kings and sixty queens and princes who between the seventh and eleventh centuries gained a place among the saints." The seventh and eighth centuries are the period of glory for the Anglo-Saxon Church. "Amid the deep pagan woods of Germany and round about, the English Benedictine plied his axe and drove his plough, planted his rude dwelling and raised his rustic altar upon the ruins of idolatry, and then, settling down as a colonist upon the soil, began to sing his chants, to copy his old volumes, and thus to lay the slow but sure foundations of the new civilization." "When Charlemagne arose upon the Continent, the special mission of the two islands was at an end." "The Anglo-Saxon Alcuin was the first rector, and the Irish Clement the second, of the studium at Paris."<sup>1</sup>

The influence of Christianity upon civilization is with most advantage studied in detail in its bearing upon the individual, the family, and the state, to all of which it gave a peculiar dignity and clearness as well as firmness in their relation to one another. The individual was exalted by realizing his immortal nature, his accountability, his re-

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Office and Work of Universities*, Ch. X., pp. 192, 194.

demption by Christ, the Elder Brother of the race. The sacredness of the family was defended by securing the recognition of the worth and dignity of each of its members, and by the forbidding of slavery. Obedience to the state was secured, while its power was restrained from despotism by the recognition of the various rights and the protection of the various classes of which society is composed. In Asia certain elements of society, it has been said, obtain unchecked sway; whereas in Europe no class or interest is uncontrolled, but all obtain something of recognition.

When King Alfred in England had expelled the Danes and put his kingdom in a state of defence, he set himself to construct laws. He placed at the head of his code the Decalogue with one modification, and the twenty-first and twenty-second chapters of Exodus with some changes. To these he added the Golden Rule, and then a selection of decrees of wise and holy men. He took special pains to insure "that every man warily hold his oath and his pledge." The variation in the Decalogue was in the sanction of the Second Commandment. "In six days Christ wrought the heavens and the earth and all shapen things that in them are, and rested on the seventh day; and for that the Lord hallowed it." It is very plain that the wise and great king of England put the divine laws which he took out of Holy Scripture upon a peculiar footing of sacredness. They bind alike all kings and people of the earth. They are the will of the Supreme Maker of the world, and of man. Christ, the Son of God, declared that He came not to break these laws, but to fulfil them, and to cause others to keep them.

In the history of Bulgaria is an interesting example of the peculiar power of Christian teaching. Boris, a Bulgarian prince of the ninth century,<sup>1</sup> sent to Constantinople for missionaries to teach his people the Christian religion. In answer to his request two brothers were sent—Cyril, a man of books, and Methodius, who was an artist as well as monk. "Methodius presented himself at the Bulga-

<sup>1</sup> A. D. 852-888.

rian court; he offered to decorate a hunting lodge for the royal sportsman. The work was finished, and Boris came on a visit of inspection. Instead of the pleasures of the chase, which he expected, he found a picture of the Day of Judgment. Among the blessed were the weak, the sick, the blind, the defenceless, recalling those peoples whom the pagan Bulgarians had reduced to servitude; among the lost were fierce warriors, fashioned after the likeness of Boris himself and his attendant chiefs. The king asked for an explanation, and this was Methodius's opportunity for preaching righteousness and mercy, and judgment to come. The king begged that he might be further instructed in Christian doctrine, and his conversion and baptism rapidly followed.<sup>1</sup> From these brothers proceeded the conversion of the Slavonic races. They invented the Slavonic alphabet, created the Slavonic literature, translated into this energetic, primitive tongue the Scriptures, and the liturgy of S. Chrysostom, which became the instrument of the evangelization of Servia; and in this latter work Methodius again appears especially prominent.

"The Russian Church is a child of the Greek. Russia's conversion was the work of the tenth century, and was accomplished by missionaries from Constantinople, who introduced the Slavonian liturgy, and a translation of the Scriptures drawn up in the ninth century by Cyril and Methodius for the use of the Bulgarians. These have ever since been scrupulously adhered to by this most conservative nation."<sup>2</sup> It is curious that in the mission in Russia the device of Methodius was successfully repeated. "Constantine convinced Vladimir by the icon of the last judgment of the 'good to those on the right hand, the woe to those at the left;' the idol Peroun was carried by the Dnieper to the sea; farther and farther the pioneers of truth pushed their way; Moscow, and

<sup>1</sup>Dr. H. P. Liddon, in a paper *Rites and Customs of Græco-Russian Church*, by H. C. Romanoff, p. viii. London, 1869.

<sup>2</sup>C. M. Yonge, Introduction to

Kieff, and Vladimir owned their metropolitans; tribes unknown to the ancients received spiritual illumination. Undeterred by Sarmatian forest or Æstian swamp, the soldiers of the Cross went on conquering and to conquer till they stood on the barbarous shores of the 'sluggish sea.' Thence their holy chivalry bore them eastward; overleaping the Ural Mountains, they forced their way into Siberia; slowly and painfully they advanced toward the rising sun, preaching the glad tidings of the Sun of Righteousness; at Irkoutsk, and Sitka, and Tomsk, after centuries of warfare, they have placed a vicar of Christ for the feeding of his flock; and thus on the borders of Chinese Tartary, they hailed the disciples of the early teachers that went forth from Edessa." "At this time, when everything betokens the approaching dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, when the most widely extended nation and the mightiest emperor in the world profess the Oriental faith, when the great line of railway which will connect England with India, the main artery of universal commerce, must intersect in half its length the domain of the Eastern Church, it is impossible, humanly speaking, but that a bright future is still before her."<sup>1</sup>

An almost typical Christian state in Europe is Hungary, which became Christian under its first king, Stephen,<sup>2</sup> who labored zealously to set the institutions of his kingdom, political as well as religious, upon a Christian basis. We are told that he "proclaimed the freedom of Christian slaves." It is doubtless in connection with this that "he often parted," as the Breviary says, on the day appointed for his commemoration,<sup>3</sup> with his household furniture, and with his own hands washed the feet of the poor." He introduced Latin schools, established bishoprics, built churches, etc. The political and administrative institutions of the state were also organized. He is said

<sup>1</sup> Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, Part II. General Introduction, pp. 4, 5.

<sup>2</sup> September 2; "domesticam quoque suppellectilem eximia benignitate frequenter distribuit."

<sup>3</sup> A.D. 997-1038.

to have imitated the Western feudal aristocracy. Still it is evident, from the advice he gave to his son, that he respected the national spirit. "What Greek,"<sup>1</sup> he asks, "would try to rule Romans by Grecian fashions? Or what Roman would seek to govern Greeks according to Roman habits? Not one." He perfected the work which was only begun by his father and grandfather;<sup>2</sup> by menaces, punishments, and rewards he compelled nearly the whole nation to renounce the idolatry of their ancestors. The crown of S. Stephen became a precious and sacred possession to after ages.

The Church and State of England are, perhaps, the most instructive examples that can be found at once of the advantages and disadvantages of an intimate relation between the two bodies. All that is noble and attractive in the state, its enlightenment, its high principles, its peculiar balance of authority and freedom, everything, perhaps, except the native qualities of the population, it owes to the Christian religion, in the form presented through the national Church. The Church, on the other hand, from its peculiar relation to this kingdom, has incurred from Erastians the reproach of being the creature of the State, founded by Henry VIII., etc. The Dissenters, who reject the idea of a kingdom of God apart from the mere letter of the Bible, hate the Church of England because her bishops sit among the peers, and her relation to the State gives a higher social status to her clergy, though in fact her ministers alone are excluded from the House of Commons, and government dictates the appointment of her bishops, and her advantages from tithes have shrunk. Of the thirty-four sees in the two provinces of Canterbury and York, thirteen were virtually founded before there was an English nation (if we date, say, from King Egbert, A.D. 828). Canterbury,

<sup>1</sup> "Quis Græcus regeret Latinos Græcis moribus? aut quis Latinus Græcos Latinis regeret moribus? nullus."

<sup>2</sup> This is mainly the Grecian account; the Germans, the Bohemians, and the Poles claim a share in the conversion of Hungary.

London, Winchester, Rochester, Worcester, Hereford, Lichfield, and York remain where they were planted in the days of the Heptarchy. Salisbury, Chichester, Lincoln, Norwich are pre-Norman sees, in which the bishopric has been removed from its original seat.

Wells was founded A.D. 909, and Exeter (originally Crediton) in 905. Carlisle and Ely were founded in 1109 and 1133. Henry VIII. established Gloucester and Peterborough in place of two mitred abbeys; while Oxford, Bristol, and Chester were founded, under the same royal robber, on the ruins of twenty-five mitred abbeys. Our own generation has seen seven bishoprics—Manchester, Ripon, Liverpool, Newcastle, St. Albans, Truro, and Southwell—formed out of portions of the old sees, under the authority of acts of Parliament, but without a shilling from the public treasury, and solely by the contributions of private munificence. The Church lends to the State the authority of a true branch of the Catholic Church, an apostolic descent, Christian teaching, and a noble ritual. She receives, in turn, the stigma of being an Act of Parliament church, the odium without the reality of state help, having much less real freedom than the dissenting bodies, and the constant threat of being robbed under the name of disestablishment.

Taking the achievement of Stephen, in bringing his people from the service of many gods to that of the One True God, as our text, we might show that it is a type of all true political progress throughout the world, because under every form of government—theocracy, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy—the people always seek for the source and seat of legitimate sovereignty. It is not too much to say that human nature, in the smallest as well as in the largest community, revolts at being governed simply by force claiming no title of reason or justice. And it is only an unbeliever, like Hobbes, who can deliberately maintain that a despotism is the only suitable government for human beings. Legitimate sovereignty resides in some supreme will, the rightful master

who alone can give sanction and substance to the rules that are to govern mankind. The political theories of philosophers in this agree with the intuitive convictions of the masses of men. The result is very much the same as that expressed in the words of inspiration: "There is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." It is natural for man to believe that there is such a sovereignty; since always, in every effort he makes toward government, he seeks to place himself under this rightful rule. If we glance over the chaos of European society, after the fall of Rome, say from the fifth to the twelfth century, and watch the efforts in different lands to realize a supreme power, we may note how in Spain<sup>1</sup> they referred it to the direct will of God; how in England, among the Anglo-Saxon powers, it was attained through an election; how in Italy, on the other hand, they strove to make the sovereign power the inheritor of the old imperial traditions; while in Germany, again, it always inclined to the elective shape; and in France, assumed almost all shapes in turn, as time went on: still there was everywhere the tacit, if not expressed, determination pervading the people, that the result of their efforts after a ruler should not be mere chance, or force, or usurpation; and next, that it should not be really the rule of the will of any individual man, though it sometimes appeared to take that form. They implicitly, at least, believed in the collective will and aggregate wisdom of a people, which they persuaded themselves was in the main reasonable, enlightened, just, and impartial, and having

<sup>1</sup> "The king is called *rex* because he governs with justice. If he acts justly (*recté*), he has a legitimate title to the name of king; if he acts unjustly, he loses all claim to it. Our fathers, therefore, said with reason, *rex Ejus eris si recta facis; si autem, non facis, non eris*. The two principal virtues of a king are justice and truth. While we obey the will of

Heaven, we make for ourselves, as well as for our subjects, wise laws, obedience to which is obligatory on ourselves and our successors, as well as upon all the population of our kingdom. God, the creator of all things, in constructing the human body, has raised the head aloft," etc. —Council of Toledo, Forum judicum, tit. i. 1, 2; tit. i. 1, 2, l. 4.

the right to control individual wills because the personification of legitimate sovereignty. At times the supreme power was raised high above the details of actual administration, and never interfered except on great and critical occasions. In the constitution of Brazil, it is said that this conception of sovereignty is made the very basis of the throne. What was it that men labored after, amid these various conceptions of the origin and purpose of the ruling power of the state? It was, without doubt, to find a power able to secure public order, a depository of justice, and a protector of the common interest.<sup>1</sup>

Such a conception of government we affirm to be the centre and bond of society, under the most diverse circumstances, in all stages of its advance from the rudest to the most civilized condition, and to spring up, as it were, spontaneously, amid confusions and disorders of the most threatening kind; and hence we conclude that the conception is not accidental or artificial, but demanded by the very nature of man. We go on with confidence to what seems the most obvious conclusion from this, viz., that the true idea of government finds its proper explanation and defence, its only sure ground, in the teaching of religion; in the doctrine of Providence; in the presence among men of their Maker, as a ruler who takes account of their actions, whether as individuals or as nations, leading them to govern and judge themselves, supplying them with the principles of wisdom, of justice, or of righteousness, of which He alone is the Fountain and Author. A representative of Rome's imperial power once said to the Incarnate King, whose mission

<sup>1</sup> The Church supplicates for nations as such the blessings of "unity, peace, and concord."

<sup>2</sup> "Our whole nature leads us to ascribe all moral perfection to God, and to deny all imperfection of Him. And this will forever be a practical proof of His moral character, to such as will consider what a practical

proof is, because it is the voice of God speaking in us. And from hence we conclude that virtue must be the happiness, and vice the misery, of every creature; and that regularity, order, and right cannot but prevail finally, in a universe under His government."—Butler's *Analogy*, Introduction, § 5.

in this world, in His form of humiliation, was "to bear witness to the truth:" "Knowest Thou not that I have power to crucify Thee, and have power to release Thee?" And he heard for answer: "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above."<sup>1</sup> Rome herself held the might in which she trusted, at the hands of Him whose patience is as great as His power. Her legions could do nothing against the truth. She vanished from the earth, and gave place to other powers, who still held their being from the same Author, whether they confessed Him or not. Their strength grew or waned, their place was brilliant or obscure, their record honorable among the nations, according as they witnessed to the truth, or denied its Author and sought to expel Him from His own creation. This testimony we believe the true religion has received from the states and governments of the world.

<sup>1</sup>S. John, xix. 10, 11.

## LECTURE IX.

---

### INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON LAW.

MY purpose at this time is to bring into view the evidence that comes to Christianity from the influence it has exerted upon law, or the rules by which human beings in society or in states and governments are regulated. The subject of the present lecture, therefore, differs from that of the last in being in one aspect more restricted, as referring to the methods of government, and in another as more abstract, since it is the study of a distinct and noble science, forming an important part of education.

Perhaps the best introduction to this subject will be to take notice of the various senses of the word "law, whose ambiguities are even celebrated. Its noblest sense without doubt, when applied, as is our present concern, to the control of beings endowed with reason, is as signifying a rule of action prescribed by a superior to an inferior. Law therefore contains always something of the nature of a command, and implies a person addressing the will, or voluntary principle, in another. This may be seen in the most abstract account of government, where its functions are exactly distributed. "Law is indeed a rule of action prescribed by a superior power;" but though the legislative branch make the law, and the judicial decide

<sup>1</sup> President Woolsey puts on the title-page of his work on *International Law*, that it is "designed as an aid in teaching and in historical studies." New York, 1877.

upon its meaning when disputed, still to become a reality law must be enforced by an executive, who is usually one person. So, also, municipal or civil law is rightly defined by Blackstone<sup>1</sup> to be "the rule of civil conduct prescribed by the superior power in a state, commanding what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong." The latter part of this definition can be vindicated from the utilitarian criticism that it is pleonastic, for it asserts the personal element that is in law. A thing is not right because it is commanded, or wrong because it is forbidden; hence mere command and prohibition do not rise to the full conception of "a law." But as of the highest idea of law we say, in the words of a great divine, "The being of God is a kind of law to His working, for that perfection which God is giveth perfection to that He doth,"<sup>2</sup> so the laws of all less powers, whether of individuals, or of assemblies, become true laws only by enjoining the right, or the justice, through which all things, animate or inanimate, live and continue. The Creator of all being good, and willing what is just, nothing that He has made can presume to enjoin the opposite to these.

Before proceeding further to consider law in detail, it will be useful to notice its analogical sense in the domain of science, though we propose to consider the subject more fully in a separate lecture. Law is applied in science to an observed order of facts. This is its most general sense. The term increases in clearness if we connect the order of facts with some producing force. The law is still clearer if we can express the action of the force by some numerical measure. A good illustration of these three senses of "law" is presented by astronomy. Kepler's three laws were at first a series of facts which observed a wonderful order; the planets moved in elliptical orbits; the radius vector of each planet described equal spaces in equal times; the squares of the times of their revolutions varied exactly as the cubes of their mean distances from

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to Comm., § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. I., Ch. II., I. 156.

the sun. This idea of the law was advanced to the second stage when it began to dawn upon the scientific mind that masses of matter attracted one another. The third stage was reached when Newton announced the law of gravitation, that these masses exerted on each other an attraction, "directly as the mass, inversely as the square of the distance." We ought not to forget that Newton held such action of bodies at a distance from each other, without material contact except "through the mediation of something else, which is not material," to be simply "inconceivable." There are two other conceptions of law familiar to science, besides the three already mentioned. When two or more forces are coördinated, so that they mutually control and modify one another, and thus produce some destined effect, the intelligence and will which bring about this combination give still a new sense to the word "law." All the forces of nature exist, in fact, in some such combination, never separately. The very motion of the planets is not determined by gravity alone, but by gravity combined with a centrifugal force, which tends to carry them away from the sun. The seasons, with their wonderful circle of life, are the result of the annual and diurnal motion of the planet combined with certain conditions of light, heat, moisture, the atmosphere, electricity, etc., any one of which being changed, the whole result would be different. A fifth sense of the word "law" is when it is used to denote an abstract conception, employed by the mind to explore or explain the facts of nature. The first law of motion is a good illustration of this sense of "law." There actually exists nowhere, nor can there be artificially produced, the condition of a body moving in a straight line with a uniform velocity, because nature presents us with no moving body abandoned to the control of a single force. Yet this conception is of great use in the elementary part of mechanics. I shall at present<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Lect. III. (I., 225, etc.). Kepler's third law was made known in 1619; Newton's *Principia* was published in 1687.

<sup>2</sup> See Lect. XI., "On Science."

make no further use of these conceptions of law in the study of nature than to call attention to the fact that they do not lead away from, but rather lead toward, the idea of a living Person, whose intelligence and will are expressed through law. This is of course the only law that can regulate the intercourse of human beings in society and in the state, either the law which, according to Blackstone's distinction, protects individuals in society, or the law through which states and governments preserve society itself. It is always a rule of action prescribed by a superior to an inferior, of which the great type is the relation of God to man, the Creator commanding His creature, who absolutely depends upon Him for all things, to use his free will according to the dictates of his reason and conscience.

Our argument from the influence of Christianity upon law will perhaps be clearer if we consider the subject, first historically, and then theoretically.

I. As a matter of fact, we have already seen how the Christian religion intimately influenced the foundation of the European states. The action of Alfred the Great, who copied the very words of Holy Scripture into his fundamental law, was perhaps the most emphatic recognition of what nevertheless was in those times everywhere an active and vital, sometimes the only, principle of civilization. Of course the body of precedents, customs and maxims derived from the Saxon times, and known as the common law, every one is aware was not reduced to writing; still it seems to have formed,<sup>1</sup> both before and after the Conquest, an important part of such education as was given in the monasteries, universities, and noble families. The proficiency of the clergy, even in technical law, is witnessed by the maxim preserved by William of Malmesbury,<sup>2</sup> *Nullus clericus nisi causidicus*. Both before the Normans came, and after, the judges were chosen from among the clergy; and in like manner the inferior legal offices were supplied.

The controversy which arose, and the contention, in

<sup>1</sup> Selden in *Fletum*, VII., 7.

<sup>2</sup> De Gest. Reg., L. IV.

England especially, between the common law on the one side, and the civil and canon law on the other, dating from the discovery of Justinian's Pandects at Amalfi in the early part of the twelfth century (A.D. 1130), in which controversy the Church became identified with the patronage of the civil and canon law, enables us to estimate with more precision the influence of religion upon the law. It is well known that the civil and canon law prevailed far more extensively in the states and kingdoms of the continent than in England, where it was introduced by the foreign clergy who came in with the Conqueror and after. Theobald, the Norman abbot, made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1138, is credited especially with introducing teachers of this law into the country, and, in particular, Roger Vacarius as professor at Oxford. The clergy were charged with favoring the civil law because its arbitrary maxims, derived from imperial days, countenanced the despotic authority of the Popes. Two celebrated maxims were often quoted as characteristic of the two systems: the first, from the beginning of the Institutes,<sup>1</sup> affirms that "what the emperor has sanctioned has the force of law;" the second was the maxim, dear to the English heart, declaring the right of every one to be protected by "the judgment of one's peers and the law of the land."<sup>2</sup> One of the memorable incidents of the contest between the common and the canon law was the declaration of the earls and barons at the parliament of Merton, in reference to a proposed change in the laws of marriage, "*nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*"<sup>3</sup> Among the curious illustrations of the violence of the contest, both in England and on the Continent, between the civil and canon law on the one side and all other systems of law, is a passage from Albertus Magnus, the renowned Dominican of the thirteenth century, who, in a book upon the merits of the Blessed Virgin, seeks to exalt her by declaring her a finished

<sup>1</sup> Quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem. Justin., *Instit.*, I., 2, 6.      <sup>2</sup> Stat. Merton, 20 Hen. III., Ch. IX.

<sup>3</sup> *Judicium parium vel lex terræ.*

civilian and canonist: "That she thoroughly understood the civil laws, written and unwritten, as well as the canons," says Albertus, "is proved in this way: the skill of an advocate is shown in three points: first, that he obtains everything before a just and wise judge; secondly, that he succeeds against a cunning and shrewd adversary; thirdly, that he triumphs in a case that had been given up. For the most wise Judge, before whom the ever blessed Virgin pleads, is God: her most cunning adversary is the Devil; the cause in which she obtained a favorable verdict is our own most desperate one."

In the reign of Henry III. ecclesiastics were forbidden by the bishops to appear as advocates in courts of the common law (*in foro sæculari*), and of course they ceased to be judges in these courts; at length, the Pope<sup>2</sup> forbade the reading by the clergy of the common law, which thus ceased to be taught in the universities. The common law, however, established schools of its own in London, and its complete triumph over its rival is placed in the reign of Edward the First. The nobility declared in 1388 (11 Richard II.): "The realm of England hath never been unto this hour, neither by the consent of our lord the king and the lords of parliament shall it ever be, ruled or governed by the civil law."<sup>3</sup>

Still the rules of the civil and canon law continued to be followed in all spiritual courts, in the high court of chancery, and in those of admiralty, as well as in the chancellor's courts in both universities. The precedents of the civil law are said to prevail largely in the branch of jurisprudence called equity. The forms of the canon law, though

<sup>1</sup> Quod jura civilia, et leges, et decreta scivit in summo, probatur hoc modo: sapientia advocati manifestatur in tribus; unum quod obtineat omnia contra judicem justum ac sapientem; secundo, quod contra adversarium astutum ac sagacem; tertio, quod in causa desperata: sed beatissima Virgo contra Judicem sapientissimum, Dominum; contra

adversarium callidissimum, diabolum; in causa nostra desperata; sententiam optatam obtinuit.—Alberti Magni, *Summa de laudibus Christiferae Virginis*, qu. 23, § 5.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent IV., A.D. 1254. See Chron. M. Paris.

<sup>3</sup> Selden, *Jani Anglor. L. II.*, § 46, in Fortesc, Ch. XXXIII.

it may have been repudiated in name, and its authority declared to be derived only from the state, are still observed in matters relating to the hierarchy and government of the Church, to such as relate to what are called pious uses, and to wills, the guardianship of orphans, and questions of marriage and divorce.<sup>1</sup> In the maxims and principles of the common law, as set forth by the great legal authorities, it seems likely that there might be found on examination as much of the Christian element as in its great rival, the civil law. Three favorite institutions distinguishing English law from that of other countries—the parliament, the tenures on which real property rests, and the trial by jury—though founded on Norman jurisprudence, became popular, it is believed, through their analogy to Saxon institutions. Resemblances to all these have been found in the internal government of Christ's kingdom. On the other hand, it has been maintained that when our Lord said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,"<sup>2</sup> He was stating in other words precisely the principle of Roman law, that "three persons suffice to make a corporation" (*tres faciunt collegium*<sup>3</sup>). To take another illustration: The connections denounced by our Lord, in His Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, as adulteries, were all unions that were sanctioned by Jewish law. When the civil law, therefore, adopted the Church's view of this great subject, it sanctioned the important principle, that matrimony is a state of divine appointment, instituted before human law, and incapable of being altered or modified by human will. Again, those are noble words in which, at the beginning of Justinian's *Institutes*, the whole doctrine of law is reduced to three principles: "to live virtuously and nobly, to hurt nobody, to render to every one his due."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Stubbs says that English canon law was not the same thing as Roman canon law. *Seventeen Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History*, etc., Lect. XIII. Oxford, 1886.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. xviii. 20.

<sup>3</sup> See *Church Times*, Feb. 20, 1885.

<sup>4</sup> "Juris præcepta sunt hæc, honeste vivere, alterum non lædere, suum cuique tribuere." Justin., *Instit.*, I.,

It is therefore with reason that Blackstone unites the common with the civil law when he would vindicate the claim of both combined to form part of a liberal education, as the "science that distinguishes the criterions of right and wrong; which teaches to establish the one, and prevent, punish, or redress the other; which employs in its theory the noblest faculties of the soul, and exerts in its practice the cardinal virtues of the heart; a science which is universal in its use and extent, accommodated to each individual, yet comprehending the whole community."<sup>1</sup>

It is worthy of note that of the three codes that entered into the composition of the Roman law, the Gregorian and Hermogenian belong to pagan times,<sup>2</sup> and the Theodosian alone to the Christian period, containing the laws of the Christian princes from Constantine to the younger Theodosius.<sup>3</sup> Some influence from the Roman law was undoubtedly transmitted through old usages handed down, and especially the municipal traditions in towns. But after the long lost volume of pandects was discovered in the twelfth century, the Roman civil law became an important branch of study in the universities of Western Europe, particularly that of Bologna; lectures were read upon it, themes written, and degrees conferred for proficiency in it, as in other branches of science. Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, Belgium, and Scotland received

i. 3. The peculiar strength of the word *honeste*, referring as it does to all moral excellence, seems to require a double translation when put into English.

<sup>1</sup> *Comment.*, Introd., Lect. I., I. 27 (15).

<sup>2</sup> "It was the legislation of the pagan emperors, carried on by Valentinian and Valens, and received into the codes of Athalaric, of Liutprand, and of Charlemagne, which founded the penal laws against sorcery which prevailed in the middle age; and thus did the torch of the ancient wisdom kindle the piles with which the

Church has been reproached."—Fred. Ozanam, *Civiliz. in Fifth Century*, Vol. I., p. 133. Lond., 1867.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon admits that the emperor Constantius might have killed "the most eminent citizen" of the state without hindrance; but that "the caution, the delay, the difficulty with which he proceeded in the condemnation and punishment" of Athanasius "discovered to the world that the privileges of the Church had already revived a sense of order and freedom in the Roman government." *History*, Ch. XXI., II. 342.

it "as common law or reason;" in France, Italy, Spain, its influence, direct and indirect, was very important.<sup>1</sup> In all these countries, as in England, the study of the civil law was fostered by, and might almost be said to have been conducted under the patronage of, the Church. Thus much may serve as a historical outline of the influence of Christianity upon law.

II. Fixing our thoughts, in the second place, upon the theoretical view of that law by which human beings in states are ruled, we may compare with that definition of Blackstone's, quoted in the beginning of this lecture, a very noble description of law given by Demosthenes in one of his orations. "It is fit,"<sup>2</sup> says the illustrious Grecian orator, "that all persons should obey the law for various reasons, but in particular because all law is the invention and gift of the gods, the deliberate decision of wise men, and the correction of wrongs both voluntary and involuntary, and thus forms the common bond (or constitution) of the state, to live in conformity with which is the duty of every member of the state." This noble passage, to which parallels might be quoted from Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero,<sup>3</sup> is especially valuable, first, as coming from one who is not merely a theorizer in politics, but in some sort a practical statesman; and, next, because it recognizes the necessity of religion to aid the fundamental conceptions of the law. This the natural reason of man has discerned with great clearness in heathen as well as in Christian lands. Now we may argue with confidence that if the human reason and conscience unaided have been unable to retain uncorrupted the most elementary truths of religion—the Being and

<sup>1</sup> Savigny's *History of the Roman Law during the Middle Ages.*"

<sup>2</sup> τοῦτ' ἔστι νόμος, ὃ πάντος προσήκει πειθεσθαι διὰ πολλὰ καὶ μάλιστα, ὅτι πᾶς ἔστι νόμος εὐρημα μὲν καὶ δῶρον θεῶν, δόγμα δ' ἀνθρώπων φρονιμῶν, ἐπανόρθωμα δὲ τῶν ἐκουσίων

καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀμαρτημάτων, πόλεως δὲ συνθήκη κοινῇ· καθ' ἣν πασι προσήκει ζῆν τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει. Demosthenes, *Orat.*, I., cont. Aristog.

<sup>3</sup> *De Rep.*, III., 22, quoted in *Lact. Inst.*, VI., 8.

Unity of God, His providence, the immortality of man—they are certainly incompetent to avail themselves of the help which true religion offers to human law. A religion without authority cannot assist human laws, which are nothing unless they have authority. Taking the analysis of the great expounder of English law, we may trace the necessity of the aid of the true religion through all the four parts which lend completeness to every law, viz., its declaratory, directing, remedial, and vindicatory character. The law must declare, clearly define, and lay down the actions it commands and forbids. This necessitates a recognition not only of a standard of right and wrong, but, more specifically, of the rights of men. The directing part of every law is of the nature of a command: "Thou shalt;" "Thou shalt not." Here authority enjoins duties. The remedial quality of the law seeks to redress the wrongs and atone for the injuries that may have been committed. The vindicatory sanction lays down the penalty that shall be incurred by the transgressor of the law. Now consider each of these four things more in detail.

1. With regard to the first, no person, I think, not blinded by devotion to some theory, can think that all either of the rights or the wrongs defined by any human law derive their nature and become what they are from the definition. Life and liberty, for instance, are rights of men, as inviolable before any law defines them as afterward, though the law by defining seeks to defend them; on the other hand, murder, theft, and perjury are quite as wrong before they are forbidden as after. The grounds, therefore, of what are called the rights of the person, and the sanctity of the virtues of truth and purity, which human laws recognize but do not constitute, must be sought elsewhere than in human authority, and can be found only in the revelation of Him who made and redeemed man. It is a melancholy proof of human weakness that the wisest and most virtuous of men, when endeavoring without the aid of revealed religion to lay

down the ideal outlines of a perfect state, have been so blind to the true and rightful nature of man as to destroy, as did Plato in his ideal republic, all the ties of the family; or to sanction, as did Aristotle, the system of slavery by which all the defences of freedom are overthrown. The Church, by her protection of the family, and by the fostering care she alone has been able to give to all the tender and chaste virtues which build up that domestic relation, has rendered the most valuable service to society and to the law upon which the best governments rest. The Church of Christ alone has shown the disposition and the power to extirpate slavery from human society. She did this in despite alike of the traditions of Rome and of the great Grecian master of science, who had said: "That being<sup>1</sup> who by nature is not his own, but totally another's, and yet is a man, is a slave by nature;" and that "it is clear that some men are free by nature, and others are slaves, and that in the case of the latter the lot of slavery is both advantageous and just." No power save the religion of Christ has ever appeared in the world—neither human reason, nor political theories, nor scientific enlightenment, nor general progress—able to put an end to slavery.<sup>2</sup> The Saviour did this by bringing to every human being the power to restore "the image of Him that created him, where there is neither Greek nor Jew, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free," but "all are one in Christ Jesus."<sup>3</sup> The bride of Christ, His Church, causes this marvel to be possible among men, when she pronounces that every one, without distinction of color or race, washed in her holy baptism, is "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the

<sup>1</sup> ὁ γὰρ μὴ αὐτοῦ φύσει ἀλλ' ἄλλου, ἄνθρωπος δὲ οὗτος φύσει δοῦλός ἐστιν . . . ὅτι μὲν τοίνυν εἰσὶ φύσει τινὲς οἱ μὲν ἐλεύθεροι, οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι φανερόν· οἷς καὶ συμφέρει τὸ δουλεύειν, καὶ δίκαιόν ἐστι.—Arist., *Pol.*, I., Ch. II.

<sup>2</sup> Even the great Roman Civil Law places at the head of its account of the Rights of the Person the following declaration: Summa divisio de jure personarum hæc est, quod omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi.—Justin., *Instit.*, I., 3.

<sup>3</sup> Col. iii. 10, 11. Gal. iii. 28.

Kingdom of Heaven." Nations have at different times, some with mixed motives, set themselves against slavery, but never with any success, except under the impulse of Christian ideas. "The unwearied, unostentatious, and inglorious crusade of England against slavery," says Mr. Lecky, "may probably be regarded as among the three or four perfectly virtuous acts recorded in the history of nations." (*Hist. of Europ. Morals*, Ch. I., Vol. I., p. 161.) The Church accomplishes, and has always accomplished, her holy purpose not by political agitation, but by teaching the sacredness of human nature, the priceless worth of every being, however feeble and weak, that shares in this image of God, bearing as each does the jewel of an immortal spirit in the casket of the body, which, though mortal, shall itself also share in the endless life.

There are, it is true, rights and wrongs which are created simply by the definitions of human law; such, for instance, are many relating to property, monopolies, the execution of contracts, etc. One broad rule which distinguishes these from the rights and wrongs we have just considered is that their observance or neglect does not of necessity bind the conscience. Unless public peace and welfare be involved in the observance of such a law, the very law itself points out a way; *e.g.* by paying some pecuniary fine, through which its provisions may be neglected entirely without blame.<sup>1</sup>

2. The second part of a law, or the directory, consists of a command addressed to the will of each member of the community, enjoining the observance of rights and forbidding the commission of wrongs. This comprehends the field of duty. But as in the case of the declaratory part of law, so here, there are many duties which are not created by human law, and would still be duties even though enjoined by no human laws; such, for instance, as the care of children by parents and the reciprocal duty,

<sup>1</sup> *Lex pure pœnalis obligat tantum et ad pœnam.*—Bp. Sanderson, *De at pœnam, non item ad culpam; lex Conscient. Obligat.*, præl. viii. 17, pœnalis mixta et ad culpam obligat, 24.

industry, aid to the sick, instruction of the ignorant, etc. Nay, it is now the custom for the laws of free states to protect persons in the performance of certain duties, like the worship of God, for example, which the law carefully abstains from either commanding or forbidding. While it is perfectly true, therefore, as Blackstone says, that all human law depends upon the two foundations of the law of nature and the law of revelation, it may be remarked that it does not attempt to enforce everything in these two laws—the duties, for instance, of charity and divine worship—but it seeks never to contradict them. In matters indifferent, the human law creates duties by its injunctions. And still it is evident that when it prohibits what is forbidden also by divine law—as murder, theft, perjury—it speaks also with something of the authority of Him who is the real Author of all power whatever. Perhaps the very best example, and at the same time proof, of the influence of Christ's religion upon law, can be found in that class of legislation called in England "factory legislation," whose real strength lay in its prohibition of cruelty, though its advocates often rested their arguments on lower grounds, as public health, or in general the public interest. The laws to which I refer are peculiarly a product of these modern days of invention and industrial progress. It was when the fly-shuttle, and the further inventions of Hargreaves, Arkwright, and Crompton—the spinning-jenny, spinning-frame, and mule-jenny—impelled by Watt's wonderful engine, had created factories, replacing the old simple operations of weaving and spinning by the labors of crowds gathered together, first by streams and then in towns, and the new power of production had given an eager impulse to trade and commerce, it was found at length that the greed of man was making use of the toil of delicate women and children, without scruple and without mercy, regardless alike of the claims of education<sup>1</sup> and of health. The

<sup>1</sup> These claims have been better recognized in the legislation in the United States, that is parallel to the factory legislation in England.

names of Robert Peel, father and son, are especially connected with the laws first introduced into Parliament to check this terrible abuse. When Sir Robert the elder first proposed such a law, he was met by the sharp retort, "You are seeking to put a check upon free labor; you are interfering with the development of trade and commerce; nay, you are trespassing upon the rights of parents, who surely should guide their own children, and may be trusted to protect their interests." Such objections long obstructed the triumph of the beneficent laws. The two statesmen learned, as the contest went on, to meet the objections by successful arguments, that were strictly political and economical; such as, that the parents and employers, though apparently most interested in acting rightly, could not be trusted, when under the sharp impulse of trade rivalry and greed of gain, to observe either common humanity or the rights of fellow beings and citizens, even though some of these were their own children, and that therefore the public interest required the interference of the supreme power of the state with the freedom of labor and of trade, and even with the parents' control of their children. The age of the tender laborers, the hours of labor, and sundry obvious safeguards were fixed by law. But the champions of this beneficent legislation were not moved to their efforts originally by such arguments as were employed in Parliament: rather, what first stirred them, and kept ever urging them on, were the pale faces of the children, their overworked and stunted forms, and the fearful degradation amid which their brief lives were passed. The success with which this Christian impulse met in legislation brought to light some political paradoxes. It was found that the will of man, immersed in ignorance and want, is so enslaved by mercenary and sordid motives, that it requires the aid of the supreme power, interfering by positive law, to give it real freedom. "Free labor, even in a free country," said one of the most experienced of the factory inspectors, Mr. Baker, "re-

quires the strong arm of the law to protect it from the cupidity and ignorance of parents."<sup>1</sup> It has been well said, that this "strong arm of the law" is virtually conscience and reason asserting their supremacy over the lower instincts of our nature. And it is affirmed to have been also part of the experience of this same period of legislation, that as restrictions had to be imposed on what theoretically had been thought to be free, so from extensive fields of trade and commerce, restrictions had to be removed where hitherto they had been placed without scruple. This also was a recognition of the ability of men, freed from disturbing causes, to look best after their own interests, when exempt from the interference of the state. The doctrines both of necessity and of free will, it has been acutely remarked, have received new illustrations from the legislation of modern times.

It deserves to be remarked here that nothing can be more groundless than the assertion, that if the Church possesses truths supernaturally revealed, and essential to salvation, she is logically bound to check their denial by coercion, and in fact to persecute. Something like this having been paradoxically said by eminent men, has been made a ground of unbelief by objectors.<sup>2</sup> But though the Church undoubtedly possesses truths of Divine Revelation, which men can learn from her alone, and which are of infinite concern for them to know, yet the very law of her being and the strict injunction of her Lord forbid her to use anything but persuasion to win their obedience,<sup>3</sup> or any punishment but withdrawal of privilege for unfaithfulness.

3. The remedial part of a law is that provision com-

<sup>1</sup> *Reports of the Inspectors of Factories*, half-year, October, 1864, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> These objectors have ceased to complain that factory legislation was an invasion of the rights of parents or of free labor.

<sup>3</sup> "Constraint can obtain everything

from man except faith."—S. Augustine. "Humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique, quod putaverit colere, nec alii obest aut prodest alterius religio : sed nec religionis escogere religionem."—Tertullian. *Ad Scap.*, II.

manding the transgressor to repair according to his ability the injury inflicted by the wrong that he has done. This is confirmed by the religion that teaches that restitution is an essential part of repentance. Out of Christianity, too, have sprung not only hospitals and reformatories, which care for the victims of misfortune and wrongdoing, but the merciful treatment of criminals, which aims to secure for them, first, even justice, then such opportunities and privileges as may encourage reformation.

4. The fourth part of law, or the vindicatory, lays down the penalties that shall be exacted of him that breaks it. It has been said that the chief force of human laws lies in these penalties, rather than in any rewards it confers upon the obedient. Without some infliction of loss or pain, little reliance could be placed on the best human laws. Even those enactments which secured to factory children the privileges of humanity were found to be ineffective till officers were appointed to see that they were observed, and to enforce penalties for their neglect.

The progress of that branch of the law called international is an excellent illustration of the expansion of the Christian idea of the brotherhood of nations, or in the language of Holy Scripture, "that God has made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth."<sup>1</sup> It was a doctrine of Austin, an eminent writer of the last generation on this branch of jurisprudence, that international affairs fall quite out of the province of law proper, and are confined to the department of positive morality, because in positive law a definite sanction is implied; and where there is no political superior, or organization, a sanction may indeed exist, but cannot be of a certain or definite nature. A late writer,<sup>2</sup> however, in decided antagonism to this, holds to "the interdependence of states as opposed to their independence." By this he means "that although states are in appearance and in theory quite separate and independ-

<sup>1</sup> Acts, xvii. 26.

*Law of Nations*, 2 vols. Blackwoods,

<sup>2</sup> Jas. Lorimer, *Institutes of the* 1885.

ent entities, yet they are in reality bound into a whole by the ties of natural necessity, whereby the existence of each is necessary to that of the rest. This natural necessity, which, as between citizens of the same state, is the foundation of law, is also the foundation of the relation existing between states." <sup>1</sup> I can sum up the argument for Christianity from its influence upon law in the words of a recent American writer on politics. "I believe," he says, "that free government is a political application of the Christian theory of life; that at the base of the republican system lies the Golden Rule; and that to be a good citizen of the United States, one ought to be imbued with the spirit of Christianity, and to believe in and act upon the teachings of Jesus. He condemned self-seeking, covetousness, hypocrisy, class distinctions, envy, malice, undue and ignoble ambition; and He inculcated self-restraint, repression of the lower and meaner passions, love to the neighbor, contentment, gentleness, regard for the rights and happiness of others, and respect for the law. It seems to me that the vices He condemned are those also which are dangerous to the perpetuity of republican government, and that the principles He inculcated may be properly used as tests of the merits of a political system or a public policy."<sup>2</sup>

The great English authority, Blackstone, in the beginning of his work, drawing an outline of education in this branch of knowledge, first insists that it shall be approached with due academical preparation; next, that its importance be recognized in a university course; then that its successful cultivation requires the highest qualities both of head and heart. Any one, he says, that shall

<sup>1</sup> The noble words of Burke, "Justice is the common concern of mankind," is the motto of Phillimore's recent *Commentary on International Law*. Phil., 1857. 3 vols.

"There never has been in any age any philosophy, sect, religion, law, or other discipline, which did so

highly exalt the good which is communicative, and depress the good which is private and particular, as the holy Christian Faith."—Bacon, *De Augmentis*, VII., 1.

<sup>2</sup> Chas. Nordhoff's *Politics for Young Americans*, preface, pp. iii, iv. N. Y., 1884.

aspire to rival a Hyde, a Hale, or a Talbot, must possess "affectionate loyalty, a zeal for liberty and the constitution, a sense of real honor, and well-grounded principles of religion." The most splendid abilities, moreover, he declares, in order to succeed, must submit to a certain amount of drudgery and discipline in practical details.<sup>1</sup>

Two celebrated churches, one in England, the other in France, are memorials of the honor paid by the Church to the legal profession. "The Temple Church in London," says the Archbishop of Canterbury in a sermon lately preached at its seven hundredth anniversary,<sup>2</sup> "was for the service of the Church of Christ, whether it be laid on soldiers or on lawyers. It was a significant parallel to the history of the Temple Church, that La Sainte Chapelle of Paris, prepared by S. Louis, the most Christian hero of the Crusades, to receive Christ's crown of thorns, should, like this, have been assigned to the life and work of the lawyers of France." "Their empty halls were re-peopled by a new chivalry of justice, peace, order, reason, in a word, of law."

The crown of thorns may be viewed as a most expressive symbol of that burden of sympathy and responsibility, involving even the highest sacrifice, resting on the true ruler, typified in Codrus, the last king of Athens, the pagan anticipation of the Man of Sorrows in the kingdom of souls.

<sup>1</sup> Introd. to *Commentaries*, Lect. I., I. 19-22.

<sup>2</sup> March 1, 1885.

## LECTURE X.

---

### INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON MORALS.

THERE is a large class in every state and community which never seeks to be any better than the law. What the law allows they do without scruple, and they are content to keep just within the limits of what it condemns.<sup>1</sup> This is true even in communities where a much higher standard is zealously upheld by other persons throughout their limits. Far more generally shall we find it true where no loftier teaching comes to the aid of human law, as complement or corrective. Not merely the practice, but the consciences, of the mass of a community will conform to the laws which allow, for instance, polygamy or slavery. "The national conceptions of the various relations of society, as property, marriage, the family, the state, and the like, which are the basis of the laws, are also the basis of the morals of the nation."<sup>2</sup>

This serious fact calls our attention to the necessity that if revealed religion is effectively to influence the morals of men, it must speak to them with the authority of a state or kingdom. Christian morals must be based upon the divine laws of the Kingdom of God. And as among

<sup>1</sup> This is beneath the standard of Aristotle's "equitable man," who "does not push the letter of the law to the furthest on the worse side, but is disposed to make allowances, even although he has the law in his favor."—*Ethics*, Bk. V., Ch. X., p. 146.

<sup>2</sup> Whewell's *Morality*, Bk. III., Ch. XIX., § 458.

pagan nations we observe that the state absorbed into its own the authority also of the Church—that is, the interpretation of the divine law—so it is to be noted that the language of Scripture, which the Church addresses to her children, usually implies in them a knowledge of the principles of natural justice. When, for instance, the “unjust, covenant breakers, extortioners,”<sup>1</sup> are condemned, the sentence is simply left without definitions or limitations of the respective offences. The Church, in fact, while seeking to form in her members a new character, upon a distinct type of morals, recognizes and requires of them, as a matter of course, the virtues such as truth, justice, industry, prudence, which the natural reason and conscience demand in a good man and a good citizen.<sup>2</sup> But while human laws enforce their precepts by the coercion of penalties, Christ, in His kingdom, offers to His every subject and member the power, purchased by His work of sacrifice on earth, to fulfil every duty, natural and spiritual, and threatens no penalty whatever save the withholding of this power.

And here it seems appropriate to our subject to attempt an arduous task, no less than to sketch an outline of Christian morals, this picture of unearthly perfection, the ability to realize which has been actually brought to human beings in their several places and conditions here upon earth.

The best type of the ideal Christian is doubtless to be found in the example, suggested by our Lord's own comparison, of the little child following in faith and loyalty the voice and leading of his heavenly Father. This is enjoined by the great exemplar of every Christian virtue. “Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect.” And He is Himself the infallible guide in that heavenward way, bidding each of us as we arise to go, “Learn of me.”<sup>3</sup> The peculiar virtues of any earthly

<sup>1</sup> 2 S. Peter, ii. 9. Rom. i. 31. Moses: “The law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.”—1 S. Tim. i. 9.

<sup>2</sup> We might say of human law what S. Paul says of the law of

<sup>3</sup> S. Matt. v. 48; xi. 29.

state or kingdom are sometimes said to depend upon its situation, its surroundings, its ruling house, its period in history. Following this analogy, we may say that the traits demanded in the character of the children of God's kingdom, though adapted to every place and time on earth, are in a peculiar way the reflection of the image of their heavenly King, and are fostered by realizing vividly that their life in this world, wherever cast, is in truth a probation and parental discipline for the future life into which they are ushered by death as by a new birth. Every soul alive to the meaning and nature of the Christian life has a deep and growing faith in the invisible world, words from which, and about which, its King and inhabitants, it receives with joy rather than surprise, with thanksgiving rather than difficulty; it has a growing hope that the grace and mercy of its Maker and Redeemer will triumph over its own feebleness and imperfections, and make it share in the glories revealed to faith; it glows with a charity, kindled at first, indeed, and ever fed by the thought of its God and Saviour, but extending to all creatures, and proved and strengthened by labors of love to all who bear the divine image, long-suffering and kind, without envy or pride or anything unseemly.

The virtues of the Christian soul stand in their completeness for what it is; its duties, on the other hand, for the acts it performs in its threefold relation to God, to its neighbor, and to itself. Considering these in a reversed order, we may say that the root of the morality which regulates a Christian man's duties toward himself is the longing for holiness—that is, for likeness to his heavenly Father and Lord—and the deliberate purpose to make the loyal service of that Lord, in thought, word, and deed, the supreme end of life. He finds his self-conquest the more assured to him, when, in the second place, he can labor and pray for his neighbor with the same zeal as for his own salvation, and recognizes his own truest happiness in the success of such unselfish

efforts. In the third place, his devotion to God is quickened, his gratitude enkindled, his faith strengthened, when he perceives the fire that consumes his own heart burning in other souls, and that even his own poor service is accepted in extending the kingdom of his Lord among those who were aliens to it. With new fervor does he bless that holy name and celebrate His hallowed service, when he perceives it displacing profaneness, winning to itself reverence, giving hope to the desperate, and comfort to those forsaken of earthly help.

A Christian hates sin not merely because it threatens his own soul with irremediable misery, but primarily and chiefly because it separates him from God, whose favor is the very life of his being, and lifts the hand against the Master whose honor is dearer to him than his own; then, next, because sin is the fountain of all the sorrows and sufferings of his brethren, and indeed of the entire race of man, for whose ruin the author of sin is plotting. On the other hand, the Christian accepts the toils and discipline of life, not at all as drudgery or a mercenary task for which he will claim a stipulated reward, but as a glad service for a Master whom it is too great honor to be permitted to serve, and a test of the faith and a proof of the love which are the strength and joy of the breast in which they are cherished.

We may test the reality of Christian virtue by comparing it in detail with what the wise heathen called the cardinal virtues—those on which all others depend—prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance. Prudence by itself denotes simply the adapting of suitable means to accomplish a given end. Christianity has raised this virtue into *wisdom*, which includes the power to select right ends, as well as to adopt suitable means as prudence does. The true religion can alone disclose those ends of action that are absolutely right and worthy. S. Paul inculcates justice almost in the very language of the Roman law: "Render to all their dues."<sup>1</sup> But S. James announced

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xiii. 7. ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς. Cf. suum cuique tribuere.

also what no teacher or law-giver among the heathen had done: "He shall have judgment [or justice] without mercy, who hath showed no mercy."<sup>1</sup> So, again, fortitude is a Christian virtue, but means a strength and courage to resist more than mere pain, that is to say, the blandishments of sense and luxury, and still more, the courage to acknowledge fear of what is truly formidable, according to the Lord's words: "I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear."<sup>2</sup> Finally temperance became a Christian virtue when self-control, no longer confined to one or two solicitations, was extended to "all things."<sup>3</sup> The Christian religion certainly did a service to morality when it thus not only enlarged the sphere of the old cardinal virtues, but put on a level with them benevolence, truth, and purity, the first and last of which were hardly recognized by heathen moralists as virtues at all.

We should here note how some of the chief points of morality are taught in Holy Scripture. At one time leading virtues are taught by general rules. Thus the duty of piety: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." The Golden Rule, or Christian justice: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." Benevolence: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us." "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." Purity is taught by condemning a lustful look; and that religious defilement proceeds not from ceremonial omissions, but from the things that proceed "out of the heart." Our Lord illustrates such virtues at times by expressive narratives, like that of the Good Samaritan or the unmerciful servant; or again by incidents that came in His way, such as His reproof of S. James and S. John when they

<sup>1</sup> S. James, ii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. ix. 25.

<sup>3</sup> S. Luke, xii. 3.

desired to burn the Samaritan village, or to check the man who could work miracles but did not follow their Lord, His praise of the poor widow who cast in her last mite, His censure of the Pharisee who chose out the chief rooms, and of the tradition whereby they evaded the command to sustain their indigent parents. Or, lastly, He teaches by resolving questions propounded to Him, like that of the lawyer who asked, "What is the great commandment?" or the inquiry of the rich young man, "What lack I yet?" after he had kept all the commandments; to whom our Lord gave the counsel of perfection: "Sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me."<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the peculiar Christian spirit and temper are most characteristically portrayed in the Beatitudes at the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, where the poor in spirit, the meek, the merciful, the peacemakers, the pure in heart, the persecuted, are blessed by the Christian's Lord, and in the same discourse, in the command, "Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also," coupled with the still harder precept, "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."<sup>2</sup> S. Paul, to whose natural temper they were much opposed, was enabled, in the twelfth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, and in 1 Cor. xiii., to repeat these precepts of his Lord.

Now, the peculiar quality of Christian virtue has provoked two kinds of antagonism. The first may be described as that of the coarse, sensual, unbelieving world, to whom such dispositions have always appeared either contemptible, or absurd, or incredible. This feeling has been well drawn out by the following contrast:

<sup>1</sup> S. John, iv. 24. S. Matt. xxii. 52-56, 49, 50; xxii. 1-4; xiv. 7-11. 37; vii. 12; vi. 12, 14, 15; ix. 13; S. Mark, vii. 10-13. S. Matt. xxii. v. 28; xv. 18. S. Luke, x. 29-37. 34-40; xix. 16-22.  
S. Matt. xviii. 23-35. S. Luke, ix. <sup>2</sup> S. Matt. v. 1-12, 39, 44.

“The truth is, there are two opposite descriptions of character under which mankind may generally be classed. The one possesses vigor, firmness, resolution; is daring and active, quick in its sensibilities, jealous of its fame, eager in its attachments, inflexible in its purpose, violent in its resentments.

“The other, meek, yielding, complying, forgiving; not prompt to act, but willing to suffer; silent and gentle under rudeness and insult, suing for reconciliation where others would demand satisfaction; giving way to the pushes of impudence, conceding and indulgent to the prejudices, the wrongheadedness, the intractability, of those with whom it has to deal. The former of these characters is, and ever hath been, the favorite of the world. It is the character of great men. There is a dignity in it which universally commands respect. The latter is poor-spirited, tame, and abject. Yet so it hath happened that, with the Founder of Christianity, this latter is the subject of His commendation, His precepts, his example; and that the former is so in no part of its composition.”<sup>1</sup>

Now, it is very true, what has been often alleged, that the Gospel omits, or notices but slightly, some of the virtues that have been most popular among men, such as patriotism and military valor; and that it brings into view and commends other virtues that have been either ignored or despised, like humility, patience under affronts, placability, purity, contempt of wealth. To a believer these two facts are strong proofs that his religion is divine. But to one who cannot look upon this world and the next as faith views them, the exaltation, the strength, the real courage, and the true wisdom of the Christian virtues are things hidden. The world, however, has at times shown its sensibility to their greatness, or to their claim to greatness, in two ways. The first way

<sup>1</sup> Paley's *Evidences*, P. II., Ch. II., praises, on *The Internal Evidences of* pp. 330, 331. Paley says he derives *Christianity*. this from a book, which he highly

is in the severity with which it criticises an inconsistent Christian. No passage among Christian writings has occasioned more scandal, or formed the theme of more scornful invectives of unbelievers, than the celebrated outburst of Tertullian when, in speaking of the last judgment, he allows himself to triumph over the world in the world's own spirit. "You are fond of spectacles," he exclaims; "expect the greatest of all spectacles, the last and eternal judgment of the universe. How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs, so many fancied gods, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates, who persecuted the name of the Lord, liquefying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians; so many sage philosophers blushing in red-hot flames with their deluded scholars!" The sneering Gibbon affects to draw a veil in the interests of humanity over this lurid passage. But if he were logical in unbelief he should rather say: Here is a Christian who has gotten rid of his unnatural notions about placability and mercy, and speaks truthfully what he feels, like a man of spirit. Though Christians may feel ashamed of Tertullian, the unbelieving world has no logical right to condemn him. But, in the second place, the mass of men, though immersed in sin and evil customs, and amid the inconceivable abominations of idolatry, still contained many souls ready for faith, and often proved very sensitive to the high courage displayed by the wonderful

<sup>1</sup> At enim supersunt alia spectacula [Tertullian has just referred to the spectaculum adventus Domini], ille ultimus et perpetuus iudicii dies, ille nationibus insperatus, ille derisus, cum tanta sæculi vetustas et tot ejus nativitates uno igne haurientur. Quæ tunc spectaculi latitudo! quid admirer? quid rideam? ubi gaudeam, ubi exultem, spectans tot et tantos reges, qui in cælum recepti nuntiabantur, cum ipso Jove et ipsis suis

testibus in imis tenebris congemiscentes? item præsidēs, persecutores dominici nominis sævioribus flammis, quam ipsi sævierunt insultantibus contra Christianos, liquescentes? præterea sapientes illos philosophos coram discipulis suis una conflagrantibus erubescentes, quibus nihil ad Deum pertinere suadebant, quibus animas aut nullas aut non in pristina corpora redituras affirmabant?—Tertull., *De Spectaculis*, Ch. XXX.

procession of Christian martyrs, or to the contempt of wealth and its luxuries in those who forsook the world. "The very young and the very old, the child, the youth in the heyday of his passions, the sober man of middle age, maidens and mothers of families, boors and slaves as well as philosophers and nobles," defied alike the powers of darkness and the cruelty of the Roman judge, with whom it was a point of honor to break the determination of his victim, but whose most savage expedients for that purpose proved in vain. The martyrs shrank from suffering, like other men, but they would not apostatize. The intensity of torture could not expel from their minds the sovereign thought that was the support of their life and their consolation in death. It was a wonderful host assuredly that then faced the prospect of wounds and loss of limbs, and even ran to meet the attack, like the choicest combatants of this world. Not one Scævola as at its foundation, but a multitude of Scævolas, able to hold their hands in the flame,<sup>1</sup> now astonished Rome, as it drew on toward its fall. The effect of this supernatural courage is witnessed even by those who attributed it to magic. The officer who had custody of S. Perpetua, we are told, feared her escape from prison "by magical incantations." When S. Tiburtius had walked barefoot on hot coals, his judge cried out that Christ had taught him magic. S. Anastasia was thrown into prison for a mediciner; the populace called out against S. Agnes, "Away with the witch! away with the sorceress!" When S. Bonosus and S. Maximilian bore the burning pitch without shrinking, Jews and heathen cried out, "Those wizards and sorcerers!" "What new delusion," says the magistrate of S. Romanus, in the hymn of Prudentius, "has brought in these sophists who deny the

<sup>1</sup> Compare the accounts of the martyrs S. Ignatius, Germanicus, Blandina, Apollonia, S. Laurence, the noble maiden of Merida, and especially the hundred and fifty Christians

at Utica, of both sexes and all ages, who being told to burn incense to an idol, or they should be thrown into a pit of burning lime, without hesitation leaped into it.

worship of the gods? How doth this chief sorcerer mock us, skilled by his Thessalian charm to laugh at punishment?" "Christians," says a writer of the early part of the second century—and his words are worth quoting both for their own beauty and because they contain the arguments that conquered an indifferent if not unbelieving world—"Christians differ not from other men in country, or speech, or customs. They do not live in cities of their own, or speak in any peculiar dialect, or adopt any strange modes of living. They inhabit their native countries, but as sojourners; they take their part in all burdens as if citizens, and in all sufferings as if they were strangers. In foreign countries they recognize a home, and in every home they see a foreign country. . . . They obey established laws, but they go beyond them in the tenor of their lives. They love all men, and are persecuted by all; they are not known, and they are condemned. . . . Nor can they who hate them say why.

"Christians are in the world, as the soul in the body. The soul pervades the limbs of the body, and Christians the cities of the world. The flesh hates the soul and wars against it, though suffering no wrong from it; and the world hates Christians. The soul loves the flesh that hates it, and Christians love their enemies. Their tradition is not an earthly invention, nor is it a mortal thought which they so carefully guard, . . . but God Himself, the Omnipotent and Invisible Creator, has from heaven established among men His truth and His word . . . and has deeply fixed the same in their hearts; not as might be expected sending any angel, servant, or prince, but the very artificer and builder of the universe. Him God hath sent to man, not to inflict terror, but in clemency and gentleness, as a king sending a king who was His Son; He sent Him as God to men, to save them. He hated not, nor rejected us, nor remembered our guilt, but . . . in His own words, bore our sins; He gave His own Son as a ransom for us, the just for the unjust. For what other thing except His righteousness could cover our guilt? In

whom was it possible for us, lawless sinners, to find justification, save in the Son of God alone? O sweet interchange! . . . O benefits exceeding expectation! Sending, then, a Saviour who is able to save those who of themselves are incapable of salvation, He has willed that we should regard Him as our Guardian, Father, Teacher, Counsellor, Physician; our Mind, Light, Honor, Glory, Strength, and Life."<sup>1</sup>

These were the thoughts that upheld the aged Ignatius, looking forward, in his long journey from Antioch to Rome, to his death from the wild beasts, asking his brethren to bear with him, as he desires to die, ambitious of neither things visible nor invisible, but only to gain Christ, saying, "My Love is crucified;" answering Trajan's reviling by naming himself "Theophorus, he who bears Christ in his breast." Thus supported, the young Germanicus at Smyrna provoked the wild beast to fall upon him; thus, too, Blandina, a slave at Lyons, while her fellow-Christians feared for her constancy, tired out her tormentors, seeming to find refreshment in the oft-repeated declaration, "I am a Christian," and was able not only to endure her own trial victoriously, but sustained the faith of a youthful fellow-sufferer, who passed to God before her; thus the youth Epipodius was sustained, uttering from his bleeding mouth his simple confession of his Saviour; thus Symphorian of Autun, also a youth, who when told to adore an idol answered, "Give me leave, and I will hammer it to pieces." The victorious principle which was the support of this noble army of martyrs through centuries of persecution seemed to have increased in strength, till in the last, according to an eye-witness, Eusebius, the slaughter of men, women, and children went on by twenties, sixties, hundreds, till the instruments of execution were worn out, and the executioners could kill no more. Yet he tells us that as soon as any Christians were condemned, others ran from all parts, and surrounded the tribunals, confessing the faith, and

<sup>1</sup> *Epist. ad Diognet.*

joyfully receiving their condemnation, and singing songs of thanksgiving and triumph to the last.

In the presence of such events, how dwarfed and sordid appear the ambitions and pursuits, and even heroic struggles of the children of this world for temporal interests and earthly ends! The speculations of worldly philosophy applied to this Christian history resemble the line and plummet of a child seeking to measure and sound the mighty ocean. It is to such a speculation in morals that it is now my purpose to call your attention. And the theory to which I refer brings, I believe, this peculiar evidence to Christianity: that as the corruption of the best things is said to be the worst, so this form of opposition, having sprung up in the full light of Christian teaching, exhibits the nature and temper of its rejection in the least disguised form; for it seeks to substitute for the religion of self-sacrifice and all-embracing charity a theory of human action more distinctly mean and degraded than any form of teaching put forth by any celebrated heathen teacher, because this theory seems to possess a determined completeness and consistency in baseness. What is known as the utilitarian theory of morals, I profess, appears to me more disgraceful to the intelligence that adopts it than any of those doctrines out of which Socrates shamed Gorgias, Polus, and Callicles, or at least concerning which he reduced them to silence in the Athenian market-place.

This theory has had for advocates in England, Mandeville, Hobbes, Gay, Brown, Hartley, Waterland, Paley, Bentham, and Mill; and in France, Helvetius, Condorcet, D'Alembert, and La Rochefoucauld. Among these, it will be seen, are two eminent English divines. The list of those who have defended the opposite, what is sometimes called the intuitive system of morals, comprises Butler, Adam Smith, Cudworth, Clarke, Wollaston, Hutcheson, Henry More, Reid, *Hume*, Lord Kames, and Coleridge; and in France, Jouffroy and Cousin.

The utilitarian theory teaches that virtuous actions are

those which increase the happiness or diminish the pains of mankind, and vicious actions those which do the reverse; and that the sole motive to virtue is self-interest. Mandeville says that rulers first persuaded men to virtue, leading them, by cunning arguments addressed to their vanity, to restrain their passions for the common good. "Good and evil," says Hobbes, "are names that signify our appetites and aversions."<sup>1</sup> According to Helvetius, the science of morals is identical with the science of legislation.<sup>2</sup> "Nature has placed mankind," says Bentham, the great systematizer of the doctrine of utility, "under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure." "Pleasure is in itself a good; nay even, setting aside immunity from pain, the only good. Pain is in itself an evil, and indeed, without exception, the only evil, or else the words good and evil have no meaning."<sup>3</sup> "Happiness," says Mill, "is the sole end of human action, and the promotion of it the test by which to judge of all human conduct."<sup>4</sup>

Bentham's expressions at times seem almost ludicrous, from the unshrinking completeness he likes to give to his abominable doctrine. "Conscience," he says in one place, "is a thing of fictitious existence, supposed to occupy a seat in the mind."<sup>5</sup> "Duty is either an impossible motive, in so far as duty is synonymous to obligation," or else "love of duty is a variety of love of power."<sup>6</sup> Because pleasure and pain are the only motives to virtue and vice, there is not, according to Bentham, "such a thing as any sort of motive that is in itself a bad one."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Leviathan.

<sup>2</sup> "La science de la morale n'est autre chose que la science même de la législation."—*De l'Esprit*, II., 17. This would suit the middle-class Englishman so graphically described by Mr. Brewer: "moral, but not devout; religious, but not fervent; strictly observant of his duties, but intolerant and impatient of anything beyond them."—J. S. Brewer's

*Reign of Henry VIII.*, etc., reviewed and illustrated from original documents. London, 1884.

<sup>3</sup> *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Ch. I., X.

<sup>4</sup> *Utilitarianism*, p. 58.

<sup>5</sup> *Deontology*, Vol. I., p. 137.

<sup>6</sup> *Springs of Action*, II.

<sup>7</sup> *Princ. of Morals and Leg.*, Ch. IX. Cf. *Springs of Action*, II.,

So Hobbes defines pity to be "imagination or fiction of future calamity to ourselves;" and La Rochefoucauld<sup>2</sup> says "friendship is an intercourse whence self-love always designs to obtain some advantage." It may be asked with surprise how Christian men could ever be brought to countenance so debased a doctrine. The answer probably is the love of system, which charms in proportion as it can trace more things to a single principle. And so the clear-headed Waterland can say: "To love God is in effect the same thing as to love happiness—eternal happiness; and the love of happiness is still the love of ourselves."<sup>3</sup> Paley's well-known definition is: "Virtue is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness."<sup>4</sup> Even Coleridge, who professes to detest Bentham's doctrines, permits himself to use this language: "The happiness of man is the end of virtue, and truth is the knowledge of the means."

Now, to the assertion that virtue is always a regard to self-interest, we can reply, on the authority of the intuitive convictions and the unstudied language of mankind, that such a regard is precisely that which debases or destroys the virtue of an action. Men of every land, simple or learned, refuse the name of virtuous to one who regulates his actions solely or chiefly with a view to his own interest. They call such actions selfish, the opposite of disinterested. The consideration of the utility of any course of conduct, the calculation of the happiness it will bring us, is exactly what robs it of its elevation and charm, and removes it from the category of virtue. Heathen and Christian alike, unspoiled by theory and the narrowness of system, have ever believed that "man is capable of pursuing what he believes to be right, although pain and disaster and

<sup>1</sup> *On Human Nature*, Ch. IX., § 10.

<sup>2</sup> Third sermon on Self-love.

<sup>3</sup> L'amitié n'est enfin qu'un commerce où l'amour-propre se propose toujours quelque chose à gagner.—Max., 83.

<sup>4</sup> *Moral and Pol. Philosophy*, Bk. I., Ch. VII.; cf. Bk. II., Ch. II.

<sup>5</sup> *The Friend*, Vol. II., p. 192, ed. 1850.

mental suffering and an early death be the consequence, and though no prospect of future reward lighten upon his tomb."<sup>1</sup> To derive right and wrong from pain and pleasure, is a still more gross and unpardonable abuse of language, comparable only to calling "good" "evil," and "evil" "good."<sup>2</sup> It is, of course, only simple consistency, but it is a consistency that should warn all honest minds from such a system, that proceeds to remove "conscience" as a mental fiction, that pronounces "duty" an imaginary obligation, or a love of it only a "love of power," and the sense of merit and demerit a delusion because there is no such thing as a bad motive.

The simple truth in regard to the nature of man will best put to flight these monstrous figments of system. That nature, though one, is composed of various elements: as there are body, soul, and spirit, so are there passions, affections, thoughts, purposes. Now, in such a hierarchy of powers unity is impossible, unless we recognize that some are higher, some lower; some whose function is to command, and some to obey. Now, it is as certain as anything that we know, that right and wrong are conceptions recognized by all human beings as of singular importance. As soon as they are seen, conscience says to every soul, "Do the right," "Shun the wrong." This command is direct, urgent, without calculation, and with no other condition save that compliance or non-compliance is accompanied by the sense of merit or demerit, and, if the latter, with the expectation of punishment or some pain to follow. The impulse to do right and to avoid wrong, to obey conscience, we call

<sup>1</sup> Lecky, *Hist. of Eur. Morals*, Ch. I., I., 72. "The essence of true nobility is neglect of self. Let the thought of self pass in, and the beauty of a great action is gone, like the bloom from a soiled flower." —J. A. Froude, *Science of History, Short Studies*, etc., p. 24.

good; wrong, the sacrifice of good to self — not graduated objects of desire, to which we are determined by the degrees of our knowledge, but wide asunder as pole and pole, as light and darkness; one the object of infinite love, the other the object of infinite detestation and scorn."—

<sup>2</sup> "Right, the sacrifice of self to *Id.* from Kant, p. 25.

duty or obligation. These are simply facts of human nature, not an hypothesis about it; they are witnessed by the consciousness and attested by the language of all nations. The independence of the conceptions of right and wrong, the supremacy of conscience, are not rendered in the least degree doubtful by the fact that in different nations we find a different estimate set upon both virtuous and vicious actions, and even at times an apparent insensibility to the plainest duties—care of parents, gratitude; or a tolerance of murder, theft, or impurity. These facts certainly point to undeveloped or perverted faculties: they do not show that any human being is incapable, under proper circumstances, of perceiving the right and the wrong in these matters. Language is still a capacity of the race of man, though here and there we find individuals who are dumb, and others whose organs cannot utter particular sounds. Education in neither case creates the powers it unfolds, nor the distinctions it imparts. The important fact is that as soon as any human being recognizes the conception of right and wrong, whether clearly or indistinctly—as soon as he hears the command of conscience, whether it speak loudly or only in a whisper—he knows that these ideas and this command are supreme over all others; that it belongs to their very nature to rule all the other powers and affections of soul or body.

These truths, which are clear enough to the natural, unperverted reason of man, are emphasized and placed beyond dispute by the religion of Christ. What business have Christians to be talking of self-interest, when their own Master “pleased not Himself,” and bade them confess, “after they had done all,” that they were still “unprofitable servants”?<sup>1</sup> How dare they talk of “happiness,” and the evil of pain, when the ideal of all excellence is still before them as the “Man of Sorrows”? How can they confound friendship with selfish aggrandizement, when they remember who said, “Greater love hath no

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xv. 3. S. Luke, xvii. 10.

man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends"?<sup>1</sup> What a commentary upon the assertion, that pity is only compassion of ourselves suffering hereafter what we see another suffering at present, may be read in the story of that youthful martyr Germanicus at Smyrna, who, when the proconsul urged him to have mercy on himself and on his youth,"<sup>2</sup> replied only by provoking the wild beast in the arena to fall upon him. The pity in such a soul is not for himself, though he have youth and everything that can make life attractive, but for the souls of men who cannot see the beauty of his invisible Master, to die for whom is an unspeakable honor. He prefers the fangs of the brute that can send him to his Lord, to the persuasions of the sophist that would draw him thence.

The theorists who have injected the poison of selfishness into Christian ethics have forgotten the finer aroma of unconsciousness which, borrowed from the example of the child, breathes over the whole field of its characteristic virtues. Humility, for instance, lies at the foundation of Christian virtue;<sup>3</sup> but he that reflects upon his humility loses it by that very act. In like manner the heroism, the self-sacrifice, the burning charity of the Christian saint are attained by fixing his thoughts not on

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, liii. 3. S. John, xv. 13. "Summa religionis est imitari quem colis."—S. Augustine.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the argument of a heathen judge with the martyr Epipodius: "Nos deos immortales colimus, quos universitas populorum, quos etiam nominibus propriis sacratissimi principes venerantur. Nos deos colimus lætitiâ, conviviis, cautionibus, ludis, comessatione et lascivia; vos vero hominem crucifixum, cui placere non possunt, qui his omnibus perfruuntur, qui damnatis voluptatibus tristem et infœcundam diligit castitatem.—Ruinarte, *Select. Mart. Acta*, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> S. Matt. xviii. 4. Newman, in a sermon preached in 1825, said that the teaching of the Bible concerning humility is one of the most striking evidences of the truth of Revelation. "When I see a person hasty and violent, harsh and high-minded, careless of what others feel, and disdainful of what they think; when I see such an one proceeding to inquire into religious subjects, I am sure beforehand he cannot go right—he will not be led into all the truth. It is contrary to the nature of things and the experience of the world, that he should find what he is seeking."

himself, but on his Lord, for whom all toils are sweet, and on his brethren beloved as members of that dear Lord. It is in such a frame that dangers are faced, labors performed, temptations repelled. It is, in fact, only while not thinking of himself that any Christian's condition is safe and sound, his prayers unhindered, his hope unclouded.

We can finally, then, I believe without exaggeration, claim for the Christian religion not merely in theory, but bringing in attestation myriads of examples, the production of all the chief virtues which speculative moralists assert are only found in perfection in varying circumstances and times. It has shown an "heroic endurance of suffering" equal to any in the barbarous period to which this virtue is affirmed peculiarly to belong, and that, too, combined with the "amiability" which is declared to be the characteristic attendant of civilization. The homely virtues cannot be denied to Christians, whose teachers tell them, "If any would not work, neither should he eat;" "If any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, . . . he is worse than an infidel;"<sup>1</sup> "Be ye angry, and sin not;" and say, "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, working with his hands, . . . that he may have to give to him that needeth." (It is not selfishness, but generosity that helps even the repentant thief.) So of truth: "Putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor: for we are members one of another." (Here again the motive is charity rather than self-interest.) How dare any one say that Christian virtue is mercenary, that the Christian selfishly labors for the salvation of his own soul, or that he expects to win heaven by faith in abstract dogmas, when from the page of inspiration there come, as with the voice of a trumpet, such words as these: "Though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Thess. iii. 10. 1 S. Tim. v. 8.

And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." The same fervid apostle who said this once expressed his willingness to be destroyed, even as a sacrifice is consumed, if he could thus save those he loved. For such is doubtless the meaning of the words, "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ [rather, "that myself were made an expiatory offering by Christ"] for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Eph. iv. 26, 28, 25. 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 3. Rom. ix. 3. *ἡὐχόμενον γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* There is no ground for the impious meaning foisted into this text by the Calvinists: "to be separated from Christ and the benefits of His death, and devoted to eternal destruction." See Robinson's *Lexicon*, s. v., ἀνάθεμα.

## LECTURE XI.

---

### INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON SCIENCE.

IF I have shown that the Christian religion has a formative or educational effect upon human beings, leading them out of rudeness and imperfection toward self-control and refinement; if I have proved that it has lent important aid in making the rules or law that regulate them in communities; and if I have made good its claim to present the loftiest conception and ideal of morality, free alike from the taint of selfishness and the unbalanced devotion to any exclusive principle—I have shown that this religion has performed a service akin to that of the missionary who brings the waifs from the streets of a great city, or the savages out of the wilderness, into the schools of civilization, within hearing and reach of the knowledge that charms and the instruction that transforms human souls. And now, as I have tried to trace the evidence of her Divine origin in the power of our religion over the subjects of her education, it is my purpose at the present time to show how she has proved herself from God by her influence on the development of that beautiful and marvellous system of truth embraced in the circle of the human sciences. For if religion can explain and control the nature of man, it can give the key to that knowledge which is man's chief glory and delight. It does both, because it is the voice of Him who created as well the faculties of man as all the objects

upon which they are exercised. The plan I am to follow in considering the relation of revealed religion to science is, first, to seek to apprehend what science is as a whole, then to show how religion is essential to its integrity, and, lastly, to point out, more in detail, the benefits she has conferred upon the different sciences.

1. If you will look into works like Whewell's *History of the Inductive Sciences*, or his philosophy of the same sciences, you cannot fail to become aware of the fact of the wonderful advance and development of science in modern and Christian times, as compared with its condition in the most enlightened periods of paganism. The fact is certain, whatever explanation shall be given of it, and the improvement will be found not only in the sciences that depend on experiment and the observation of nature, or the field of induction proper, but it must be confessed to have extended with immense strides into the branches in which ancient science was strongest, mathematics, pure as well as applied, and even into logic. Although the sagacity of Aristotle in natural science is still recognized with respect by scientific men, the attainments of any period of the ancient world in this branch, compared with the rich treasures of modern science, were simply puerile—the lisps and guesses of children. There is now a multitude of real and important sciences, not whose names merely but whose fundamental and elementary ideas were utterly unknown to the most enlightened sages and philosophers of antiquity. It is true that there is an interesting list of lost arts that may fairly be placed in the opposite scale.<sup>1</sup> But compared with chemistry, galvanism, electro-magnetism, with the mechanical inventions to which they as well as steam have been applied, the advantage is immeasurably on the side of the modern world. Euclid and Archimedes would have

<sup>1</sup> There are anticipations in the school of Pythagoras of the sphericity of the earth and its annual revolution around the sun (a truth lost under the Ptolemies, and not found again till the time of Copernicus), the physical theory of music, chemical proportions, etc.

placed themselves at the feet of Newton and Laplace, when these unfolded the wonders of the differential and integral calculus. Now, I believe that the marked and incontestable superiority of the moderns over the ancients in human science can be shown, with a probability amounting to moral certainty, to be due not to difference of brains or mental calibre or race or opportunities for study, but to the fact that the latter were worshippers of idols and involved in the abominations which attend this infatuation, and the former were acquainted with the true God and in the midst of that divine kingdom which had sure possession of this truth and of many other important truths and facts concerning man and the spiritual world.

What is science? It is knowledge, of course; but it is knowledge so verified and systematized as to be most conveniently retained in the mind, or imparted by instruction to another. All knowledge of whatever kind, we are to remember, is conversant about the universe, or some of its parts, or about its Maker. We learn by degrees one thing after another about the same concrete substance, or facts. The senses analyze and separate for us the various qualities of material things, hard or soft, heavy or light, sweet or sour, fragrant or otherwise; they introduce us to the wonders of sound, melody, and harmony, and to the still higher marvels of light, radiance, and color. But all these qualities (and perhaps many more) we perceive can belong to the self-same substance. Each of the senses—touch, taste, hearing, etc.—gives us, if we may borrow a word from the most intellectual of them, but a single *view* of any one object. They are thus a kind of image in miniature of the respective sciences which make up the sum of human knowledge. Our memory enables us to store up what we have learned. By the aid of the imagination we mould it into new forms. We then apply to it the rules of the reason, digesting it into propositions that have a logical coherence, in which form it may with most advantage be taught or enlarged. Each of the sciences, we should note, is but a particular

view of some concrete portion of the universe: optics, for example, treats of it as visible; acoustics and music present the wonders of sound, either mechanically or as speaking to the soul; geology takes account of the different layers of the earth and of their contents; astronomy lifts our eyes to the material heavens; mathematics collects the laws of number, time, space, relations, entering into every exact expression of any kind of knowledge. Another series of sciences is occupied with different views of man: anatomy numbers and describes the bones of his skeleton, and the more wonderful organs which it contains and which cover it; physiology gives the history of the same through the marvellous development of life; psychology analyzes and describes the mental and spiritual powers whose home is in this mortal frame; philology traces out the growth and laws of man's varied speech. This last suggests the remark, how little of the richness and interest of a science is suggested by its general characterization. In language, which of course comprehends poetry, rhetoric, oratory, and might be said further to contain history, philosophy, and ethics, is summed up almost all knowledge, and every department and instrument of education; and still its agent is the smallest member of the body. Sound is simply the result of vibrations; and all the glorious colors come from vibrations of different velocities confined to a plane.

Now, when we have mentioned the universe and man, and counted up all the departments of knowledge concerned with them, have we completed the circle of the sciences? Are we prepared to say that nothing is known of the Maker of man and of the universe, and that there is no such science as theology? or that what it professes to teach is a mere fancy and dream? If so, who has proved this? or what account has he given of the most universal, the most ancient, the most stubborn, the most ennobling conviction of the human race? The wisest, the most impartial, the most thoughtful men of all nations and times have held that the universe is a work of

intelligence, that its order marks the presence of a Mind behind it and controlling it, and manifesting itself through all the parts, not less certainly than the soul within the body of a man. And still the wisest have held that the Maker is in no sense the soul of the world,<sup>1</sup> but utterly independent of it; that its periods, great as they may be, are but as an instant to Him; that as He called it into being, He could turn it again<sup>7</sup> into nothingness, with a word. The science which Christians call theology, commanding still the suffrages of the best wisdom of the world, teaches that the Creator has in Himself all perfections, that He is almighty, omniscient, and that His name God means good, and that He possesses in Himself all blessedness; that He delights in the happiness of His creatures, of whose evil or misery He is in no sense the author, while He made them responsible; that His loving providence watches without sleeping over every creature; that each shall have at His hand a merciful trial and a just judgment; that He has given intimations, to those who will read them, of His character, will, and purposes, through His visible works, in the frame of man's nature, in history, in even false and corrupt religions, in literature, in law, wherever men have witnessed to truth and goodness and anticipated the overthrow of wrong.

Such being the nature of theology, it is quite clear that if it represent real knowledge, its presence or absence from the circle of the sciences cannot be a matter of indifference. The absence of any science, however subordinate, will vitiate any scheme of universal knowledge; but the removal of such a science as theology may be likened to the omission of spring from the circle of the year, or of the part of the Prince of Denmark from such a play as *Hamlet*.

<sup>1</sup> "It is a peculiarity of revelation, that it clears up all doubts as to the existence of God as separate from and independent of nature, and shows us that the course of the world

depends not merely on a system, but on a Being, real, living, and individual."—Newman's *Arians*, Ch. II., sect. 4, p. 107.

2. We are now prepared to see how religion is necessary to the integrity of universal knowledge as represented by the human sciences collectively. It is not merely that the absence of an important member, like theology, will maim the body as a whole: it is rather like the subtraction of the living soul from the frame. When life leaves any organized existence, you know how its various parts disintegrate and drop asunder, as completely as the most heterogeneous substances. It is an old complaint against scientific men, that they have a tendency to run into details, and to dwell upon detached portions of their favorite studies, forgetful of everything else. This tendency is left without any corrective when religion is separated from science. One of the most brilliant intellects of modern times, partaking both of the scientific and of the irreligious tendency, still clearly perceives and complains of the evil of which I have just spoken. "Our scientific men," says Goethe, "are rather too fond of details. They count out to us the whole consistency of earth in separate lots, and are so happy as to have a separate name for every lot. That is argillaceous earth; that is quartz; that is this, and this is that. What am I the better for these lots? What for these names? I want to know what it is that impels every separate portion of the universe to seek out some other portion—either to rule or to obey it—and qualifies some for the one part, and some for the other, according to a law innate in them all, and operating like a voluntary choice. But this is precisely the point upon which the most perfect and universal silence prevails."<sup>1</sup> I have already referred to the fact that the greatest scientific minds—Newton, whose depth has never been surpassed, Herschell, Leibnitz—in reflecting on the law of gravitation, have been inclined to assign as its ultimate cause simply the Creator's will;<sup>2</sup> and in the present favorite speculations upon what is called the

<sup>1</sup> Goethe's *Conversation with Falk*, translated by Miss Austin, Notes to Faust, 342.

<sup>2</sup> See Lect. III. (p. 96).

correlation of forces, there is, first, a marked tendency to believe that heat, light, motion, electricity, galvanism, chemical affinity, will be reduced to a single force, and then, next, to confess that this, too, must be referred to the Sovereign Maker's will.<sup>1</sup> There is a natural and nearly irresistible tendency in all the sciences and in the finer arts, when in their due place and without extravagance, to point to the last and highest truth of religion. This tendency may be described as a striving after unity. Science proper strives to reach some abstract conception or law, comprehending a multitude of phenomena. A great historian instinctively gives to nations the unity and interest of an individual, and can point out, as did Arnold in the case of Rome, that there is a national conscience, and that its violation beyond a certain point insures irrevocable disaster.<sup>2</sup> In art the same tendency is shown in the effort to express great spiritual truths or underlying and universal sentiments. Nay, even in active life we may note the same impulse in the mind of an able inventor or engineer systematizing and combining every form of material force, and using human sympathy and enthusiasm to further the same end. Why should not human beings amid the Creator's works, of which works they themselves are part, seek to trace His footsteps, and, bearing His image, delight amid the rich variety of life and form everywhere to recognize and to adore Him? It is, in fact, a necessity of our nature, wrought into the very constitution of our minds, to think that, as each science has its own unity, so all the sciences are bound together by a higher unity, which we sometimes express by saying that "no one truth can contradict another." Many of the sciences are indeed concerned only with the relations between different parts of matter or mind. The soul and mind and heart of man, by a natural necessity, crave amid every inquiry for the Almighty Creator and Father, the beginning and the end of what-

<sup>1</sup> Duke of Argyle's *Reign of Law*,  
Ch. V., p. 223.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Rome*, Ch. XIII., p.  
96.

ever exists. His absence would leave simply intellectual and moral chaos, comparable to what would occur in the material universe if the force of gravitation should be withdrawn.

We should note also what is the effect upon each of the sciences if we withdraw any member from their circle. The rest, and especially those in immediate proximity, endeavor to occupy the space thus left vacant. Each stretches itself beyond its own sphere, and attempts to seize upon ground that does not belong to it. We have repeated in the world of science the attempt so common in every-day experience, and in society. We constantly meet with persons who feel it incumbent upon them to have an opinion on every subject, a view of every celebrated character and event, even though they have taken no trouble to inform themselves, and have no natural aptitude to judge of the matter in question. They seem to be more ashamed of being without an off-hand view or summary judgment, than of having neglected consistency or truth or charity. In a similar way we find the different sciences at times, not content with the modesty of their own sphere, exhibiting an ambition to invade foreign territory.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most flagrant and typical instance of this that can be found is in the celebrated Glasgow discourse of Lord Brougham, in 1825, in praise of science, when upon the authority of his metaphysics of necessity or fate, pronouncing the religious belief of a man a thing "accidental and involuntary," "over which he has himself no control," he expels theology from the circle of the sciences. It is evident that no instructor could teach grammar or optics, if, after laying down the laws of language or of light, he should say: "These laws appear to me to be true; but if to any pupil they appear absurd, I cannot dismiss him from my class: his ideas may be as correct as my own."

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle gave the name of ἀλλὰ- degree the province of the art which ζορεία to the disposition in a he professes. teacher to extend to an extravagant

The modern science of political economy is an instructive example of a new science, whose professors are naturally full of enthusiasm, stretching itself beyond its own province.<sup>1</sup> That province was defined, a few years ago, in his inaugural lecture, by the first professor in the chair of political economy in the University of Oxford, to be to teach "in what wealth consists, by what agents it is produced, and according to what laws it is distributed, and what are the institutions and customs by which production may be facilitated and distribution regulated, so as to give the largest possible amount of wealth to each individual." Warming with enthusiasm over his subject, the professor said that it will soon be esteemed "among the first of *moral* sciences in interest and utility." Then, kindled by an objection to his favorite science, he asserts "that the pursuit of wealth—that is, the endeavor to accumulate the means of future subsistence and enjoyment—is, to the mass of mankind, the great source of *moral* improvement." He does not shrink, in the further development of his theme, from maintaining that this pursuit of wealth is the only solid basis of virtue, religion, and happiness. Now, what is to be condemned in teaching like this is not the absence of truth, but the absurd exaggeration of what is really sound and true. Because industry and thoughtfulness and care for the maintenance and education of their families are admirable virtues in laborers, and are fostered by showing them how to lay by a store for the future, beyond their present expenditure, it is not needful to pronounce the method of doing it "the first of moral sciences" or a moral science at all, since in strictness its sphere appears to be social and political; far less the process of "accumulating wealth" "for future enjoyment," the "great source of moral improvement," since the effort to accumulate, though merito-

<sup>1</sup> Adam Smith asserted "merely what he says of political economy, that, as far as the arts of production are concerned, and of buying and selling, the action of self-interest may be counted upon as uniform." But Mr. Buckle "would extend over the whole circle of human activity."—*Hist. of Civilization.*

rious at first, may easily, as every one knows, if not kept within bounds, cease to be a virtue at all. The fact is, that political economy has here intruded into the provinces of ethics and religion, scorning as unreal the warning that "the love of money is the root of all evil," neglecting the admonition, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," and despising the promise, "Blessed be ye poor; for yours is the Kingdom of God." On the other hand, the same religion that says this, recognizes all that is valuable in political economy when it says: "Who-soever will not work, neither shall he eat," and, "If any provide not for his own, and specially for his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Again, physiology steps beyond its sphere when it speaks rhetorically of "that combination of natural forces which we call life."<sup>1</sup> This is the language of one determined to ignore the life and immortality witnessed by the true religion.<sup>2</sup> For nothing is more certain in science than that it knows nothing of life, as a force or combination of forces, in the same sense in which it knows something of the force of gravity or of magnetism or of electricity or of chemical affinity. These forces reside in and are developed from inorganic as well as living substances, and can be expressed in definite relations of space, time, and number. We have no such knowledge of life: Bastian's hobby of spontaneous generation is thoroughly exploded. Professor Tyndall has made this decided statement: "I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life."<sup>3</sup> Even the author of the statement first given above has, in a more careful publication, confessed that "the present state of knowledge furnishes us with no link between the living and the not living."<sup>4</sup> Physiology again intrudes into a province not its own, when it presumes to deny moral evil and human responsibility.

<sup>1</sup> Huxley's *Elements of Comparative Anatomy*, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Nineteenth Century*, p. 507, 1878.

<sup>3</sup> Huxley, art. "Biology," in *Ency. Brit.*

<sup>4</sup> 2 S. Tim. i. 10.

The science of philology suffered a similar perversion when Horne Tooke made a work on grammatical studies a vehicle of scepticism; and even jurisprudence was pushed from its sphere by Bentham, who, in a work on judicial proofs, covertly attacked the miracles of Revelation. So history has been abused when writers like Ewald and Milman have sought to show that in Judaism was nothing generically different from other political institutions; or, to instance a perversion of history of another kind, when Gibbon seeks to discredit the Gospel narrative because the miraculous darkness at the Crucifixion is not mentioned by certain writers.<sup>1</sup> In these instances, the historian has, without warrant, made his science the criterion of facts proposed to us by religion, rejecting authority in one case and demanding authority in the other.

Illustrations of sciences thus leaving their own proper province to invade another are by no means confined to those which have trespassed upon the grounds of morals and religion. Wherever the knowledge proper to any particular science is wanting, its field is liable to such invasion. Ignorance of true astronomy made the false science of astrology possible, and the intrusion of this, in turn, into the province of health and disease was invited by the empiricism and quackery of many representatives of medical science. Popular superstitions about the bearing of meteors and comets upon wars, plagues, and political changes afford a curious illustration of the same principle. The human mind can never cease from speculating and systematizing; it must give some account of everything: in the absence of real knowledge, it will supply conjecture and hypothesis. The indolent and the inaccurate, especially if writing or amusing their fellow-beings has become their occupation, will spread a little knowledge over a very large space, and assert their right to treat of what they do not understand by bold jests and sarcastic challenges. It is astonishing how far

<sup>1</sup> Seneca, Pliny, Plutarch, and the Jewish Mishna.

Mr. Darwin's theory has been stretched beyond his own declared design in the first edition of his famous *Origin of Species*. In that book he professed merely to explain the processes by which new forms, when they have appeared in the organic world, acquire a preference over others, and thus become established. He gave to his theory the name of natural selection, which could do nothing except with the materials presented to its hands, and accounted for the spread and success of new forms only "when they have arisen." With Mr. Darwin the new species is simply "an unusual birth" connected with previous forms by the "bond of inheritance." But he confesses, with great frankness, "our ignorance of the laws of variation is profound;" we must "acknowledge plainly our ignorance of the cause of each particular variation;" and, finally, he says, "I believe in no law of necessary development."<sup>1</sup> Strictly speaking, according to this, Mr. Darwin's theory was not a theory of the origin of species at all, but a theory on the causes which lead to the relative success or failure of such new forms as may be born into the world. But how soon did the author himself (not being restrained by religion) forget the modesty of this his first and deliberate position, and begin to speak of natural selection "producing" this and that modification of structure, and to affirm of one class of changes, that they can, and of another that they cannot, be produced by this process!<sup>2</sup> His followers suppose that they are able to explain the processes by which new forms first appear, and boast that they are in possession of a law or rule according to which the new forms are born of the old forms—the very thing Mr. Darwin disclaimed; who added, moreover, that outward conditions will not account for the new forms, still less the effort or aspirations of any organism after new faculties and powers. His name is now associated not only by sciolists and flippant scoffers, but by honest people, misled

<sup>1</sup> *Origin of Species*, pp. 131, 351 (1st ed.).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 200.

through their idle talk, with the very theories and explanations which he carefully repudiated.

3. It is time for us to endeavor to point out in detail some of the benefits conferred by the true religion upon particular sciences. The great benefit, of course, which she has conferred upon them all, is to assure them, as natural religion could never assure them, that the Almighty is something infinitely different from a mere principle, a centre of action, or a quality, or a generalization of phenomena ; that He is more than the laws of the universe, more than a function, or correlative, or subjective reflection of each phenomenon of the material or moral world ; no constitutional monarch, whose throne is beset with honor and ceremonial, and unable to issue the most ordinary command except through legal forms and precedents, but One whose particular providence follows each of His creatures, and who acts as readily in independence of as through the laws of nature, whose correlation still is always the present effect of His will. This conception or thought of God, though distasteful to the enthusiastic devotee of a specialty,<sup>1</sup> is not unacceptable to the large-minded student who takes in the whole field of science.

The first special benefit, after this general one, that I note, is that revealed religion both recommends and leads the way in the use of the favorite instrument of modern science, viz., induction, which "is engaged in detecting the general laws or uniformities, the relations of cause and effect, or, in short, all the general truths that may be asserted concerning the numberless and very diverse events that take place in the natural world about us."<sup>2</sup> Now, we have no less an authority than Bishop Butler for asserting "that there is a great resemblance between

<sup>1</sup> If Professor Huxley thinks it "conceivable that some powerful and malicious being may find his pleasure in deluding us, and in making us believe the thing which is not, every moment of our lives," as he has said, why

should he envy us the possibility that an All-Powerful and Good Being may confer upon us the opposite benefit, viz., a knowledge of the truth?

<sup>2</sup> Jevons's *Lessons in Logic*, Less. XXV., p. 212.

the light of nature and of revelation." "The study of what the apostle calls 'going on unto perfection' (Heb. vi. 1) and of the prophetic parts of revelation, like many parts of natural and even civil knowledge, may require very exact thought and careful consideration. The hindrances, too, of natural and of supernatural light and knowledge have been of the same kind. And as it is owned the whole scheme of Scripture is not yet understood, so if it ever comes to be understood before 'the restitution of all things' (Acts, iii. 21), and without miraculous interpositions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at—by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty, and by particular persons attending to, comparing, and pursuing intimations scattered up and down in it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world. For this is the way in which all improvements are made; by thoughtful men tracing on obscure hints, as it were, dropped us by nature accidentally, or which seem to come into our minds by chance. Nor is it at all incredible that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind should contain many truths as yet undiscovered. For all the same phenomena, and the same faculties of investigation from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made in the present and last age, were equally in the possession of mankind several thousand years before. And possibly it might be intended, that events, as they came to pass, should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture."<sup>1</sup>

The following remark seems to me to be just: No one reading Scripture even superficially can fail to note the absence of everything like scientific abstractions, metaphysics, or definitions—the latter being often concrete descriptions as much as definitions. Holy Scripture, in other words, in its teaching has shown us how best to convey knowledge to every capacity. "There are undoubtedly," says a skilful teacher of the day, "great differences

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, P. II., Ch. III., pp. 132, 133.

among men in the acuteness of their sensations ; but successful observation depends far less on the acuteness of the senses than on the faculty of the mind, which clearly distinguishes and remembers what is seen and heard." "The power of observation, then, is simply the power of fixing the attention upon our sensations, and this power of fixing the attention is the one essential condition of scholarship in all departments of learning." "In beginning the study of geometry," he goes on to say, "the power of conception should be helped in every possible way." Divide some triangular prism into three actual triangular pyramids, as a preliminary to measuring the solid contents of a sphere.<sup>1</sup>

Neander says that Clement of Alexandria was "the founder of the true view of history," a science that has been defined to be "philosophy teaching by examples."

Christianity, as we have seen, has produced languages for its peculiar use, and we shall have occasion in the next lecture to treat of its influence on literature. We have already seen how it fostered the noble science of the law by which man is governed.

It has produced in the department of the fine arts an architecture the most original, splendid, and impressive among human works ; in painting, a succession of masterpieces which, while distinctively Christian, can be compared with the most celebrated works of the ancient world. Perugino, Leonardo, Rafael, Michael Angelo, who are Christian artists, will live, even though Apelles and Praxiteles and Protogoras and Zeuxis be forgotten. And so the music<sup>2</sup> of Mozart and Haydn and Handel was

<sup>1</sup> Address of J. P. Cooke (Prof. of Chem. and Min. in Harvard) on *Scientific Culture*, pp. 5-7, 1884.

<sup>2</sup> It has been noted that music advanced by a bound rather than by gradual development with the coming of Christianity. The Greeks were acquainted with the mathematical relations of sounds, and with

melody, chiefly in the minor mode ; but of harmony, "coincidences of according sounds simultaneously produced," they remained ignorant. Its laws, with the mysteries of connected counterpoint, sprang out of the antiphonal chants in unison, the *Trisagion*, etc., and found their richest and triumphant expression in an-

inspired by Christian ideas, and has never been surpassed, probably never equalled.

Descending to details, it is fair to note how "the very student of physical science takes more interest in his facts and theories in proportion as they seem to bear upon some statement of Holy Scripture, or upon some gloss currently put upon its words; and many a so-called scientific treatise is in reality a theological argument."<sup>1</sup>

Copernicus,<sup>2</sup> a Christian priest in the fifteenth century, serving his humble canonry at Frauenburg, wrote the work *De Revolutionibus Orbium*, dedicated to the Pope (Paul III.), in which was explained that system of the universe that bears his name.<sup>3</sup> He says to the head of the Church: "If there be some who, though ignorant of mathematics, . . . dare to condemn this treatise because they fancy it is inconsistent with some passages of Scripture, the sense of which they have miserably perverted, I regard them not, and even despise their rash censure." This learned and religious man, we are told, divided his working day into three parts, "one of which he devoted to the duties of his office, another to giving medical advice gratuitously to the poor, and the third to study."

Kepler,<sup>4</sup> whose three laws were the basis of Newton's mighty discovery, was indebted for his early education to the convent of Maulbronn. His views of astronomy were always religious, and sometimes tinged with mysticism. When professor of mathematics at Gratz in 1593, he published a work called *Prodromus*, in which he found a type of the Holy Trinity in the sun, stars, and planets.

them, mass, and oratorio, the *Miserere*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Magnificat*, and *Te Deum*. And so all instruments received their crown and completeness at length in the organ.

<sup>1</sup> R. Payne Smith's *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. I., p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> 1473-1543, A.D.

<sup>3</sup> Whewell says of Copernicus:

"It is manifest that in this as in other cases of discovery, a clear and steady possession of abstract ideas, and an aptitude in comprehending real facts under these general conceptions, must have been leading characters in the discoverer's mind." —*History of the Inductive Sciences*, 2d ed., Vol. I., p. 434.

<sup>4</sup> 1571-1630, A.D.

Newton, Leibnitz, the two Herschells, were religious men, and have never been surpassed in scientific ability. They found in the thought of the Christian's God the explanation and support of the profoundest conclusions of their science. Descartes, who founded a philosophy that rivalled Aristotle's, was thoroughly a Christian.

Galileo, whose name is often quoted as proving the opposition of religion to science, incurred odium chiefly, we should note, for defending the discoveries of Copernicus of half a century before, to which he had added the rotation of the sun upon its axis. It is likely that his sufferings were due as much to his hasty and intractable temper as to his science. Pope Urban VIII. allowed him to spend his latter years, though he was nominally a prisoner, in the palace of the Medici at Rome and in his own country house at Florence, receiving his friends and pursuing his studies, which appear to have been praised both then and now quite as much as they deserved.

One of the most beautiful and typical of the sciences of modern days, botany, was the creation of Karl von Linne,<sup>2</sup> Linnæus, the son of a clergyman of Rashult in Sweden. The child's passion for flowers was kindled, according to the story, even in his cradle, where he could be amused by their bright hues for hours. When twenty years of age Linnæus assisted Olaf Celsius in preparing a work on the plants of the Bible. When his great work, *Species Plantarum*, sent forth in 1753, had crowned his fame as the first naturalist of Europe, his philosophic mind had not learned to disdain the lessons of the pious home where his cradle stood.

The heathen poet lamenting the untimely death of a learned philosopher, who lay unburied after shipwreck, deplores the helplessness, in such an hour, of the mind<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1564-1642, A. D.

<sup>2</sup> A. D. 1707-1778.

<sup>3</sup> Nec quidquam tibi prodest  
Aerias tentasse domos, amimoque rotundum  
Percurrisse polum, morituro!

Horace, *Odes*, I., XXVIII., 4-6.

that could traverse the heavens and the round world, and even number the sand. The poor ghost cannot escape the indignities of the common lot. We have here a most expressive comment upon that praise of knowledge—how that it should be cultivated for its own sake, and not for any utility to the life of man—so familiar to readers of Plato and Cicero. That he who has triumphed over space, and unravelled the mysteries of time and number, should be doomed to flit helplessly for a hundred years around his unburied corpse, is certainly an affecting parable upon the impotency of learned fame. There was nothing in the teaching of the great heathen sages to kindle a general or public interest in the pursuits of science, such as that with which we are familiar. Science was more often made the instrument to silence alike the promises and threats of religion, and along with these to put out the colored lights with which fancy and imagination had decked the mysteries of existence. It is not unlikely that Horace may be satirizing the rationalism of Lucretius. The Baconian philosophy, which aims to turn the knowledge of nature and her forces to the use of man, if kept within the bounds that Bacon himself<sup>1</sup> prescribed, so that devotion to the natural may not blind us to supernatural light, is certainly more in conformity with Christian conceptions, which take account of whatever concerns the interests of man either in the life present or in that to come.

Chateaubriand, who treated of the genius of Christianity, says that “had the Reformation been completely successful from the beginning, it would have established, for a time at least, another species of barbarism. Viewing as superstition the pomp of divine worship; as idolatry, the *chefs-d'œuvre* of sculpture, of architecture, and of painting—its tendency was to annihilate lofty eloquence and sublime poetry, to degrade taste by repudiating its models, to introduce a dry, cold, and captious formality into the operations of the mind, to substitute in society

<sup>1</sup> *The Student's Prayer*, Bacon's *Works*.

affectation and materialism in lieu of ingenuousness and intellectuality, and to make machinery take the place of manual and mental operations." Yet, after all this, the brilliant essayist adds with apparent inconsistency: "The Reformation was, properly speaking, philosophic truth, under the guise of Christianity, attacking religious truth." "Religious truth is the knowledge of one God manifested in a form of worship. Philosophic truth is the threefold knowledge of things intellectual, moral, and natural."<sup>1</sup> This seems to be said in apparent forgetfulness that no truth of whatever kind can ever really contradict any other truth. The most perfect intellect ever bestowed on man, and at the same time the most acute (a modern logician<sup>2</sup> thus describes Pascal), has shown how the same person can find entire harmony in the deepest mysteries of religion, the profoundest researches into nature, and the most subtle analysis of the human heart.

The religion of Christ can justly claim this testimony to herself. She teaches her children to do everything, the simplest action, to God's glory. She also teaches that no real knowledge can ever lead us away from Him. It is never enlightenment, it is simply pride, that suggests the imagination that there can be natural causes or laws independent of Him. The root of sin and of intellectual stupidity is the same—a turning away from Him in whom alone is happiness, who alone is truth. All beauty, all wisdom, all that is wonderful, the works that occupy our waking and our sleeping thoughts, as well as the more marvellous faculties that discern and remember and imagine and reason, in varying measure through our little day, while our personality remains, point to Him, and to Him alone, as the end of all knowledge, and suggest that what we do not know of Him, nor can imagine, is still more wonderful and glorious than what we do or can.

<sup>1</sup> *Études Historiques, François I.*  
Exposition.

<sup>2</sup> There is no more truly Christian  
hymn than the *Benedicite, Omnia*

<sup>2</sup> Jevons's *Logic*, Less. XIII., p. III. *Opera.*

## LECTURE XII.

---

### INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON LITERATURE.

IN English speech, I think, "literature" generally means *elegant* literature, whereas in French and German it signifies almost whatever can be written. A writer in the *Spectator* or *Tattler* would include under "literature," rhetoric, poetry, criticism, the classical authors; and by a *man of letters* we should understand one to whom polite studies had given a certain polish—a meaning illustrated also in our usage of the word "style." But if we should examine a French or German account of "literature," we should find that it included annals, political history, law, and in fact a development of most of the sciences. This latter conception of "literature" makes it, indeed, nearly equivalent to an account of civilization itself, so far as this can be committed to writing. The history of different nations is mirrored each in its own language and literature. "We have as many literatures, wrought into the highest forms of taste and art, as there have been civilized nations and languages."<sup>1</sup>

The very letters of different alphabets are suggestive of character and history. In one country we can trace them up to their original ideographic forms, as in Egypt; in another, as in China, these pictured forms are combined with the phonetic symbols. A large number of letters, indicating an elaborate analysis of elemental sounds, is

<sup>1</sup> Felton's *Greece, Ancient and Modern*, Lect. III., Vol. I., p. 39.

usually the sign of a similar copiousness of words, and redundance in composition. The Zend language, for instance, has thirty-nine letters, and the Sanscrit forty-eight. The latter seems appropriate to a meditative people, whose life is spent not in action, but in dreamy contemplation. "The longest life," says Sir William Jones, "would not suffice for the single perusal of works that rise and swell, protuberant like the Himalayas, above the bulkiest compositions of every land beyond the confines of India." The epic poem called *Ramayana* has more than one hundred thousand lines; that is more than three times the length of the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Æneid* put together; and yet the *Mahabharata* is twice as long as the *Ramayana*. Passages of beauty and spirit are found in these compositions, but they are like rare flowers scattered amid the monotonous and interminable growth of their native jungles. The simple and rugged sublimity of the Hebrew tongue expressed in twenty-two letters, and in the same number of sacred books, according to the tradition mentioned by Origen,<sup>1</sup> the mysteries of Divine Revelation, the creation, the fall of man, and the preparation for a Redeemer. The Greek tongue, with twenty-four letters, attained the perfection of human speech, flexible, keen, vigorous, having the strength of primitive roots with endless power of combination and the raciness of dialects—"a musical and prolific language that can give a soul to the objects of sense, and a body to the abstractions of philosophy."<sup>2</sup> No religious mind can doubt that this wonderful language, though glorified already by the masterpieces of human genius in poetry, philosophy, history, oratory, still waited its crowning honor in being made through inspiration the vehicle of God's final and perfect Revelation to man.

Literature proper is distinguished from other writing by its attention to form, whether metre and rhyme as in poetry, or the musical element that is apparent in finished

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, Bk. VI., Ch. XXV.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon.

prose. Minds whose predominating tendency is scientific, though capable of producing elegant literature, will often so drop the element of form from their works, that, like some of Aristotle's, they may be likened to "tables of contents" or "dictionaries." There is, however, no branch of knowledge—even law, annals, natural history, the abstractions of mathematics—that may not receive from the imagination and touch of genius a place in literature. The specific and differentiating element appears to be the introduction of human feeling into the passionless conceptions of the intellect. Whatever is uttered with interest and earnestness will awaken kindred emotions among human beings. Even when the subject is little understood, and the very words in which it is set forth obscure and strange, it may arrest attention through the vibrations of a sympathetic voice. If the subject be worthy, and its treatment correspond, the sluggish periods of prose will begin to swell and fall into place with cadence and rhythm, following a musical law. Music alone is the expression of pure feeling. It is inevitably present, therefore, wherever the heart is in strong sympathy with what is uttered by the head. Nor is this all: the unity of mind and heart and will, in any great poetical utterance, is witnessed by the law of metre, acutely detected by Coleridge as being "the result of the balance which the mind strikes by the voluntary effort to check the working of passion." It has been noted that poetry can dwell on details and extremities of suffering that would be intolerable in simple prose. It is a well-known remark of Aristotle, that poetry has a higher truth and a higher seriousness than history.<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth finely says: "Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science."<sup>2</sup>

These definitions and distinctions may suffice as preliminary to the argument which I propose to sketch in

<sup>1</sup> φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ ὀνυ-  
δαίότερον.—*Poet.*, Ch. IX.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, p.  
255, ed. Paris.

the present lecture for the divine origin of Christianity from its influence upon literature. The Author of that religion claims control over our very thoughts; and this He does, without doubt, not as wishing to destroy any that are just and natural, but as vindicating for Himself every noble and worthy expression of them.

My plan will be to show, first, that Christianity enables us to form the best judgment and to make the most profitable use of the various literatures of the world; then to call attention to the fact that it has produced a noble literature of its own; lastly, that it has contributed influences and elements of the highest value even to the literature that has since sprung up professing independence and often hostility to itself.

I. The service our religion renders in helping us to a just estimate of literature, wherever found, I express in this way: Our religion, and it alone, enables us to contrast the view of human life and its experience as a real and serious thing, a probation followed by a judgment, while not destroying its æsthetic element, its pleasure and sentiment, with the view of the same life and its events that we find in the great heathen writers, Homer, for instance, who recounts the thrilling episodes of human life and the gleams of the supernatural world for the pleasure they can give, to pass the hours of a festival, not for the education there may be in the examples of heroes, nor for any serious belief in the gods. There are persons who look upon the Bible as simply literature. But this surely is a great mistake. While the Bible contains passages that as literature—that is, even in form—can be compared with advantage with the best human compositions, these passages are always much more than mere eloquence and poetry. Take, in illustration, the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, which the poet Wordsworth pronounced the finest piece of prose in the English language. Compare it now with the wonderful plea for mercy which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of Portia. The themes are kindred, charity and mercy; in the treatment of each we

might say the force of language could no further go. Yet what a difference lies in the simple fact that the one is serious, and could hardly be conceived without profanation as declaimed for entertainment; while the other, even with its unsurpassed beauty and pathos, ay, and its Christian sentiment, still savors of the stage! The Bible is the statute book of the Kingdom of God; it contains the fundamental laws of that kingdom, guidance for the daily life of its subjects, and meditations that are the food of their souls. It is the lesson book of their divine education, and is for "warning, reproof, instruction in righteousness," never for the amusement of idle hours. Homer is not more elevated in majesty and seriousness above the rhymes of the nursery, than are the Holy Scriptures, in these respects, above Homer.

The contrast of which I speak may be brought home to a merely literary judgment, without the aid of faith, by simply contrasting the majesty of Milton, who derives all his spiritual elevation and moral grandeur from the Scriptures, with the loftiest flight of Homer. The advantage of Milton lies not in superiority of talent, for he has no such superiority, but in acquaintance with supernatural revelation. In simplicity of thought and language the style of Homer is far nearer the style of Scripture. Nay, in a certain nobility of manner and rapidity of movement peculiarly his own, Homer is far more like Scripture than is Milton with his lofty reasonings, involved sentences, and metaphysical subtleties, savoring at times of the dregs of fanaticism amid which he lived, and of which he was tempted to be a leader. The true difference, however, whence flows always the incomparable superiority of the Christian poet, a superiority even more remarkable in Dante than in Milton, is that in Homer the loftiest themes are treated always simply as literature; in the others, as awful and veritable disclosures from the supernatural world. The habitual reception of these truths, familiar to them from the opening mind of infancy, accompanying all their education, pervading the atmosphere, gave to

the Christian poets a peculiar development and elevation, fitting them to be leaders and masters of human souls.

Admirers of Cicero are sometimes vexed to find how easily he forgot in practice the noble pictures of virtue and the philosophical perfection he had drawn in his eloquent treatises and speeches. It is not quite enough to say that this eminent man, like others of all, including Christian, times, amid the strain and trial of actual life, thought that general rules might yield a little in his individual case: it is to be feared that moral motives and principles were not habitually regarded by him, as they certainly were not by many distinguished teachers, as seriously applicable to the conduct of life. Their way, even when giving precepts, was to regard virtue as an ideal for the imagination, and the perfectly virtuous man as rather fit to adorn a poem or play, than as a model for imitation. Those who, like Scipio or Cato, sought to live after this model were pronounced affected or singular. At Athens it is well known that philosophy was often studied to the exclusion of every other profession; but we cannot say that the practice of virtue, or even the discovery of truth, was its object, so much as mere intellectual amusement. The subtle questions and ensnaring arguments of the sophists were by no means confined to the sphere of logic, but were extended to the province of morals, where they were reprovèd by the irony of Socrates and the serious denunciation of Aristotle. This character of Grecian philosophy occasioned the long distrust of it at Rome, and its frequent expulsion at the instance of such men as Cato. When at length its teachers were tolerated, following the fashion set by a Sulla or a Lucullus, it was regarded at one time as a kind of expensive "table furniture;" at another, as providing in its respective branches, not a harmonious system of truth, but the Stoics a scheme of moral and social duties, and Zeno what the lawyers more especially wanted; while the Academy recommended itself to disputatious orators, and Epicurus became the master of the wealthy and idle.

The literatures of China and of India exhibit what to a European mind appear abnormal and grotesque forms, an unregulated play of fancy and imagination comparable at times to the dreams of the sick, at others to the low, hopeless, mechanical conceptions of a generation of slaves. Poetry, however, when any genuine gleams break forth, as at times in the Vedas and epics of India, always contains something of three elements, a strain of self-sacrifice, the supremacy of the will over passion, the unity of the Author of the world and of man, which may be regarded as of the essence of religion. The difference between the Oriental and the European mind, as represented in their literatures, is that the former acquiesces in the disorders of the world, religious and political; the latter, keen, active, analytic, both ridicules its gods and deposes its temporal rulers, substituting scepticism for submission, and indifference for faith. This old Greek and Roman spirit was caught by an English heathen, Sir Horace Walpole, when he said: "The world is a tragedy to those who feel, and a comedy to those who think," and then added, "I have never yet seen or heard anything serious that was not ridiculous." One feels like reproving such a spirit as this by a text from the Koran: "The heavens and the earth and all that is between them, think ye we have created them *in jest?*" The listening heroes in the *Odyssey*<sup>1</sup> wept when they heard the pathetic strains of the true bard. Christianity speaks to the heart of man, wherever found, when she tells him, first, the true meaning of this his earthly state:

" True that on earth we are but pilgrims made,  
And should in soul up to our country move ;"

then of the virtues that ennoble it (I am quoting from Sir Philip Sidney, his early sonnets):

" Death, courage, honor, make thy soul to live ;  
Thy soul to live in heaven, thy name in tongues of men."

II. But Christianity has not only made it possible to

<sup>1</sup> Bk. VIII., 521-535.

judge soundly of all antecedent literatures, she has produced a literature of her own. Christ set up on earth a kingdom which gives laws to both mind and body. The Greek and Latin literature of the Christian Church is very inadequately appreciated, both as to its size and significance, by those who have not made it a special study. This literature, if I mistake not, would lend a new significance to the terms with which philosophers seek to explain every outburst of human thought and expression. The race<sup>1</sup> that produced it was drawn from every clime; its surroundings were persecution and public contempt; its epoch was the fulness of time of which prophecy speaks; its persons or authors, the *élite* of the world transformed into saints and martyrs. You can obtain an idea of its mass, if you will visit some great library, like the British Museum, and look at a complete collection of the Fathers of the Church.

It may be worth while to attempt a brief sketch of this Christian literature.

Speaking generally, theology proper, or the most important questions concerning the divine nature, were treated in the Greek language; those concerning the nature of man, in the Latin. A providence was recognized in the fact that the great controversies which agitated the early Church, touching our Lord's Divinity and the Holy Trinity, were handled when the Greek language, the most powerful, subtle, and flexible ever used by man, was still familiar to the Church's champions; and that later, when man's nature, and his relations to God in creation, redemption, and grace, were discussed, it was in the Latin tongue, the language of law and dominion, at once serious and precise.

Glancing rapidly over the different periods of the Church's history, we observe, before the Nicene council, first, the five authors known as the Apostolic Fathers—Barnabas, Clement of Rome, S. Ignatius, Polycarp, Her-

<sup>1</sup> See A. H. Welsh's *Development of Eug. Lang. and Literature*, ProL., Vol. I., p. ix. Chicago, 1883.

mas—among whom we note the Christian tone of Clement's letter, and the varied interest of the different utterances of the brave martyr S. Ignatius as he went from Antioch to Rome,<sup>1</sup> to be devoured by lions. During this period, when a man was liable to the loss of all that the world holds dear simply for owning the name of Christian, the following authors, whose works have survived and still deserve to be read both for their historical interest and their intrinsic ability, employed their pens in defence and explanation of the Christian faith, against heretics who sought to deprave it, and before magistrates who tried to crush it by force, and also for the enlightenment and comfort of fellow-believers. First of those who wrote in Greek, Irenæus, the martyr bishop of Lyons, in his great work *Against Heresies*, exposed the false teachers of his day, and compared the unity of the faith of Christians throughout the world to that of a family in one house. The following five authors, writing in Greek, defended Christianity against the heathen: Justin Martyr, who wrote two Apologies; Tatian, his scholar; Athénagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen. Of these S. Justin had been deeply versed in pagan philosophy, and he shows his ability to conduct the controversy with the Jews. Clemens and Origen were men of varied and exceptional learning; Origen, in particular, ranged over the whole field of secular as well as sacred knowledge. The four Latin apologists that belong to this time—Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, and S. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage—were men of varied ability, and can still be read with profit. Tertullian, whose fervid genius sometimes carried him beyond Christian bounds, was called the master of S. Cyprian and of S. Augustine. To this time also belongs Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian.

<sup>1</sup> See the refutation of the unhistorical statement concerning Ignatius in the book *Supernatural Religion* (Vol. I., p. 273) by Westcott, pref. to fourth ed. of Canon of N. T.

The author of *Sup. Rel.* has been deluded by trusting the learning of rationalists, who still, like Satan, desert their victim in his need.

In the conciliar period of the Church (A.D. 325-680) I will content myself with the mere enumeration of the names of a few typical Greek and Latin Christian authors. Of the Greek: Athanasius, Basil the Great (Bishop of Cæsarea), Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Chrysostom, Apollinaris, father and son. Of the Latins: S. Augustine, S. Jerome, S. Ambrose, Lactantius (the Christian Cicero), Hilary of Poitiers (to be distinguished from Hilary of Arles, an Augustinian), Leo the Great, and Gregory the Great. Of these names several will be at once recognized as the peers in intellectual ability and eloquence of the greatest names in any literature. Athanasius joined to every intellectual accomplishment the purity of the saint, and the courage of the hero that withstood alike the threatening of foes and the faint-heartedness of friends. S. Chrysostom may be numbered among the most eloquent, as S. Jerome among the most learned, of men. S. Augustine, who stands apart, embraced knowledge in a profound, and fertile, and earnest intellect, that constituted his works a perennial fountain of instruction. Apollinaris, father and son, when the Emperor Julian, in his malice against Christianity, had forbidden Christians to read the heathen classics—Homer, Sophocles, Virgil, Terence—in their schools, set themselves to form epic poems and sacred plays out of Holy Scripture. These efforts, unfortunately, have perished; but the tragedy of *Christ Suffering*, published among the works of Gregory Nazianzen, is believed by some to belong to the elder Apollinaris.

Going on to the middle ages, what noble and priceless monuments of sacred literature are the works alone of S. Bernard (sometimes called the last of the Fathers), and the *Summa Theologiæ* of S. Thomas Aquinas! Let us add to these the names of S. Bonaventura, Roger Bacon, Lanfranc, S. Anselm, and John Scotus Erigena, and we have ability enough, estimated by the highest worldly standard, to immortalize any literature. The works of

the authors I have been mentioning derive their sole interest from the Christian themes of which they treat; these occupied the best energies of their minds, and hearts, and wills. The enumeration of similar works in countries of modern times would be endless; as of Hooker, and Pearson, and Bishop Bull in England; of Pascal, Bossuet, Fénelon,<sup>1</sup> in France; and so on. Enough, however, have been enumerated to prove that Christ's kingdom has produced a noble and enduring literature, whose form entitles it, in its best specimens, to the same immortality as the masterpieces of the world's literature, while its substance is exclusively furnished by religion. The mention, however, of distinctly religious works by no means exhausts the evidence for religion from its productive power in the field of literature. The three greatest poets of the world, it is generally agreed, are Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare; and of these the two latter are Christian. Dante is a poet whose themes are the realities of the Christian faith, and his genius has made the caverns of hell and the slopes of paradise as real as the Arno and Campagna of his native Italy. If any poet can contest with him the palm of the third place in the immortality of fame, it is Milton, whose themes are even more exclusively the facts of the spiritual world disclosed by religion. Again, historians of literature assert that a worthy drama can be produced only in a vigorous nation with memorable achievements in its history, and that the world has seen only three great dramatic literatures—those of Greece, Spain, and England. Of these, again, the two latter are Christian, and we may say that the typical names are Calderon for Spain, and Shakespeare for England. The first is the foe, the second the champion, in the mighty religious struggle known as the Reformation. It was a saying of F. Schlegel that Shakespeare proposed the enigma of life without solving it, but that in Calderon "the enigma of life was not merely expressed

<sup>1</sup> "The pompous period of Gib. Massillon."—Father Prout's *Religion* was attuned to the melody of *iques*, p. 230. Lond. 1860, Bohn.

but solved." A. Schlegel says, "The religious poetry of Calderon is one never-ending hymn of thanksgiving, ascending continually to the throne of God."<sup>1</sup> The world's history, the strange rites of heathenism, all of the world's philosophy that has coherence, he turned into loving parable and symbols, through which the great Father of all ever speaks to the minds and hearts of His creatures.

III. Turning now to such literature as seems to have been produced in indifference or independence, or even in hostility to the true religion, we think it can be proved that either by having borrowed its best elements, or even by its very opposition, it bears testimony to the exalted character and divine origin of the religion of Christ. Christianity, we believe, we have shown to be the most powerful factor of modern civilization. Now, of that civilization one of the most characteristic products is the printing-press. The following is a curious specimen of its achievements. Until 1859 the language of their worship was to the Parsees themselves of India an unknown tongue. On the publication of Spiegel's translation, a wealthy Parsee gentleman, living in England, had it rendered into English and sent to his fellow-worshippers for use in Bombay. And thus these fire-worshippers "were first furnished with the meaning of their own sacred books through the labors of European learning."<sup>2</sup> This strange incident may be considered as a typical example of the way in which those in possession of the truth, secure in their own strength, sometimes furnish material to their adversaries. The most celebrated poems of atheism,<sup>3</sup> whether the *Bhagavad Gita*

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on *Dramatic Literature*.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Sterrett on "Comp. Religion," *Am. Ch. Review*, p. 63, Jan., 1885.

<sup>3</sup> "Philosophy does not sing. Unbelief does not sing. A scientific positivism has no conceivable utterance of music. . . . It is only

the faith which accepts with love the Lord who comes to us in Christianity, and which through Him sees an Infinite Mind illuminating alike the heavens and the earth, which exults in the mystic ministry of music."—R. S. Storrs, *Divine Origin of Christianity*, Lect. IV., p. 118. N.Y., 1884.

of India, the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius, or Shelley's *Prometheus*, derive their vitality from the religious ideas which they denounce and blaspheme. Voltaire decided that "the most perfect work of human genius" was Racine's *Athalie*, founded on an incident of Holy Scripture. It is possible the judgment would never have been given had he known whence the plot was taken. It is as certain as any fact of induction, that neither atheism nor pantheism nor any system of philosophic indifference has ever produced a great poem. Poetry in its very essence is founded on faith, loyalty, self-sacrifice, love, purity, which is the control of passion; and all these point to the true God, the Maker of the Universe, and the Revealer of whatever religious truth is known to man. It has often been pointed out that irreligious scientists who theoretically deny final causes, when they come to describe objects in nature will continually use language that implies design. Thus Mr. Darwin in a single sentence, describing a species of orchid, expresses design no less than three times. "The Labellum," he says, "is developed into a long nectary, *in order* to attract Lepidoptera, and we shall presently give reasons for suspecting that the nectar is *purposely* so lodged that it can be sucked only slowly, *in order* to give time for the curious chemical quality of the viscid matter setting hard and dry."<sup>1</sup>

So in many a theoretical work written by those who have thrown off religion, proposing schemes for the reconstruction of society, for the re-distribution of property, for a new division of land, for the abolition of class distinctions, the destruction of slavery, the re-organization of labor, the extirpation of some vice, like drunkenness for example, we find eloquent remarks upon the equality of the human race, the rights of man, the claims of the weak and unprotected, the beauty of charity or mercy, the charm that is in generosity, unselfishness, the strong

<sup>1</sup>On the "Various *Contrivances* by which are Fertilized by Insects," p. 29. which British and Foreign Orchids London, 1862.

assisting the weak, and the like. The writers of these fine theories forget that there is no other solid foundation for human equality, for abolishing slavery, even for charity or mercy or any other virtue, save such grounds as religion discloses. One peculiar proof of the influence of the religion of Christ upon literature may be seen in the production of works adapted especially to the young and uneducated. I know of nothing in ancient literature that corresponds to *Gulliver's Travels*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The first two are not religious books, and neither they nor the last, perhaps, were consciously written for any particular age; still all three and their thousands of imitations are the delight of the young and unlettered.

Another class of works, of which S. Augustine's *Confessions* and À Kempis's *Imitation of Christ* are the religious prototypes, I mean religious and artistic tales, picture innocence and purity, the dreaming boy, the simple-hearted maiden, whose life is in duty and domestic love and religious meditation. A book such as I have now in my thoughts was lately written, containing the following sentence: "Her mind seemed to turn naturally to everything that was good and beautiful, while what was evil made no impression on her, but passed by her as if it had not been."<sup>1</sup> It has been maintained as a theory that there is no true art but what springs from goodness. A sweet voice, for instance, in a bad woman is simply a remnant of the past morality of her race.<sup>2</sup> Virtue and vice leave their impress inevitably on face, voice, nervous power, and harmony of invention. Thus by perseverance in right conduct during a number of generations, art becomes possible; while persistence in evil after a time destroys this possibility. Now, whatever be thought of this theory with regard to music, painting, or the sister arts, we believe something like it to be true

<sup>1</sup> *Story of Ida*, p. 7.

or a fortune-hunter."—Julian Hawthorne, *Beatrix Randolph*, Ch. I.

<sup>2</sup> "Great music was never greatly sung by a charlatan, or a libertine,

of the connection between religious truth and whatever enduring excellence is in literature. The sweet voice that charms us in every composition is a tradition from the age of faith. The soul that believes not in its own immortality cannot speak words worthy to live. To flee from the great Father's house; to forget its sweet charities and gentle duties; to cast from one's heart faith, loyalty, and obedience—is to make for one's self a solitude in the great universe, or else a companionship more insufferable than solitude, and a remembrance worse than oblivion.



SECOND COURSE.  
EXTERNAL EVIDENCES.



## LECTURE I.

---

### THE JEWS.

WE are now to treat of the external evidence of religion. In the internal evidence we were looking, as it were, into the very face of Religion, striving to catch the spirit that gleams from her eye, that resounds in her voice, that challenges love and reverence in all the outlines and gestures of her august form. In the external evidence, on the other hand, we look to the history of her introduction into the world; we scan the title-deeds of her claim to her great estate; we examine with especial attention the wondrous seals of miracle and prophecy which attest these mighty instruments; we strive to weigh adequately, though not strictly defining, the divine inspiration and the real authority of the Scriptures and the Church; we show how the history of the Catholic Church warrants the advance of her claims over those of the Jewish Church; we mark the majestic unfolding and consistency of her doctrine in successive ages and amid various controversies; we point to the outward attestations of the great external facts on which she rests, and, finally, to the supernatural fruits which this divine tree has borne for the healing of the nations.

The subject to which we naturally turn first in this great series is the history of the Hebrew or Jewish people. We have already noted<sup>1</sup> how even a superficial

<sup>1</sup> In the Introductory Lecture to the First Course.

explanation of any one fact—like the existence, for example, of the first printed Hebrew Bible—involves in truth the whole evidence of religion in all its branches, internal and external. We might affirm in a similar way that the services in any Jewish synagogue, of which examples are found in every part of the world, imply, if fairly weighed, the whole history of the Jewish race, and even the entire development of revealed religion. We might perhaps say the same of any one typical Jew. As to a skilful geologist, a Lyell or a Hugh Miller, a little piece of the earth's crust, say out of the old red sandstone, involves, by clear and necessary consequence, the whole past geological history of the globe: so the very features of the Jew, his hair, his eyes, his language, his religious books and devotions, will recall to a thoughtful observer, in inevitable succession, a series of events at once the most marvellous and the most certain in the history of the world—the plain of Chaldæa, Abraham going forth toward the Jordan and the land of the Amorite, Isaac and Jacob in Canaan and in Egypt, the great lawgiver in the desert and at Sinai, the valiant Joshua, the mighty Samson, the peerless David, the gifted Solomon, the line of prophets, the triumphs, the conquests, the rebellions, the sins, the captivity, the humiliations, the patriotic struggles, the false Messiahs and the True, the final overthrow of Jerusalem, the dispersion, the long agony that followed and still continues of a real though unaccepted martyrdom; a testimony, that is, to most weighty truths which they do not love, and to Scriptures whose letter they inflexibly guard, but whose clear meaning they detest. Such are the events extending now over four thousand years, and vitally connected with every other great event in the world's history, to which every Jew by his very existence bears indisputable witness—of which, indeed, his very existence may be said to be the product. The points we now emphasize, therefore, are that the Jew is a human being, as richly endowed as any member of the race with natural gifts, whose very exist-

ence, nevertheless, such as he is, is an anomaly, an enigma, inexplicable by any natural laws, historical or physiological, that hold good in the case of all other human beings. He is found in every country, in every age, among the heathen of every kind, idolaters, philosophers, Buddhists, Muhammedans, even Christians; but everywhere refusing to eat with them, to pray with them, to intermarry, but always, nevertheless, keen in trade and able in government. The Jew is always distrusted, sometimes despised, sometimes hated, but invulnerable alike to contemptuous indifference and to active persecution, exhibiting the strange paradox of the most earthly qualities—vulgar greed of money and of the luxuries which money commands, combined with invincible resistance to the weaknesses that have subdued every other variety of the human race. It is not a theory nor any part of a philosophical hypothesis, but a plain matter of fact, attested by history, illustrated by thousands of living examples, that the Jew is what he is; that he continues amid mankind and resists disintegration solely in consequence of his religion. That he is out of sympathy with its spirit, and blind to some of the plainest truths contained in its Scriptures, does not shake his evidence to it, nor make him any the less certainly its child and product.

An outline of Jewish history for two thousand years, from the call of Abraham to the destruction of Jerusalem, with its leading and important events in their succession and dependence, is made known and certified to us by a fourfold combination of evidence, such as can hardly be produced for even a brief period of the most important section of any other human history—Egypt or Babylon, Greece or Rome, modern France or England, and such as is wholly wanting for any equally lengthened period. And the marvel of this first two thousand years has now been capped by the equal marvel, though different in kind, of a subsequent history, now nearly equal in time.

The fourfold evidence of this history is: (1) The testi-

mony of written documents whose historical character is certified by such impartial witnesses as Neander, Ewald, and Grote. (2) The confirmations given by profane literature to Sacred Scripture: *e. g.*, the attestations to the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, found in Moses of Chorene, Procopius, Suidas, and Phœnician fragments; the agreement between the Scripture account of Sidon and the Phœnicians and the descriptions in Homer, Menander, Strabo, and Justin; the account in Scripture of David's Syrian war with that in the native historian, Nicolas of Damascus; and many other striking particulars in Berosus, Herodotus, Abydenus, and Ptolemy's Canon. These last writers have been brought into harmony with Scripture, where they had been thought to differ, by the aid of the next species of evidence to be mentioned. (3) The combined testimony from physical geography, monuments and inscriptions that have been dug out of the earth. What is known of the Sinaitic mountains, for instance, agrees with the narrative of the wanderings in the desert, and there is "a *detailed harmony* between the life of Joshua and the various scenes of his battles."<sup>1</sup> And so inscriptions recently found have put beyond question Scripture statements about an Asiatic Cush, and about Belshazzar and the last days of Babylon, which had been thought inconsistent with profane historians. (4) The threefold evidence from the sacred writings, from secular literature, and from visible monuments, natural and artificial, is finally welded together and vivified by the presence everywhere and miraculous preservation of the very people who are the subjects and the inheritors of the mighty tradition, in whose speech and looks and treasured books, nay, in whose very faults and errors, as well as virtues, the varied past lives again in indestructible vitality.

Livy,<sup>2</sup> in the preface to his celebrated history, treats

<sup>1</sup>Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*,  
Pref., p. xviii.

<sup>2</sup>Quæ . . . decora poetic is  
fabulis. . . Martem potissi-

lightly the question of the supernatural in the founding of Rome, contenting himself with the remark that the nations who have endured the *empire* of Rome can well endure her claim that Mars was the father of Romulus; but that the chief and most fruitful teaching of her history lay in the fact that every great and statesmanlike virtue could be illustrated therein by some clear and authentic example. Few will deny either the substantial truth or the peculiar interest of the illustrations of political and individual virtue derived from his great theme by the eloquent historian of Rome. These examples occurring everywhere throughout the long career of the mother of empire, and not least in the period succeeding the age when Livy wrote, present in fact typical lessons of singular force and attraction upon everything connected with government, the virtues of citizens, the growth of parties, the interaction of the popular and the aristocratic principle, representation, conquest, civil and military interests, the decay of primitive simplicity and integrity amid the rising tide of wealth and power and self-indulgence. Rome is of all nations most interesting and instructive on these points because her career has a unity, a grandeur, and a completeness without parallel elsewhere; her organization triumphed over every opposing polity; and when she had passed away, her laws continued to shape the constitutions and legislation of powerful nations in distant ages.

The history of the sacred polity founded amid the Hebrew and Jewish people has this affinity to the history of Rome, not only that it furnishes a similarly rich and unique store of religious lessons in the long succession of spiritual heroes and saints, but that in the development of the heavenly commonwealth there went forth from the

mum sui conditoris esse parentem	cognitione rerum salubre ac frugi-
(etsi gentes hoc tam æquo animo	ferum omnis te exempli documenta
patiantur quam imperium patiuntur)	in illustri posita monumento intueri.
. . . hæc et his similia haud in	—Livii præf. in <i>Hist. ab Urbe Con-</i>
magno equidem ponam discrimine.	<i>dita.</i>
. . . Hoc illud est præcipue in	

confines of the Jewish race a Catholic Church, or kingdom, destined to embrace the world, and aided in this mighty consummation by the civic organization of Rome itself, whose very name and imperial functions were inherited by an important portion of the spiritual empire that succeeded it. I dwell not now, however, upon this interesting and most significant fact. My object at this moment is to impress upon your attention the circumstance that we have more objective, obtrusive, external, indisputable evidence for the career of the Jewish people recorded in the sacred books than we have for the marvellous story of the Romans that we read in Livy. Still no one doubts the substantial outline of that story. And this certainty is justified to the sagacity of a sound historic instinct, in despite of many circumstances capable of being indefinitely magnified by a persistent scepticism that should fasten on the Roman records as it has fastened on the books of the Old Testament.

In the first place, no Roman people now exists whose features and language bear living witness to the mighty line of Julius, of Scipio, of Cato, or to the speech of Cicero, Virgil, Horace. The historian Livy wrote under the patronage of the Emperor Augustus, in the very age when Christ was born. His great history was evidently considered of almost national importance, and its author one of the marked men of the day. An admirer is reported to have travelled from Gades in Spain to Rome merely to see the historian, and after gratifying this wish to have returned.<sup>1</sup> Statues were erected to him after his death. Yet of the one hundred and forty-two books of Livy's complete history, hardly one quarter have been preserved.<sup>2</sup> His account of the seven kings has been relegated to the region of legend, though a reaction has set in against Niebuhr's scepticism. Livy himself characterizes the early portion as poetry rather than history. The entire work began with the founding of the city, and

<sup>1</sup> *Pliny, Ep. 2, 3.*

<sup>2</sup> I.-X., XXI.-XLV. (the last five full of *lacunæ*).

ended with the death of Drusus, brother of Tiberius, B.C. 9. What is left covers the first four hundred and sixty years of this period (till just before the war with Pyrrhus, B.C. 293), and then, after an interval, merely the narrative of the second Punic war. We have lost, therefore, this great writer's account of the career of Pyrrhus and of the beginning of the war with Carthage; and what would seem to be still more valuable to a student of Roman history, we are deprived of his account of the events that led to the overthrow of the Roman constitution, the civil wars, the contests of Marius and Sulla, of Cæsar and Pompey. Good judges have complained that what is lost must have been far more valuable than what remains. Tacitus and Seneca praise both the style and the fidelity of Livy. It is true that, judging of the historian by modern standards, he would be pronounced rather a man of letters than the scientific writer who masters the details of war or even of geography. He applies language descriptive of more recent tactics to battles fought when, as he expressly says, the Roman still used the close phalanx and the long spear. Livy drew his material chiefly from the early annalists,<sup>1</sup> and would appear to have been too indolent to compare and correct them with inscriptions and public documents; such, for example, as the inscription preserved in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, known to have been at variance with the received *Fasti*. Livy's work at times has the air of a triumphal celebration of the heroic spirit and military glory of Rome. None of the surrounding states ever defeat the forces of the Republic in the open field. Her chief distress is from pestilence, famine, or sedition; and then, very strangely, her enemies abstain from attacking her. Slaughters that should have depopulated any ancient state of Italy appear not to have diminished her adversaries; certain cities after capture reappear unexpectedly in possession of their original in-

<sup>1</sup> Fabius Pictor, Calpurnius Piso, Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, Aelius Tubero.

habitants ; and certain nations that have been triumphed over by consuls and dictators seem to have been able to supply new triumphs to succeeding consuls and dictators.<sup>1</sup> Livy has also more than once related miracles<sup>2</sup> as if he considered them part of true history.

Now, the difference between the history of Rome and the history of God's chosen people is not that the one is a history of miracles and the other a history of secular events ; for miracles, after all, do not form the principal part even of the history in the Sacred Books. The miracles are indeed attached to the history of a peculiar and memorable people ; not having, it is true, anything like the temporal grandeur of the Roman, but still enjoying a great career, and, taking into view its whole period combined with subsequent events, exerting perhaps a still more important influence even upon the world's secular fortunes. The miracles do not render incredible the Jewish history considered as an actual and visible series of events ; there are, in fact, in the sacred narrative no traces of those peculiarities that might cast suspicion upon the details of Livy's story. The miracles no doubt explain to a religious mind and give meaning to a very wonderful and singular history ; but they no more destroy the authentic and genuine testimony to real events, than would a philosophical explanation, for instance, of the leading crises of Roman history, developed by the aid of modern science and the knowledge of subsequent events, tend to throw discredit upon those turning points of early times. We mean that the reality and certainty of the career of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt, their wanderings in the desert and conquest of Canaan, their theocracy and monarchy, the great reigns of David and Solomon, the holy city and temple, their captivity and return, the Maccabæan struggles, etc., are

<sup>1</sup> See Malden's *Hist. of Rome*.

of his story ; *e. g.*, he says "*adjiciunt*

<sup>2</sup> It has been said that the miracles in Livy do not form an essential part

*miracula huic pugnæ.*"—II., 7.

as thoroughly fixed and established by every species of historical evidence as are the building of Rome, the invasion of the Gauls or of Pyrrhus, the combat of Torquatus, the three Punic wars, the agrarian contests, the careers of Marius and Sulla, the wonderful victories of Cæsar, and the like. It is possible, as authors innumerable have proved to us, to view each of these series of events in a secular or in a religious way, to hold that both, or one, or neither, are replete with the supernatural, or destitute of it: what is not possible, consistent with reason and the laws of evidence, is to hold that the one (the Roman, for instance) is a real, and the other (the Jewish) is an imaginary series of events. The leading events in the long Hebrew history have, in fact, an attestation superior in exactness and certainty to any that can be alleged for the Roman. The deliverance from Egypt, for instance, though it took place seven hundred years before the founding of Rome, is still commemorated by a rite (the Passover) which gives it a historic reality that cannot be claimed for the victories of Camillus or the triumphs that led to the first closing of the temple of Janus. On the other hand, no indiscriminate eulogy marks the history of God's chosen people. The sacred narrative exalts their spiritual quite as sparingly as their temporal glory. They are reminded of their fewness, not of their number, of their dependence upon God rather than upon their own prowess; they are threatened with the loss of all temporal gifts, as the penalty of idolatry or religious unfaithfulness; the sins and the punishments both of the nation and of its most honored leaders are related fully and plainly; the merits of aliens and unbelievers are not concealed.

Turning now, after the pattern of Livy, to the substantial lessons of the history of the Jewish people, we may say that it presents to us great and fruitful instruction upon the paramount subject of religion, illustrated by memorable and unmistakable examples. We are taught what it most behooves us to know of the highest of

truths, not in the way of philosophical hypothesis, but by plain facts, the development of human events, individual careers, the relationship of nations, crimes and virtues, penalties and rewards.

I. We learn first the unity of the human race, disclosed, indeed, to begin with, as a supernatural fact, but verified afterward by every variety of the experience of man. This gives importance and significance to the choice from the very outset, amid the fallen race, of an elect line, the conservators of faith and hope, through whom the Deliverer should come, and wherein religious truths should find a home upon the earth. We learn incidentally, what all profane history confirms, that it is not any variety of race that can form or preserve nations, but only religious unity and the adoption of moral rules and laws whose strength lies in religion. The one only true religion has formed and preserved the one only people that has endured through all known human history, from its very twilight to the present hour. Here is a single obtrusive fact, an invincible pillar of faith, a fearless and unanswerable challenge to unbelief. Though the miraculous cause may be denied, the outward, visible, tangible, historical effect cannot well be questioned. To attempt to deny the plain facts would argue a simplicity greater than that of extreme credulity; to deny any cause whatever, or to deny any adequate cause, would be an equal absurdity to sound philosophy.<sup>1</sup> What produced the nation that came forth in Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, forsaking idolatry, clinging to the worship of One Supreme God; that grew steadily, as generations rolled on, amid aliens and foes, the iron furnace of Egyptian tyranny, the lonely discipline of the desert; that received a law, a worship, a polity, direct from the Almighty; that fought long and bloody contests in Canaan with tribes superior both in numbers and in the appliances of war; that often lapsed into

<sup>1</sup> "Nothing happens without a reason why it should be so rather than otherwise."

the heathen worship around, but always returned to their own law; that were governed for many generations, it would seem, by temporal rather than eternal hopes; that waxed strong or weak, at home and abroad, in proportion to their faithfulness to their God; that passed from the extremes of adversity and prosperity, at one time being among the great powers of the earth, at another sinking through the crisis of national dissolution; yet that finally retained its identity as a people, and its religion, when Egyptian and Babylonian, Grecian and Roman, had passed away, and their religions remained only as a speculation to the antiquary;—what, I say, has continued the identity of this people alone, and along with it their zealous guardianship of the records of the religion they did not love, which records contain in burning words their crimes and punishments, and are filled with promises and disclosures of sacred truths which find no place in the Jewish heart? The testimony of the Jew to religion has the peculiarity of being the testimony of an unwilling witness, whose prejudices are rather upon the opposite side. He exhibits to the world, upon a large scale, for four thousand years, the same miracle in substance that was shown to his great law-giver in type upon Mount Horeb: “He looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.”<sup>1</sup>

2. There is in the history of this people a memorable event which is a singular confirmation of both the facts, that their existence is a miracle, and their religion supernatural. The revolt of the ten tribes was as certainly, in its issue, a religious as it was a political revolt—a rejection of the worship of Jehovah as well as a repudiation of the line of David for their king. The result has something of the precision and certainty of a chemical test applied to verify the qualities of a substance in the mineral or vegetable kingdom of nature: five-sixths of the tribes of Israel, along with their religion, lost utterly their

<sup>1</sup>Exod. iii. 2.

distinction from the other varieties of the human race ; the remaining sixth, along with such individuals as returned to it, alone preserved at once the national religion and their identity as Jews. The physiological miracle appears solely amid the descendants of Judah and Benjamin.

3. This wonderful people have certainly produced in their unparalleled history the noblest specimens of our race, judged even by natural standards, saints and heroes, individual champions or leaders of hosts, poets and statesmen, priests and prophets, kings and patriots. There are no higher names among the sages, kings, or champions of profane annals than Abraham and Moses, Samson and David, Solomon and Isaiah, Elijah and Ezra, Jephthah and the Maccabees—not to mention here the great Author of Christianity and His prophets and apostles who were of the stock of the Jews. The manifold rulers in ancient and modern times holding high place in Gentile nations, either heathen or Christian, of which rulers Joseph and Daniel may be considered types, have attested and still attest the high native capacity of the Jewish race. It is justly said that the greatness of the individual in every capacity, literary, political, and even spiritual, is a direct product and an unfailling measure of the degree and quality of the national or corporate life amid which he is fostered. The great productions in the Jewish seed-plot, therefore, are significant and unmistakable tokens of the work of the Divine Husbandman, who there furnished to humanity the highest incentives to excellence. We have also in this matter a similar test of the miracle to that in the case of physical preservation. The nation's power of physical endurance has remained since the destruction of their city by Titus, but they have been struck with spiritual and even literary sterility. The Jewish and Christian Scriptures contain passages that may be compared without shrinking, on grounds of merely literary merit, with the loftiest utterances of genius, with Homer, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, Demosthenes, Cicero, Thu-

cydides, Livy. The divine words by simple grandeur of substance and treatment suffer no loss by the side of the masterpieces of art and intellect. But since the Jews rejected Christ, the end and substance of their religion, they have produced nothing worthy of even literary remembrance. They clung with suicidal obstinacy to a dream of temporal rule as the sense of their Scriptures, even under the iron dominion of Rome. They suffered in consequence a variety and extremity of torture and of ignominy comparable to the sufferings of the Christian martyrs themselves. Only the Jew suffered alike without faith and without reward. He lived on amid his degradation to behold Christ the conqueror of Rome ; he lived to behold his countrymen in their dispersion, organized through eight centuries, under the patriarch at Tiberias, and the Prince of the Captivity at Babylon, into a real union, but itself only a shadowy semblance of the true Kingdom of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, whose very conception the Jew so passionately hated. Through these long centuries the people with the world's best blood in their veins guarded their old treasure indeed, but, like the chained spirits of fable, without deriving from it any portion of its riches, or like demented sorcerers repeating in their delirium the incantations of the cabbala ; though supporting a learned class and devoting time and wealth to learning, yet never, any more during their golden age in Spain than during their long martyrdom in the rest of Europe, adding any memorable contribution either to religion or to science ; but victims to this day, on the one hand, of pretenders to the Messiahship, grotesque, shallow, and insincere beyond belief,<sup>1</sup> and, on the other, of a gross rationalism<sup>2</sup> quite as stupid as, and more hideous than, the old idolatries with which their fathers were tempted.

<sup>1</sup> See Milman's *Jews*, Vol. III.

<sup>2</sup> It appears to be proved that the Jews Maimonides and Spinosa are the real progenitors of the destructive

theories of inspiration adopted by Grotius and Le Clerc, and, in our own day, by Coleridge, Arnold of Rugby, and Broad Church.

The sum is this : the Jew teaches the world a lesson similar to that which the Rechabites taught the Jews.<sup>1</sup> The Rechabites were worshippers of the true God, but refused to unite themselves with the chosen people ; they refused, under a discipline accepted from their father, to taste of wine, or to exchange their tents for a settled habitation. Simple, frugal, abstemious, both brave and friendly, they were a living parable of the truth of the Fourth Commandment, before a people tempted by wealth to wantonness and luxury. The Jew has now in turn stood for ages among mankind, both heathens and Christians,<sup>2</sup> a firm witness to the One God, a monument of tribal fidelity, exhibiting often the very model and perfection of family unity and purity, with intellect clear enough and heart strong enough to reject and scorn all idols save one, namely, Mammon. But this is an important and fatal exception. For in the worship of money all the abominations of heathenism and of a corrupted Christendom return in a concentrated form. The heathen believed he could with money purchase his idol's compliance with anything. The Jew secretly contemplates his money as a compensation even for his own unspeakable sufferings. For this he is apathetic toward the very religion to which he owes his existence ; for this he scorns argument, evidence, persuasion ; dreams the dreams of pantheism and of every form of philosophical scepticism ; boasts of the strength of the intellect and the march of science ; ignores prophecy and scoffs at miracles, while himself, the while, the one miracle, almost the only miracle, of all the world. " For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Jer. xxxv.

<sup>2</sup> At this time (A.D. 1885) it is estimated that there are in the world 6,377,000 Jews; of whom 5,407,000

are in Europe, 300,000 in America, 670,000 in Asia, Africa, and the islands of the ocean.

<sup>3</sup> Deut. iv. 32.

## LECTURE II.

### THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE religion of the Jewish people and their entire Scriptures became the inheritance of a world-embracing society, whose very name—"The Catholic Church"—was designed to mark the comprehensiveness of the New Dispensation compared with the Old. This name enters into the briefest and oldest creed among Christians, and in such a way as to suggest the consciousness that its very existence, like that of God's chosen people, was a miracle: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints." It is implied that the Holy Church is the immediate work of God's Spirit. Its catholic or universal character was predicted throughout the line of prophecy from the first page to the last of the Old Testament; and its marvellous constitution might be described in the very words to which I have just referred applied to the nation of Israel,<sup>1</sup> the type and also the root<sup>1</sup> of the Catholic Church: "Or hath God assayed to go and take Him a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and by great terrors?"<sup>2</sup>

The new society that appeared in every part of the

<sup>1</sup> The name "Church" is given to Israel in the wilderness. Acts, vii. 38. *ἐκκλησία* occurs some seventy times in the Septuagint as a translation of *קָהָל*. Deut. xviii. 16. Judges, xx. 2. 1 Kings, viii. 14, etc.  
<sup>2</sup> Deut. iv. 34.

known world, soon after the Crucifixion and the overthrow of Jerusalem, was a fact in history as manifest, as wonderful, as the calling of Israel out of Egypt. Then a nation was formed by Divine Power, and aided to clear from pollution one favored spot upon the earth, where the true God might be worshipped, and some elementary laws of morality and piety observed in human lives. The Catholic Church was a society whose object from the very first was to carry these results, at least, with ever-growing completeness, into every nation, tribe, and family of man. The followers who first gathered around God's Incarnate Son, and were known among each other as "disciples," and by their enemies as "Nazarenes," were called "Christians first in Antioch."<sup>1</sup> Their collective name, as an organized body, "The Church"<sup>2</sup> was a term well known in Attic Greek (*ἐκκλησία*), signifying "an assembly of the citizens regularly summoned," at Athens, whose function was, together with the senate, to make what were called decrees (*ψηφίσματα*), though not to meddle with the laws of Solon<sup>3</sup> (*νόμοι*). The new *Ecclesia*, the Church of God, moulded upon the constitution of a Divine Lawgiver, could not change, but only enforce, adapt, and apply what it had received.<sup>4</sup> The word "catholic" already appears in the New Testament in the superscriptions of the epistles written by S. James and S. Peter, S. John and S. Jude, not to particular churches, but to Christians of the universal brotherhood throughout the world. The two terms, therefore, "church" and "catholic," mark, first, the particular election and

<sup>1</sup> S. Matt. v. 1; x. 1. S. Luke, xiv. 26, 27, 33. Acts, vi. 1; ix. 1. S. Matt. ii. 23. S. John, i. 46. Acts, xxiv. 5; xi. 26. Cf. xxvi. 28. 1 S. Pet. iv. 16.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. xvi. 18; xviii. 17. Acts, ii. 47.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides, II. 22. Plato, *Gorgias*, 456 B. *Decret. ap. Dem.* 238, Aristoph., *Fr.*, 394-396. The classi-

cal usage of *ἐκκλησία* is recognized in the New Testament. Acts, xix. 39, *ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, 41.

<sup>4</sup> And so the form of the first churches in which Christians worshipped was neither that of the Jewish nor of any pagan temple, but the *basilica*, a combination of the court of justice and the market-place.

calling forth (the proper meaning of *ecclesia*) of individual, choice, believing souls from the mass of men ; next, their consolidation into an organized body whose union and functions were real and legal, though superhuman ; and, thirdly, that this organization was to penetrate every part of the world, and in some sort subdue and possess every human power, individual and collective, political, religious, intellectual.

What I am now to show, as an important and significant part of the external evidence of Christianity, is that this surprising claim of the Catholic Church formed part of the Christian consciousness from the very first, through the dread period of persecution, alike amid the blind fury of mobs and the systematic displeasure of the magistrate, and that at the close of less than three centuries the claim was in substance made good, the world had owned the rule of God's kingdom, the cross was inscribed on the banners of Rome, and the empire which had crushed with cruel force the Jewish people as long as they offered resistance—then contemptuously bade them live in peace in their dispersion under their patriarchs at Tiberias and Babylon—now accepted for its ruler the crucified Jew whom the Jews themselves despised. This memorable fact, the idea, the growth, the triumph of the Catholic Church, as wonderful surely as the march of Israel through the Red Sea and the wilderness into the possession of Canaan, we propose now to consider simply as a matter of fact and of history, an unmistakable part of human affairs, as well as the most important of revolutions in religion. The Catholic Church was the inheritor and lawful possessor of the old Scriptures, in which its existence and triumphs were plainly foretold ; and it is itself the very body, already existing, to which every portion of the New Testament Scriptures was addressed. Prophets, lawgivers, rulers, priests, evangelists, apostles, were her organs and instruments ; if their work abides, or if any truth they taught is still known on earth, it is as part of her constitution and teaching. If there was ever any

real revelation from God to man, a remedial directive disclosure of heavenly truth, it was in the Jewish and the Catholic Church; or rather, perhaps we should say, the revelation was and is the Catholic Church; if the revelation had any meaning, it was in the doctrines taught and witnessed by her. God's revelation was not shut up within any book or collection of books, but lay in the supernatural message communicated by the living teacher<sup>1</sup> to human souls, witnessed indeed and attested afterward by writings, but in the whole body of divine writings, or Scripture, finding its sure interpretation only in the mind of that august society set up in the world by God's immediate hand. This much may serve to show the importance of the consideration of the Church as part of Christian evidence. We are now then to look first at the proof that the Christians from the beginning had this conception of the Church, then at the way in which it was shortly realized in the world, and finally at the conclusion which fairly and inevitably results from such facts. The conception is in truth that one so familiar to readers of the New Testament of the Church as Christ's kingdom or body, in which He speaks by *dogmas*<sup>2</sup> or decrees as did the emperor from Rome, but uniting individual souls to Himself by training in loving and faithful union with the whole body, comprehending Jew and Gentile, as S. Paul, for instance, writes in the Epistle to the Colossians:<sup>3</sup> "The Father hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son," "and He is the Head of the body the Church," "and you hath He reconciled," "to present you unreprouvable in His sight; if ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel." "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and

<sup>1</sup> The faith of the Gospel was propagated among barbarians "without paper, or ink, or written documents, by teaching to them the traditions of the Apostles."—*Irenæus*, III., 4, § 2.

<sup>2</sup> S. Luke, ii. 1. Acts, xvii. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Col. i., ii.

not after Christ," "not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." This conception of the individual believer joined to his Saviour, trained, moulded, kept in the faith, defended from danger, intellectual and moral as well as spiritual, through his union with the Church, safe within its fold,<sup>1</sup> lost without its borders, is that which appears in the earliest creed, the Apostles', and in almost every fragment of it, in the form of an acknowledgment of the "Holy Catholic Church," in the same breath with the confession of God and of His Holy Spirit and the life everlasting. Look, for instance, at the creed in S. Irenæus's work against heresies, written about A.D. 180. "The Church," says S. Irenæus, as he introduces this venerable confession, "the Church, though spread through the whole habitable world<sup>2</sup> even to the limits of the earth, hath received from the Apostles and from their disciples this faith."<sup>3</sup> Then follows the confession, which is the one answer to every heretical depravation of the truth, closing with the utterance of the sure conviction of the final subjection of every error and of every adversary "to Jesus Christ, our Lord and God and Saviour and King." A creed identical in substance may be read in the works of Origen<sup>4</sup> and Tertullian.<sup>5</sup> In the works of S. Cyprian, A.D. 250, we read the words in the order so well known in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the

<sup>1</sup> The church in S. Ignatius' Ep. to the Ephesians is "united and elect in a true passion, by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God," ἡνωμένην καὶ ἐκλεκτήν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. See the Bp. of Durham's (J. B. Lightfoot's) *Apostolic Fathers*, 3 vols. Part II. London, 1885.

<sup>2</sup> καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης.

<sup>3</sup> *Adv. Hæreses*, L. I., Ch. X. "The

churches which have been planted in Germany do not believe or hand down anything different, nor do those in Spain, nor those in Gaul, nor those in the East, nor those in Egypt, nor those in Libya, nor those which have been established in the central regions of the world."—*Ib.*, § 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ex Præm. Op.*, περὶ ἀρχῶν.

<sup>5</sup> *De Virg. Vel.*, Ch. I. *De Præscript. adv. Hæres.*, Ch. XIII. *Adv. Præx.*, Ch. II.

Holy Spirit, the Holy Catholic Church." And finally, in the creed of the first œcumenical council, that of Nice, A.D. 325, we find the Bride of Christ, now protected by the world's emperor, Constantine, openly uttering her own imperial dogma against the error that dishonored her Lord: "Those [who utter this] the Catholic and Apostolic Church of God anathematizes."<sup>2</sup> Let us look at the actual condition of the kingdom of God at this time, not as pictured by Christians like Origen,<sup>3</sup> Tertullian,<sup>4</sup> and Arnobius, but as described by the unbelieving historian Gibbon, whose facts we may accept while rejecting his imputations. "When Constantine embraced the faith of the Christians," says Gibbon, "he seemed to contract a perpetual alliance with a distinct and independent society; and the privileges granted or confirmed by that emperor or by his successors were accepted, not as the precarious favors of the court, but as the just and inalienable rights of the ecclesiastical order. The Catholic Church," continues Gibbon, "was administered by the spiritual and legal jurisdiction of eighteen hundred bishops, of whom one thousand were seated in the Greek and eight hundred in the Latin provinces of the empire. . . . Episcopal churches were closely planted along the banks of the Nile, on the sea-coast of Africa, in the pro-consular Asia, and in the southern provinces of Italy. The bishops of Gaul and Spain, of Thrace and Pontus, reigned over an ample territory, and delegated their rural suffragans to execute the subordinate duties of the pastoral office. A Christian diocese might be spread over a province or reduced

<sup>1</sup> "Et in Spiritum Sanctum; sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam."

<sup>2</sup> τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ Ἐκκλησία (τοῦ Θεοῦ, Soc. H. E., I., 8). —Concil. Gen. ed. Binii.

<sup>3</sup> *Cont. Celsum*, III., p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> *Apol.*, I., 37. Cf. S. Clement of

*Alex. Strom.*, V., 18. (In *Marvin*, p. 52.)

<sup>5</sup> *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Ch. XX.

<sup>6</sup> Gibbon (Ch. II., XV.) estimates the whole population of the empire at 120,000,000, of whom he thinks 6,000,000, or one-twentieth, may have been Christians.

to a village, but all the bishops possessed an equal and indelible character; they all derived the same powers and privileges from the apostles, from the people, and from the laws." "The freedom of election subsisted long after the legal establishment of Christianity, and the subjects of Rome enjoyed in the Church the privilege which they had lost in the republic, of choosing the magistrates whom they were bound to obey." "The whole body of the Catholic clergy, more numerous perhaps than the legions, was exempted by the emperors from all service, private or public, all municipal offices, and all personal taxes and contributions which pressed on their fellow-citizens with intolerable weight; and the duties of their holy profession were accepted as a full discharge of their obligations to the republic. Each bishop acquired an absolute and indefeasible right to the perpetual obedience of the clerk whom he ordained; the clergy of each episcopal church, with its dependent parishes, formed a regular and permanent society; and the cathedrals of Constantinople and Carthage maintained their peculiar establishment of five hundred ecclesiastical ministers. Their ranks and numbers were insensibly multiplied by the superstition of the times, which introduced into the Church the splendid ceremonies of a Jewish or a pagan temple; and a long train of priests, deacons, sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, singers, and doorkeepers, contributed in their respective stations to swell the pomp and harmony of religious worship. The clerical name and privileges were extended to many pious fraternities who devoutly supported the ecclesiastical throne. Six hundred *parabolani*, or adventurers, visited the sick at Alexandria; eleven hundred *copiatæ*, or gravediggers, buried the dead at Constantinople; and the swarms of monks who rose from the Nile overspread and darkened the face of the Christian world. The edict of Milan, A.D. 313, secured the revenue as well as the peace of the Church. The Christians not only recovered the lands and houses of which they had been

stripped by the persecuting laws of Diocletian, but they acquired a perfect title to all the possessions which they had hitherto enjoyed by the connivance of the magistrate. . . . Eight years after the edict of Milan, Constantine granted to all his subjects the free and universal permission of bequeathing their fortunes to the Holy Catholic Church. . . . Under a despotic government the bishops alone enjoyed and asserted the inestimable privilege of being tried only by their *peers*, and even in a capital accusation a synod of their brethren were the sole judges of their guilt or innocence. . . . The domestic jurisdiction of the bishops was at once a privilege and a restraint of the ecclesiastical order, whose civil causes were decently withdrawn from the cognizance of a secular judge. . . . The arbitration of the bishops was ratified by a positive law, and the judges were instructed to execute, without appeal or delay, the episcopal decrees, whose validity had hitherto depended on the consent of the parties. The conversion of the magistrates themselves and of the whole empire might gradually remove the fears and scruples of the Christians, but they still resorted to the tribunal of the bishops, whose abilities and integrity they esteemed; and the venerable Austin enjoyed the satisfaction of complaining that his spiritual functions were perpetually interrupted by the invidious labor of deciding the claim or the possession of silver and gold, of lands and cattle. The ancient privilege of sanctuary was transferred to the Christian temples. . . . The rash violence of despotism was suspended by the mild interposition of the Church, and the lives or fortunes of the most eminent subjects might be protected by the mediation of the bishop.

“The bishop was the perpetual censor of the morals of his people. The discipline of penance was digested into a system of canonical jurisprudence, which accurately defined the duty of private or public confession, the rules of evidence, the degrees of guilt, and the measures of punishment. . . . S. Athanasius excommunicated

one of the ministers of Egypt; and the interdict which he pronounced, of fire and water, was solemnly transmitted to the churches of Cappadocia. . . . [Synesius of Ptolemais] vanquished the monster of Libya, the president Andronicus, who abused the authority of a venal office, invented new modes of rapine and torture, and aggravated the guilt of oppression by that of sacrilege. After a fruitless attempt to reclaim the haughty magistrate by mild and religious admonition, Synesius proceeds to inflict the last sentence of ecclesiastical justice, which devotes Andronicus, with his associates and their families, to the abhorrence of earth and heaven. . . . The church of Ptolemais, obscure and contemptible as she may appear, addresses this declaration to all her sister churches of the world; and the profane who reject her decrees will be involved in the guilt and punishment of Andronicus and his impious followers. . . . The trembling tyrant at length implored the mercy of the Church. . . . Every popular government has experienced the effects of rude or artificial eloquence. . . . The bishop, or some distinguished presbyter to whom he cautiously delegated the powers of preaching, harangued, without the danger of interruption or reply, a submissive multitude whose minds had been prepared and subdued by the awful ceremonies of religion. Such was the strict subordination of the Catholic Church, that the same concerted sounds<sup>1</sup> might issue at once from a hundred pulpits of Italy or Egypt if they were tuned by the master hand of the Roman or Alexandrian primate. . . . The representatives of the Christian republic were regularly assembled in the spring and autumn of each year, and these synods diffused the spirit of ecclesiastical discipline and legislation through the hundred and twenty provinces of the Roman world. . . . At an early period, when Constantine was the protector rather than the proselyte

<sup>1</sup> This comparison occurs in Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. IV.: τὸ πρεσβυτερίον, . . . οὕτως συνήρ-  
μοῦται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χορδαί-  
κιθάρα.

of Christianity, he referred the African controversy to the Council of Arles, in which the bishops of York, of Treves, of Milan, and of Carthage met as friends and brethren to debate in their native tongue on the common interest of the Latin or Western Church. Eleven years afterward a more numerous and celebrated assembly was convened at Nice in Bithynia to extinguish by their final sentence the subtle disputes which had arisen in Egypt on the subject of the Trinity. Three hundred and eighteen bishops obeyed the summons of their indulgent master; the ecclesiastics of every rank and sect and denomination have been computed at two thousand and forty-eight persons; the Greeks appeared in person, and the consent of the Latins was expressed by the legates of the Roman pontiff." The laws of Justinian<sup>1</sup> placed the decrees of the first four General Councils on a level in authority with the Holy Scriptures.

The first impression which this picture of Christianity in its triumph, drawn by the infidel historian, certainly gives us is that of reality and fact. Though Christ's kingdom was not "of this world," and came not "with observation," and as prophecy foretold was "cut out of the mountain without hands," its place now in the world is tangible, visible enough. There was never a piece of external evidence more wonderful, more complete. The history of the people of old, from Egypt to Canaan, was written on mountains, hills, and caves, in their sacred books, and in scattered traditions amid surrounding nations; the conquest of the Christian host is inscribed, literally and indelibly, on the institutions and laws of the whole world. They, too, were taken out of not a single nation, but every other nation on the earth, "by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and by great terrors." The Christians' war was in the ten dread persecutions, wherein the only blood shed was that

<sup>1</sup> Sancimus igitur vicem legum ob-    synodorum dogmata sicut Sanctas  
tinere quæ a quatuor Sanctis Con-    Scripturas, et regulas sicut leges  
ciliis . . . exposita sunt ac fir-    observamus. — Justinian, *Novell.*,  
matæ. Prædictarum enim quatuor    CXXXI.

of the conquerors. Their victory lay in winning the souls of their persecutors to the acknowledgment and embrace of the truth. Their triumph was indeed the triumph of their religion, but it was almost as certainly and evidently the triumph of reason and humanity, of mercy and justice. While we contemplate the marvellous picture of the prosperity, the power, the unity, of the Catholic Church under the first Christian emperor, we are to put from our minds the imagination that the real strength and greatness of the heavenly kingdom was in any sense due to the patronage of the worldly power. The sentence I first quoted from Gibbon negatives this. Not twenty-five years before the period described, a man was liable in any province of the Roman empire to be robbed of his property, brutally tortured and murdered, simply for being a Christian. Still, as a fact, Christians were found in every province. In A.D. 300 Arnobius, a Christian apologist, answering a frequent calumny, that plagues, storms, disasters of every kind, were sent by the gods in anger at the toleration of Christians, asks if the defeats of the Alemanni, the Persians, the Scythians, among whom there were Christians, is thus to be ascribed to the gods? Are they also to be credited with Roman victories in quarters where there was an equal proportion of Christians? Ought the plague of mice and locusts in Asia and Syria, where Christians abounded, to be laid to their charge, while Spain and Gaul, where Christians exceeded in numbers, were free from such pests? Or if the drought and barrenness among the Gætuli and Tingitani sprang from the Christians, who were there increasing in numbers, to whom should be given the credit of the abundant harvests among the Moors and Numidians, where this religion appeared equally flourishing? This is a single testimony out of many to the wide and firm establishment of the Church before the power of the world cast its sunshine upon her.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Arnobius, I., 16.

then as now to many eyes. The

<sup>2</sup> No doubt this sunshine was her counterpart to this feeling may be chief lustre and recommendation recognized in the modern discussions

It is a natural question to ask, What causes does the historian himself, who describes her amazing triumph, assign as a sufficient account of the result? They are five in number, and are, I think, deserving of careful attention. The world was converted, Gibbon thinks,<sup>1</sup> (1) by the inflexible zeal of Christians, derived, indeed, from the Jewish religion, but purified from the narrow and un-social spirit, which, instead of inviting, had deterred the Gentiles from embracing the law of Moses; (2) by the doctrine of a future life, improved by every additional circumstance which could give weight and efficacy to that important truth; (3) by the miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive Church;<sup>2</sup> (4) by the pure and austere morals of the Christians; and (5) by the union and discipline of the Christian republic, which gradually formed an independent and increasing state in the heart of the Roman empire. Gibbon also praises the careful and liberal provision made by Christians for "widows and orphans, the lame, the sick, and the aged of the community;" also the generous intercourse of charity which united the most distant provinces, and drew assistance from opulent to feeble congregations, and remarks how this "very materially conduced to the progress of Christianity." The pagans who derided their doctrines could see their benevolence. The apostate Julian was mortified, he says, "that Christian charity maintains not only their own but likewise the heathen poor."

It seems at first incredible that anything like Gibbon's of disestablishment. "The public disavowal of religion," says Dr. Liddon, "by the legislature of such a country as ours [England], which has been nurtured by the Christian Church and has been Christian for more than a thousand years, will powerfully affect the minds and imaginations of men throughout the civilized world."—Letter to *London Times*, Oct., 1885.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist.*, Ch. XV.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon's method is to give all the facts, but to reject the conclusion, against which he says the infidel's mind is guarded by an "incurable suspicion." See the absurdity into which this has landed him in the case of the martyrs of Tiposa in Africa, whose tongues were cut out.—Ch. XXXVII., Vol. III., pp. 557-558. Am. ed. Liddon's *Univ. Sermons*, Sermon VI., pp. 158-160.

five causes could be assigned as reasons for *not* believing that a religion came from God. The inquiry naturally arises, What, then, would be *valid* reasons for such a belief? If invincible zeal, if firm faith in a future life surmounting all threatening of temporal death, if miracles strongly attested, if pure morals and unwearied charity, if the unity and discipline of an unworldly brotherhood, are not evidence of the divine presence among men, what evidence can there be of such a fact? Why does not this evidence tend to convert Gibbon himself? If one or two of the causes, the Christian zeal or unity, for instance, could be resolved by some natural explanation, as Gibbon seems to think, why does he not attempt to explain how all five happened to concur? This very concurrence, to establish a religion with such antecedents and such a subsequent history, is a distinct marvel itself, requiring explanation as much as any other. The temper of mind that puts all alike aside with indifference is justly liable to two extreme charges: first, of the bad philosophy that can accept the most striking facts without any or with a very inadequate explanation; or, second, of *credulous incredulity*, that makes a heavier demand upon our belief than religion itself.

The Catholic Church was known amid all rivals, heresies, and schisms, both by her secure possession of the very name "Catholic,"<sup>1</sup> and by her actual diffusion throughout the world, in conformity with the meaning of that name. She has also, in fact, survived every rival known while the Roman empire lasted.<sup>2</sup> She taught religion with authority. She fixed the canon of Holy Scripture.<sup>3</sup> She defined with precision in the creeds the

<sup>1</sup>S. Cyril, *Cat.*, XVIII. 26. S. Aug., *Contr. Ep. Man.*, 5. S. Pacian's *Letters to the Novatian Bishop Sympronian*. "This name 'Catholic' sounds not of Marcion, nor of Apelles, nor of Montanus, nor does it take heretics for its authors."

<sup>2</sup>Ebionites, Gnostics, Basilidians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Arians,

Sabellians, Montanists, Manichæans, Apollinarians, Cataphrygians, Novatians, Pelagians, Donatists, ever. Nestorians and Monophysites, whose error has actually perished, though their name has adhered to their Catholic organization.

<sup>3</sup>Such decrees as those of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, ob-

outlines of the faith. We shall devote a special lecture to the proof contained in the very consistency of her doctrine. Her great doctors, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, teach us how to expound Scripture and to apply religion to human life. These and other champions innumerable show us how she met and conquered error, how she welcomed truth, how she discriminated truth from falsehood, for the protection of her children. She developed new virtues in prosperity, as real if not as striking as those which shone about her path in the dark and bloody days of persecution. How instructive, for instance, was that typical humiliation of the tyrant Andronicus by Synesius, related by Gibbon, when a Christian bishop saved Roman citizens from the same cruel tortures inflicted on them for gain—the rack, the thumb-screw, etc.—which shortly before were the instruments of idolatry to produce apostasy! The same tenacity which under pagan Rome died for the faith, insisted upon the dogmas put forth by œcumenical councils when afterward disputed by philosophy or heresy. The imperishable society lived on, while everything human perished, while the present nations around her arose, herself calm, beneficent, fostering every good principle in government, learning, or art, knowing her own mind, rebuking error and sin, refusing to change, because she is the Bride of Him who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

tained acceptance throughout the whole Church. See Lardner's *Credibility*, etc., II., 574. The Canon sanctioned at Laodicea, A.D. 363, indicated the movement.

## LECTURE III.

---

### AUTHENTICITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES ; GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

#### PART I.

ONE of the methods by which the merciful God has made "the wrath of man to praise Him" can be seen in the preservation and attestation of the sacred books of Christians, which was the result, in a peculiar way, of the attempt in the last great persecution to destroy them. The earlier persecutions were directed against the confessors and living teachers of the faith: Diocletian (A.D. 303-311) made a systematic attempt, guided if not instigated by the pro-consul Hierocles, who appears to have possessed unusual knowledge of Christian literature, to destroy the sacred books of the Church. A Christian threatened with torture and death was now frequently tempted with the offer of escape, not if he would burn incense to Jupiter, but if he would give up to be burned a copy of the Gospels, or any of the holy volumes read in church as God's word. It is well known that the custom prevailed in certain churches of reading writings like the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and the epistles of S. Barnabas and S. Clement, which bore to inspired Scripture a relation similar to that which the Apocrypha had been long recognized to have to the books of the Old Testament. Some Christians claimed that they might surrender such writings without incurring guilt. It was generally agreed, however, that no one could thus give

up the *Canonical* books and be free from the guilt of apostasy. Thus came into use the term canonical (from *κανονικός, κανών*) signifying "according to the rule," or list, by which the divine books were known from all human compositions. To get at them the Roman inquisitor was wont to command, "Bring forth the Scriptures of the Law,"<sup>1</sup> meaning, apparently, the Canon, as the commissioner Felix, for instance, said to the Bishop Paul. The Christians who yielded to this mandate were regarded and treated as "traitors" (*traditores*), or as those who had *lapsed* into idolatry. The most determined schism in the early Church, the Donatist, which lasted over three hundred years, began in resistance to a bishop (Felix) who had been a *traditor*, or betrayer of the sacred books. The controversy, among other things, led to the sharp discrimination of the Canonical from all other books; and Hierocles was especially acute in detecting the attempt in any Christian to take advantage of heathen ignorance on this point. The hatred which had shed the blood of living apostles and evangelists now sought to silence the voice which from their writings, read at a thousand altars, reëchoed their imperishable testimony, and renewed the appeal of their heavenly wisdom and eloquence. The tyrant destroyed many a precious manuscript—no one can now reckon how many and how precious—but he did not destroy all; nor, had he even done this, could he have rooted out the faith of which they were the perennial support in the imperishable society to whose keeping they were intrusted. But the very attacks upon these her treasures, without doubt, produced within the Church a more rigid scrutiny and exact enumeration of the sacred canon, as well as more thorough precautions for its preservation.

Here, then, we have the connection between our present subject, the authenticity and credibility of Holy Scripture, and the two we have already treated; viz., the

<sup>1</sup>Acta ap. Mansi, Concil. II., 501 (Florent, 1759). S. Aug., T. IX. Ap. p. 29 (ed. Bened.).

history of the Jews and the development of the Catholic Church. The defence of religion is not simply the defence of certain books, though under Diocletian it seemed to be almost reduced to this, in a material sense; and modern days have seen the attack renewed under a more subtle shape, where every book and nearly every verse of the holy volume have been tortured and tried by the rack of criticism and the crucible of scorn. The keeper and true owner of these books, the kingdom of God to which they were given, cannot only defend them from such charges as would impair the credit or lower our estimate of any literature—that is, she knows their true authors, and can vindicate their characters, and she can show that their writings have been handed down such as they were from the beginning—but, beside this, she knows the true meaning of the holy word; for she has never lost the Faith which she received from the authors themselves of the sacred books, before a word of them had been committed to writing. The development and settlement of the canon were in fact inseparably connected in history with the development and authority of the Church. A single nation received and guarded the Hebrew Scriptures; a universal kingdom, unworldly but still visible and real, drawing its subjects out of every nation, became the guardian and exponent not only of the old Scriptures now translated into Greek, but of the new volume in the same language, best adapted of all tongues known to men to address human beings everywhere upon the highest of themes.

The true significance of what has just been said will be felt if we compare the inevitable difference, or perhaps we may call it enlargement, of meaning of the terms authenticity and credibility as applied to the books of Holy Scripture, and as applied to any other books. "Authenticity" is the quality of being genuine and true. It is sometimes extended to include the sense of "genuine," meaning, when descriptive of a book, that it was written by the author whose name it bears; again, it is restricted

to signify that a book relates facts as they really happened, or the truth with exactness. In either sense, it naturally covers also the idea of "integrity;" *i. e.*, the uncorrupt preservation of what has been written. "Credibility" signifies the quality of deserving belief. The meanings of "authenticity" and "credibility" are therefore easy and plain; we know what they imply and what they require in the case of any book, new or old. And we affirm that evidence of the authenticity and credibility of most of the books of Scripture exists the same in kind as, though in far greater abundance than, exists for Thucydides and Herodotus, Cæsar and Livy. But we believe that all the books of the Sacred Canon, besides the marks and attestations of their human writers, can be shown also in a very real sense to have had God for their author. And this is the very fact that is marked by their insertion in the Sacred Canon. The Catholic Church alone can attest to us a fact like this. If in connection with it we reflect upon the meaning of "authenticity," how does it lift our thoughts to say that God has told us in a given book certain facts and truths! The only place in the New Testament where the verb on which this term is founded occurs, translates it "to usurp authority over."<sup>1</sup> The true author of a volume inevitably imparts to it the authority of his own character. So, in regard to "credibility," it has been well said, "Things are made *credible* either by the known condition and quality of the utterer, or by the manifest likelihood of truth in themselves."<sup>2</sup>

Without forgetting, then, the complex character of the subject, but desiring, for clearness, to contemplate in detail its several parts, we look first at the evidence proving the single points, that the books of our Bible were written by the persons whose names they bear, and hence possess the credibility which this fact by itself gives them. The strength of this evidence would be seen to more advantage if the proofs of the authenticity and credibil-

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. Tim. ii. 12. S. Paul forbids a woman *αἰθερτεῖν ἀνδρός*.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker.

ity of the Old and New Testaments were contemplated separately. But it will be sufficient, and at the same time briefer, to view them together. We have already<sup>1</sup> given an outline of the testimony for the Hebrew Scriptures. These Scriptures, in their original language, were received and revered by the Catholic Church from the beginning, and were carefully studied by Christian scholars; and it has so happened that the most famous manuscripts, carrying us to the middle of the fourth century and earlier, contain not only the Greek Scriptures of the New Testament, but also the Greek version known as the Septuagint of the Old Testament, made two and a half centuries before the Christian era. This enables us conveniently and naturally to consider their authenticity together. We are trying, let us reflect, to bring before our minds the reasons why we believe that the books in our New Testament are the very same that have been read by Christians ever since the first century, and were written, as has always been believed, by the Evangelists, and by S. Paul and S. Peter, S. James and S. John; and that the books of the Old Testament, Greek or Hebrew, are the very ones quoted by the first Christians and by our Lord Himself, and whose authorship and integrity always were and still are witnessed by the Jews. It need hardly be said that if we establish the divine authority of the New Testament, we establish, as a necessary consequence, the divine authority of the Old Testament. The subordinate point of their authenticity would of course be included in this.

Some of the most celebrated books of ancient literature have been conveyed to us by a single manuscript; of Homer himself there is no manuscript older than the thirteenth century, though perhaps a few fragments go back to the fifth or sixth. A Talmudical law led to the destruction of Hebrew MSS. used in the synagogues when

<sup>1</sup> In the Introductory Lecture of the First Course.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero's *Republic* was in great part rescued from a palimpsest found in the Vatican in 1822.

they became faulty or torn, so that the Jews have none older than the eleventh century of our era. But there is no doubt that the written copies of the Greek Scriptures, including the Septuagint, "far exceed in age and number those of all the classical writings of antiquity put together."<sup>1</sup> There are, in fact, very nearly two thousand manuscripts of the Christian Scriptures now in existence, varying in age from the fourth century downward; and it is probable that this number will yet be increased. There was an obvious reason for the multiplication of fair and durable copies of the sacred books—a reason operative ever since Christian congregations were formed in the first century—in the constant use of these volumes in Christian worship. This is a motive both for their production and accurate preservation, perfectly distinct from and in addition to the incentives of individual interest and piety. The examination of these manuscripts has given rise to a distinct branch, almost a distinct science, of literary activity. Men of great sagacity have devoted their lives to the collection, the classification, the minute comparison of these sacred manuscripts; and it is not too much to say that results as certain, for instance, as those in geology about the earth's strata, have rewarded the labors of these scholars, concerning the age, the evidence, the comparative value of "the title-deeds of the Christian inheritance."

Now, it is quite plain that if we had a single undoubted copy of the Greek Scriptures of the fourth century, say as early as the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, it would be superfluous to quote the evidence of authors, either fathers or versions, to prove the existence of this book during the period between the fourth and the nineteenth centuries. There is, in fact, but one inquiry of substantial interest remaining after we are assured that we have a veritable copy of the Scriptures written in the fourth century. That inquiry is: Does this copy agree with the mass of other manuscripts of the Scriptures handed down to

<sup>1</sup> Scrivener's *Six Lectures on the Text of the N. T.*, p. 11.

us from other times and other places throughout the world? It would be childish to expect a literal or verbal agreement, or that every manuscript should be preserved from injury or mutilation. The various readings are, in fact, known to be counted by tens of thousands. And still, what is their combined result upon the real meaning of the holy volume, *i. e.*, upon the revelation it conveys? The answer may be safely given in the words of the greatest of English scholars, Richard Bentley, great especially and of singular sagacity in matters of precisely this character: "The real text of the sacred writers," says Bentley, "does not now (since the originals have been so long lost) lie in any MS. or edition, but is dispersed in them all. 'Tis competently exact, indeed, in the worst MS. now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them. Choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst, by design, out of the whole lump of readings . . . even put them into the hands of a knave or a fool, and yet, with the most sinistrous and absurd choice, he shall not extinguish the light of any one chapter, nor so disguise Christianity but that every feature of it will still be the same."<sup>1</sup>

I have made the supposition that we had a single undoubted manuscript of the fourth century. As a matter of fact, we have three—two of which were certainly written early in the fourth century, and the other either in the latter part of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth. I am speaking now of the celebrated Vatican, Sinaitic, and Alexandrian MSS., the most precious as they are the most venerable written treasures in the world. A brief account of them, interesting in itself, will throw light upon my present argument for the authenticity of the sacred books.

Observe that a manuscript, written when the fathers and bishops of the Church assembled from all parts of the

<sup>1</sup> Remarks upon a late *Discourse of Free-Thinking*, by Phileleutheros Lipsiensis, P. I., sect. 32.

Christian world at Nice, in A.D. 325, is separated from S. John, the last of the twelve apostles, by an interval not greater than divides us from the founding of Virginia or New York, or the strife of the great rebellion in England. It may be useful to remind you of some of the grounds which entitle us to pronounce with certainty that the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts were written in the fourth century. No one doubts that the autographs themselves of the apostles have perished. They were doubtless written upon the material usually employed for books in their day, the comparatively cheap papyrus, though traces of the employment of the finer and more durable parchment are not wanting in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> It would certainly be a valuable aid in judging of a manuscript of the fourth century if we could compare it directly with a Greek writing of the first, the period of S. Paul and S. John. Now, Providence has in an unexpected way supplied the means of this very comparison. Out of Herculaneum, buried from sight and almost from memory by the dread eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79, have been dug Greek papyri MSS., among them some dissertations of the Epicurean Philodemus, now preserved in the Museum of Naples,<sup>2</sup> written in the same peculiar Greek *uncials*, or inch-long letters, without breathings or accents, or separation of words and sentences by spaces or punctuation. The very look and size of these papyrus leaves as they were joined in the roll, forming a book or volume, were imitated on the more durable and delicate vellum codices, such as the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. The uncial writing has its perfectly well-recognized development of change and fashion, large initials, spaces, breathings, accents, and finally, at the close of the ninth century, the general substitution of the cursive style of letter. The materials prevailing

<sup>1</sup> 2 S. Tim. iv. 13.

<sup>2</sup> We may compare a *fac-simile* of some lines from the Philodemus with some from the oldest uncial MSS. of the New Testament in F. H.

Scrivener's introduction to the *Criticism of the New Testament*. Cambridge, 1874. Lith. plates No. 10 with Nos. 11-14, 17-20, 24. See Ch. II., p. 32.

in each age, also, fix decisively the time of the writing. The date in the colophon was not formally added till the ninth century, when the Damascene paper, made from cotton rags, began to be used. In the twelfth century linen paper—at times, when glazed and well wrought, rivalling in elegance the vellum—began to appear. It is obvious, therefore, that the look and material of the Vatican MS. would speak very clearly of its age to an expert. On still closer inspection, the division of its text into chapters and paragraphs, after the older fashion, never found subsequent to A.D. 340, when the Ammonian sections and canons of Eusebius were universally adopted, serve still more precisely to ascertain its date. Let us pause a moment to look at the three oldest MSS. of the Scriptures—the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and the Alexandrian.

1. In the great library of the Vatican at Rome, since A.D. 1448, when the library was founded by Nicolas V., there has been kept, except during one short interval, the treasure known to biblical scholars as Codex B, class 1209. Ordinary visitors are permitted to see nothing of it but the red morocco binding. It is a quarto volume, containing seven hundred and fifty-nine thin and delicate vellum leaves, having on each page three columns of Greek in the uncial character. The entire Greek Bible, the Old Testament in the Septuagint version, is still contained in this precious manuscript, with the exception of the following portions that have yielded to the ravages of time: Genesis to xlvi. 48, Psalms cv.–cxxxvii., Heb. ix. 14 to the end, First and Second S. Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Revelation. The uncials are simple, elegant, and distinct. There are no capitals and very few stops. Certain peculiarities in the spelling suggest that it had its origin in Alexandria. The absence of the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons, of which we have already spoken, point unmistakably to the early part of the fourth century as the time when it was written. This most venerable manuscript contains a history for the thoughtful scholar: the

purity of the vellum, the faded ink, the shape of the letters, the arrangement of the columns, besides the disposition of the contents, fix its date; while in certain portions, a scribe—between the eighth and the eleventh century—“with mistaken diligence,” as critics would now decide, has sought to retouch the letters, to supply accents and breathings, and here and there an elaborate capital. The latter portions of the manuscript, that had perished, have been supplied by a scribe of the fifteenth century. The papal librarian Bombasius, in 1521, gave an account of Codex B to Erasmus. It formed part of the plunder carried from Italy to Paris in the early years of Napoleon’s empire. It remained several years in the royal library at Paris, till in 1810 a Roman Catholic scholar, I. L. Hug, drew attention to the treasure in his treatise on the *Antiquity of the Vatican Manuscript*.<sup>1</sup> Since its return to Rome it has been guarded with a vigilance in strong contrast with the foregoing period of neglect. No one, not even scholars like Tregelles and Tischendorf, not officially connected with the library, were permitted to copy, much less collate, the precious manuscript, in whole or in part. The librarian Cardinal Mai, who died in 1854, caused it to be printed in five quarto volumes, but the work was very unskilfully done; and the attempt has since been renewed by Vercellone in five other volumes, of which he lived to put forth two. It is to be regretted that this work could not have been placed in the hands of experts like Tregelles or Tischendorf, who can pronounce upon the claims of a manuscript with the same unerring sagacity that enabled a Cuvier or Agassiz to reproduce the history of a fossil or a bone. The result of fourteen days’ labor allowed to Tischendorf upon the Vatican treasure has given us the most valuable critical results. Tregelles believed there was no doubt that it was older than the Council of Nice.

2. The second of the great Greek MSS. of Holy Scripture, the Codex Sinaiticus, or Aleph (Ⲁ), was found by

<sup>1</sup> *De Antiquitate Vaticani Codicis Commentatio.*

Tischendorf in the Convent of S. Catherine,<sup>1</sup> on Mount Sinai in 1859. He had previously, in 1844, obtained forty-three leaves of the same MS., containing a portion of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. The three hundred leaves recovered in 1859 contained, besides fragments of the Old Testament, the New Testament entire, and also the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. The treasure is now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, and a *fac-simile* has been published (in 1862 and 1863) at the expense of the emperor. No competent judges have now any doubt that this manuscript stands next in age to that in the Vatican: the singular fineness of the vellum; the peculiar simplicity of the uncials; the absence of capitals, breathings, accents, and spaces, both mark its capacity to endure, and fix its origin in the first half of the fourth century. The presence in it, on the other hand, of the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons, for the division of the text, lead us to place its date a little lower than that of the Vatican MS., but not later than A.D. 350. The Sinaitic, as well as the Vatican codex, has along with the proofs of its great antiquity the unmistakable attempts of later hands to supply deficiencies or to amend defects, faded words being sometimes rewritten, and accents, breathings, and capitals here and there inserted. A curious question was raised concerning the Sinaitic manuscript soon after its discovery, and the ensuing discussion settled a number of interesting points. An audacious impostor, Constantine Simonides by name, a Greek of Syme—a worthy compeer of the famous George Psalmanazar of the last century—was first brought into notice by his fabulous history of Uranius, the son of Anaximenes. Simonides was an accomplished calligraphist, and had been employed by Tischendorf, with whom he quarrelled. When Tischendorf, in 1860, issued his first *fac-similes* of the Sinaitic manuscript, Simonides boldly declared that he had himself written the whole of it, between November, 1839, and

<sup>1</sup> Founded by the Emperor Justinian, A.D. 530.

August, 1840, for his uncle Benedict, copying from a printed Moscow Bible, and imitating the antique style, as he well knew how. This adroit rogue had before this imposed on Professor Lepsius of Berlin, and Sir Frederick Madden of the British Museum, with forgeries of ancient authors, but was detected when making a similar attempt on Mr. H. O. Coxe of the Bodleian. Simonides never, like Psalmanazar, made a clean confession of his falsehoods.<sup>1</sup> But nothing could have put them in a clearer light than a simple review of the facts.<sup>2</sup> In the first place he was but fifteen years of age, according to his own account, when he thus wrote, in less than nine months, the whole Scriptures, and two of the Apostolic Fathers besides! But this would have been a minor difficulty in his story, compared with the stupendous achievement, conceivable only by one who has looked at the work, of giving to the vellum its air of antiquity, the faint and faded look of much of the writing, the emendations in different ink and style,<sup>3</sup> the very character of the uncials of the Herculanean papyri, and the history of Dio Cassius, and, what is least of all possible to deliberate invention, the very inaccuracies and mistakes of the manuscript. There are, for instance, in the Sinaitic MS. occasional omissions of what was evidently just a line in the papyrus column<sup>4</sup> from which it was copied—such a fault as the most careful scribe might commit, but not such a fault as the most painstaking deceiver could well invent when copying from a printed text!<sup>5</sup> The change of the feminine into the masculine pronoun—a most improbable reading—in

<sup>1</sup> After a rumor that he had perished by leprosy in 1867 in Alexandria, he reappeared two years later in St. Petersburg.

<sup>2</sup> See F. H. Scrivener's introd. to his *Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus*, pp. lx-lxxii.

<sup>3</sup> While in Codex B two or three such revisers can be traced, in Codex N there is evidence of at least ten.

<sup>4</sup> There are four of these columns on a page of the Sinaitic MS.

<sup>5</sup> Codex N is also full of *itacisms*, *i.e.*, false spelling arising from the substitution of one vowel or diphthong for another resembling it in sound; N supports *καρδίας* for *καρδιάς* in 2 Cor. iii. 3. The *ἔχομεν* of Rom. v. 1 in N is said to be *ἔχωμεν*, *primâ manu*.

S. Mark, vi. 22 ; the change of *καί* into *διὰ*, and the transposition of *ἦλθε* in S. Mark, vii. 31 ; the paraphrase in S. John, ii. 3 ; the bold omission in S. Matt. xxiii. 35 of *υἱοῦ Βαραχίου* ; the equally bold attempts at emendation in S. Mark, xiv. 30, 68, 72<sup>1</sup>—in all of which the Codex Sinaiticus, though not absolutely alone, is slenderly supported by other manuscripts—are very unlikely to have occurred to the invention of a lad of fifteen. It has thus happened, in the providence of God, that the very weaknesses and defects of this famous manuscript of Scripture have turned into its strongest defence against the charge of imposture.

3. The third of the three great manuscripts I have undertaken to describe is the Codex Alexandrinus, or Codex A, now in the British Museum. It was sent to Charles I. of England in A.D. 1628, as a gift from the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, who states, in a writing inscribed in it, that it came from Alexandria, and according to a tradition was written a little later than the date of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. The manuscript consists of seven hundred and seventy-three vellum leaves, six hundred and thirty-nine of which comprise the Old Testament, having two columns on each side of the leaf. The Old Testament, in the Greek of the Septuagint, is complete with the exception of ten leaves, which contained 1 Sam. xii. 20–xiv. 9 and Psalms l. 20–lxxx. 10. The New Testament lacks the beginning up to S. Matt. xxv. 6 ; a leaf containing S. John, vi. 50–viii. 52 ; and three containing 2 Cor. iv. 13–xii. 6. Codex A contains also the only extant copy of S. Clement of Rome's epistle to the Corinthians, also a fragment of a second epistle.<sup>2</sup> The vellum of this venerable manuscript has fallen into holes in places, and the ink will crumble from it at a rough touch. The uncials are elegant, but less simple in form than

<sup>1</sup> It is said that in the four changes in these verses one old Latin copy alone has been found to go the whole way with Codex  $\aleph$ .

<sup>2</sup> This MS. contains also three Christian hymns, one of which is the Greek original of the *Gloria in Excelsis*.

those in Codices  $\aleph$  and B. It has more frequent punctuation, though this consists only of a single stop near the top of the preceding letter. A vacant space frequently occurs at the end of a paragraph, and in Codex Alexandrinus we first meet with capitals. Vermilion was freely used in the initial lines of several books, and has stood the test of time better than the ink, which in these ancient days appears to have been made only of vegetable materials. The date of Codex A is fixed lower than those assigned to B and  $\aleph$  by numerals indicating throughout the Gospels the larger Greek chapters,<sup>1</sup> in addition to the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons. The presence also in this manuscript of the epistle of S. Athanasius to Marcellinus on the Psalms makes it likely that it was not written before A.D. 373, when the great confessor died.

The Codex Alexandrinus furnishes the material for the earliest recension of the sacred text thoroughly applied by modern scholars, and is actually far nearer, especially in the Gospels, to the received text of later copies than any other manuscript at all comparable in antiquity. It was collated by Bentley in 1716. The Old Testament portion was published in 1786 in *semi-fac-simile* uncial type, and the New Testament in like manner between 1816 and 1828.

<sup>1</sup>Not to be confounded with the ployed in the middle of century chapters in modern Bibles, first em- XIII.

## LECTURE IV.

---

### AUTHENTICITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES; GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY.

#### PART II.

THE possession of three such manuscripts as we have just examined is justly estimated as of the highest value. They take us back literally over fourteen and a half centuries. Here are the very copies of Scriptures handled by Christians between A.D. 300 and A.D. 350. There can be no doubt whatever that the Bible in these venerable vellum leaves is identically the same with the Bible which Christians use to-day. Still, while this proof is perhaps the most direct and striking, it is obviously not the only proof, nor even the strongest proof of the same fact that might be given. All three manuscripts might be destroyed, and yet the existence of the same Scriptures, at the time they were written, could be established on perfectly conclusive evidence. They are, after all, but three out of nearly a hundred uncial manuscripts still in existence; and the uncials themselves constitute but a fraction of two thousand manuscripts, representing every century from the fifth downward, and almost every civilized country of the known world. It is true that many of the MSS. are merely fragments; and perhaps one-half, or one thousand, belong to the class of what are called Lectionaries, or portions of Scripture appointed to be read in church. But this very fact reminds us of and attests for

us a truth of the highest interest and value; viz., the unity and supreme worth of the whole volume thus preserved in fragments, and the defence which its very dispersion provided against both its destruction and its corruption. And yet, again, we are not to forget that these two thousand Greek MSS. are not themselves the only evidence that we have the very Scriptures that came from the hands of apostles and evangelists. Were every Greek manuscript burned to-day, the Scriptures could be restored in their integrity from versions in various languages, old and new, and from quotations contained in a multitude of authors of every age and land.

But the possession of three such MSS. as the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and the Alexandrian renders the employment of the collateral aid of versions and quotations entirely superfluous for the whole period between this and the first half of the fourth century in establishing the authenticity and credibility of the sacred books. The work before us is therefore much abridged. We have to inquire simply, Upon what evidence did the Christians of the fourth century identify the books of these venerable MSS. with the writings left by the evangelists and apostles? When we realize that the vellum volumes upon which we look to-day in the Vatican and the British Museum were written not more than two hundred and twenty-five or two hundred and fifty years after the death of S. John—a period not so great as that which already separates us from the death of Shakespeare or Spenser or Lord Bacon—we may feel that the question of authorship is not one that should be necessarily thought doubtful or even difficult. No one doubts the authenticity of a multitude of famous writings of much older date, and unsupported by a hundredth part of the evidence. Even if a foolish question like that of the authenticity of Shakespeare's plays chance to be mooted, it is more likely to be on the ground of some fanciful theory than upon the well-known fact that some of the most celebrated of his plays were printed, not

from a manuscript furnished to the press by the author, but from copies of the various stage parts.

The very autographs of the apostles, even had they been written on the cheapest papyrus, may have been in existence when the Vatican manuscript was written; nay, the Alexandrian scribe may have copied S. Mark's Gospel from the sacred roll left by the evangelist himself. The Church guarded her treasures even amid the fires kindled by Diocletian. Mr. Norton<sup>1</sup> has shown, by no improbable calculation, that as many as sixty thousand copies of the Gospels may have been in circulation among Christians at the end of the second century. Many of these, doubtless, survived even the fourth century.

Now, it is in the latter half of the fourth century that we first find catalogues of the sacred books; in other words, the canon of Holy Scripture regulated by the authority of councils. The Council of Laodicea in A.D. 363, and the third of Carthage, A.D. 397, both legislated on this subject. The Council at Carthage, in which S. Augustine sat, put forth a complete list of the sacred books, including the books mentioned as apocryphal in the sixth of our Thirty-nine Articles. The canon<sup>2</sup> containing this list "decreed that, besides the Canonical Scriptures, nothing be read in the Church under the title

<sup>1</sup> *Genuineness of the Gospels*, I., pp. 28-34. 2d ed., 1847.

<sup>2</sup> "Placuit ut præter Scripturas canonicas nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum Scripturarum. Sunt autem Canonicae Scripturae hæ: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium, Jesus Naue, Judicum, Ruth, Regnorum libri quatuor, Paralipomenon libri duo, Job, Psalterium Davidicum, Salomonis libri quinque, libri duodecim prophetarum, Iesaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Esther, Esdræ libri duo, Machabæorum libri duo. Novi autem Testamenti, evan-

geliorum libri quatuor, Actuum Apostolorum liber unus, Epistolæ Pauli Apostoli XIII., ejusdem ad Hebræos una, Petri Apostoli duæ, Johannis tres, Jacobi una, Judæ una, Apocalypsis Johannis liber unus. Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro Bonifacio, vel aliis earum partium Episcopis, pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia a patribus ista accepimus in ecclesia legenda. Liceat autem legi passiones martyrum cum anniversarii eorum dies celebrantur." — Concil., III. Carth. can. 39 (47). *Mansi*, II., 1177.

of Divine Scriptures. . . . We have received from our fathers," the canon adds, "that those books must be read in the Church. Let it also be allowed that the passions of martyrs be read when their festivals are kept." It is not my purpose now to look forward and trace the successive ratifications of this list of the third Council of Carthage in every part of the Church, east and west—thirty-three of these lists may be seen in Westcott's work on the canon, Appendix D—but rather to trace the stream of testimony upward toward its fountain with the apostles. The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363, where the subject first appears in legislation, rather refers to the list than gives it in its completeness, though a nearly perfect enumeration is found in the first printed copies of the Laodicean canons. It resembles the reserve which still formed part of the Christian temper in setting forth their treasures amid an unbelieving world. But all the manuscripts contain the important introductory words of the fifty-ninth Laodicean canon: "Psalms composed by private men must not be read in the Church, nor uncanonical books, but only the canonical (books) of the New and Old Testaments."<sup>1</sup> This was ratified in general terms at Chalcedon,<sup>2</sup> A.D. 451, and expressly at the Quinisextine Council<sup>3</sup> of Constantinople, A.D. 692. The presence of the epistles of Barnabas and Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas in the Sinaitic and Alexandrian MSS. (Σ and A) witnesses to the practice still lingering at which the words of the canon are aimed: these venerable writings, it is well known, were read at times in Christian congregations, like the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. This is another incidental witness to the antiquity of Σ and A.

The action at Laodicea and Carthage should be viewed as the formal ratification of the current belief of the Church—a belief indicated in many ways, and among

<sup>1</sup> Verified by Westcott from MSS. in British Museum. Canon of N. T., pp. 427-435.

<sup>2</sup> Canon I.

<sup>3</sup> Canon XXI.

them by such language as that of the Council at Gangra in Paphlagonia, A.D. 324, the year before the great Council of Nice: "To speak briefly, we desire that what has been handed down to us by the Divine Scriptures and the apostolic traditions should be done in the Church."<sup>1</sup> It will be of interest now to take a brief survey of the period immediately before, extending a little way into the second century—say from the close of Diocletian's persecution, A.D. 311 back to A.D. 170—during which the process of the separation of the canonical from the ecclesiastical books was going on, and at length sharply accelerated, as we have said, by the attempt of the imperial tyrant to destroy the sacred books. We shall then be prepared to review the evidence for the gradual collection of the sacred writings after their separate circulation, as they came forth one by one, by God's providence, from the divinely inspired author.

When the first Christian emperor, in A.D. 324, laid the foundation of his new capital, Constantinople, one of his first cares was to repair the injury of his predecessor Diocletian against the sacred books. Constantine directed Eusebius to prepare "fifty copies of the Divine Scriptures, of which he judged the preparation and the use to be most necessary for the purpose of the Church, written on prepared skins,<sup>2</sup> by the help of skilful artists accurately acquainted with their craft."<sup>3</sup> Either or both the Sinaitic and Alexandrian manuscripts may have been of the number of these thus ordered by the emperor. It is nearly certain that the list given by Eusebius is identical with that in these MSS., even to the Apocalypse, whose claims he leaves in his history undecided.<sup>4</sup> Eusebius had with his own eyes, he tells us, seen "the houses of prayer thrown down and razed to their foundations, and the inspired and sacred Scriptures consigned to the fire in the open market-place."<sup>5</sup> His testimony is of peculiar inter-

<sup>1</sup> Canon XXI.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. Eccles.*, III., 3, 24, 38;

<sup>2</sup> Obtained from young antelopes. IV., 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Eusebii Constantini Vita*, IV., 36.

<sup>5</sup> *H. E.*, VIII., 2.

est and importance as being an eye-witness of the very formation of the canon, as it emerged complete from the fires kindled to consume it. Although he never quotes the Epistle of S. Jude or the second of S. Peter, or the two shorter Epistles of S. John, he shows us how the books of the New Testament were already grouped in distinct collections—"a quaternion of Gospels," "fourteen Epistles of S. Paul," "seven Catholic Epistles;"<sup>1</sup> and the term *Antilegomena* (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*), among which he places the Apocalypse (H. E., VI., 13), we are to interpret not as *rejected* books, but as books comparatively less known.

It is worthy of note that we have express testimony that the Donatists, whose very existence sprang from their zeal in defence of the Scriptures menaced by Diocletian with destruction, had precisely the same sacred books as the Church. "Donatist and Catholic alike," says S. Augustine, "admitted the Canonical Scriptures." . . . And what are these," he asks, "but the Canonical Scriptures of the Law and the Prophets, to which are added the Gospels, the Apostolic Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, the Apocalypse of John?"<sup>3</sup> It has been well said<sup>4</sup> that "the history of the formation of the whole canon involves little less than the history of the building of the Catholic Church." The individual writers to be now quoted do not speak simply as individuals; but whether arguing, explaining, defending, quoting inspired authorities, or offering their own lives in proof of their convictions, they inevitably represent the Christian body in the midst of whom they acted, who adopted their words and cherished their memories. We may note this difference between the two parts into which we have divided the period between the Council of Nice and the apostles—that as the champions of the faith in the third

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. Eccles.*, II., 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Cont. Crescent.*, I., 37.

<sup>3</sup> *De Unitate Eccles.*, 51 [XIX.].

<sup>4</sup> B. F. Westcott's *General Sur-*

*vey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament.* Introd., p.

3. London, Macmillan, 1875, 4th ed.

century and latter quarter of the second used more philosophy and secular learning than those next the apostolic age, so do they, when using the authority of the apostles, refer rather to their writings than, like their predecessors, to the apostles themselves, whose words still resounded by a living tradition in the ears of those who had heard them.

Looking at the interval between A.D. 311 and A.D. 170, the evidence is abundant and clear, in every part of the Church, that the New Testament was composed essentially of the same books as now, and that these books were treated with the peculiar reverence afterward enjoined by the law of the Church, as the oracles of God. How this appears before yet a formal declaration of the canon was made may perhaps be shown with best effect by reviewing in this period, first the evidence for the acknowledged books, next for those which were less often quoted as not being so widely known, and then looking at the testimony of heretics and adversaries.

We mean by the "acknowledged books" the Four Gospels, the Acts, the thirteen epistles of S. Paul, and the first epistles of S. John and S. Peter.

There are three celebrated Christian writers, Irenæus, Clement, Tertullian, who may represent for us the belief, respectively, of the Gallican, the Alexandrine, and the African churches. Irenæus (A.D. 130-202), the great bishop of Lyons, was a native of Asia Minor, perhaps of Smyrna. He was a pupil of Polycarp, of whom he has left us a touching account, in the letter to Florinus, preserved in Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> Irenæus accompanied into Gaul Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons, under whom he was presbyter and whom he succeeded as bishop. The famous letter from members of the church at Lyons and at Vienne was taken by Irenæus while still a presbyter to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome. Irenæus's great work *Against Heresies* was written about A.D. 180. It contained five books. The following is from the third book: "We have learned from none

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. Eccles.*, V., 20.

others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the Gospel has come down to us, which they did at one time proclaim in public, and at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our faith." It is worthy of note how S. Irenæus here applies to the Scriptures what S. Paul (1 Tim. iii. 15) says of the Church: "After our Lord rose from the dead, the Apostles were invested with power from on high, when the Holy Spirit came down upon them, were filled from all his gifts, and had perfect knowledge: they departed to the ends of the earth, preaching the glad tidings of the good things sent from God to us, and proclaiming the peace of heaven to men. . . . Matthew also issued a written gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and laying the foundations of the Church. After their decease Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, did also hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter. Luke, also the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him. Afterward John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon his breast, did himself publish a gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia. . . . It is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer than they are. . . . He who was manifested to men has given us the Gospel under four aspects, but bound together by one Spirit."¹ In book fourth (33, 8) S. Irenæus says: "True knowledge is the doctrine of the Apostles, and the ancient constitution of the Church, and the character of the Body of Christ according to the successions of the bishops to whom the Apostles intrusted the Church that is in every place; and this has descended even to us a thoroughly faithful tradition, through the guardianship of the Scriptures, not by forging them, admitting neither diminution nor addition."

In this work of Irenæus and in a few fragments of other of his works, preserved by Eusebius, there have

¹ Iren., *Cont. H.*, III., 1, 2, 8.

been counted one hundred and ninety quotations and references to S. Matthew's Gospel, fifteen to S. Mark's, one hundred and twenty to S. Luke's, one hundred and thirty to S. John's. He quotes from every book of the New Testament except Second S. Peter and Second and Third S. John.<sup>1</sup> In the narrative addressed by the Christians of Vienne and Lyons to "the brethren in Asia and Phrygia," preserved in Eusebius, there are references more or less direct to the Gospels of S. John and S. Luke, the Acts, the Epistles of S. Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, the First to S. Timothy, the First of S. Peter and of S. John, and the Apocalypse.<sup>2</sup> These declarations may be fairly taken to represent the belief of the Church in Gaul, as well as in Asia Minor, with which the connection was so intimate and direct. S. Clement is in like manner a representative speaker for the Church in Alexandria. He lived from A.D. 165 to A.D. 220, was trained in the famous school of Pantænus, whom he succeeded there<sup>3</sup> after extensive travel and study in Greece and Italy, Coele-Syria, Egypt, Assyria, and with a Hebrew in Palestine. In his great work, or Miscellany, of Christian philosophy, S. Clement says of the teachers from whom he had received the faith: "These men, preserving the true tradition of the blessed teaching directly from Peter and James, from John and Paul, the holy apostles, son receiving it from father (but few are they who are like their fathers), came by God's providence even to us to deposit among us those seeds of truth which were derived from their ancestors and the apostles."<sup>4</sup> "There being, then," says S. Clement in a later passage of this work, "such a thing as demonstration, it is necessary to ascertain by the Scriptures themselves how the heresies erred, and how in the truth

<sup>1</sup>See translation of Irenæus in Ante-Nicene Christian Library. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

<sup>2</sup>Euseb., H. E., V., 1. The reference to the Apoc. xxii. 11, is intro-

duced by the words *ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῆ.*

<sup>3</sup>Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, V., 10. *Hieron. de Vir.*, Ill. 36.

<sup>4</sup>Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, I., 1, 11.

alone and in the ancient Church is the exactest knowledge." <sup>1</sup> He elsewhere speaks of the harmony of the Law and the Prophets and of the Apostles and the Gospels in the Church. <sup>2</sup> Clement gives an outline of the Four Gospels agreeing with that we have quoted from S. Irenæus. <sup>3</sup> Manifold quotations of nearly every book in the New Testament are found in his writings. <sup>4</sup> He quotes, for instance, S. Matthew one hundred times, S. Mark twenty-one, S. Luke one hundred, and S. John sixty times. <sup>5</sup> The testimony of Tertullian may be considered as representing the North African Church in a way similar to the relation S. Irenæus and S. Clement bear to the Church in Gaul and in Alexandria. Tertullian lived from A.D. 160 to about A.D. 240, and his great ability as a writer and thinker made him a permanent authority in the Latin Church <sup>6</sup>—a position he did not lose even after he fell into Montanism, at least so far as his works written before that period are concerned. This vigorous and eloquent writer wrote with great energy against various heresies, and invariably appealed to the authoritative testimony of the Church in different parts of the world to confute errors concerning sacred doctrines or the books of Scripture. "If that is evidently more true which is earlier," says Tertullian in the fourth book (Ch. V.) of his work against Marcion, "if that is earlier which is from the very beginning, if that is from the beginning which has apostles for its authors, then it will certainly be quite as evident that that comes down from the apostles which has been kept as a sacred deposit in the churches of the apostles." After referring to the authenticity of the Four Gospels, as does S. Irenæus, he repeats that author's charge against the heretic

<sup>1</sup> *Strom.*, VII., 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Strom.*, VI., 11, 88.

<sup>3</sup> See the passages from his lost work *Hypotyposes*, in Eusebius, *H. E.*, II., 15; VI., 14. Cf. the passage from Origen in B. VI., Ch. XXV.

<sup>4</sup> See note 2, P. II., Ch. I., pp. 342,

343, of Westcott on the canon of N. T.

<sup>5</sup> Index to his works in Ante-Nicene Library.

<sup>6</sup> S. Cyprian's admiration for him is well known. *Hieron. Cat. Script. Eccles.*

Marcion<sup>1</sup> of mutilating the Gospel of S. Luke and then asserting it to be the only true Gospel. This falsehood is refuted by the uniform tradition of all the churches, bearing equal testimony to the Four Gospels. In this treatise against Marcion, Tertullian refers to S. Matthew forty times, to S. Mark once, to S. Luke two hundred and seventeen times, and to S. John thirteen times. He often quotes the Acts and every Epistle except the second of S. Peter, the Second and Third of S. John, and S. Jude's. He has many quotations from nearly every book of the Old Testament. Tertullian first uses the phrase "New Testament"<sup>2</sup> of the later Scriptures. The treatise against Marcion was written about A.D. 210. In two works,<sup>3</sup> written shortly before, Tertullian apparently gives a summary of the Latin New Testament of his time. The testimony of these three leading writers, Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian, makes it perfectly clear that by the end of the second century there was recognized a body of Christian Scriptures, "the Gospel and the Apostles," of equal inspired authority with "the Law and the Prophets." There can be no question about the acknowledged books. There remain to be considered the seven sometimes called *Antilegomena*, or the disputed books of the New Testament, the Epistles of S. James, S. Jude, Second S. Peter, Second and Third S. John, that to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. All of these books were received without question into the canon of Scripture in the fourth century, and have ever held their place throughout the Church before and since the schisms east and west. During the third and second centuries we are to understand that they were disputed or omitted from catalogues and quotations, rather because they were less widely known than the acknowledged books, than because of formal objections to them. It would be more correct

<sup>1</sup> Iren., *adv. Her.*, I., 27, 2.

tionem nostræ interpretationis.—

<sup>2</sup> Si hunc articulum questionibus  
Scripturæ Veteris non expediam, de

*Adv. Prax.*, XV.

Novo Testamento sumam confirma-

<sup>3</sup> *De Resur. Carnis*, XXXIII., 38-40. *De Pudicitia*, Ch. VI., 12, 19.

to say that they were unknown than that they were rejected. The Apocalypse alone of the seven was made the subject of a controversy, and this appears to have been purely on internal evidence. Dionysius, for instance, a scholar of Origen and his successor in the catechetical school, and Bishop of Alexandria in A.D. 248, while affirming that the Apocalypse was "the work of some holy and inspired man,"<sup>1</sup> doubts whether it were written by the Apostle S. John. And still this opinion appears to have left no perceptible impression on the Alexandrine Church. Origen had without hesitation ascribed the Apocalypse to S. John. In a homily on the falling of the walls of Jericho, he says: "John gives forth the trumpet sound in his Epistles and Apocalypse."<sup>2</sup> S. Clement,<sup>3</sup> S. Irenæus, and Tertullian also assign the book to S. John, as do many others both before and after them. Once more, the Peshito, or ancient Syrian version of the New Testament, believed to have been made while some of the apostles still lived, contains the Epistle of S. James, and places the Epistle to the Hebrews among the fourteen of S. Paul. In a passage from S. Clement of Alexandria, preserved in Eusebius's History,<sup>4</sup> the epistle is ascribed to S. Paul, and a reason suggested for the apostle's withholding his name from the superscription. Origen believed S. Paul to be the author, but accounts for its peculiarities of style by supposing that S. Luke or some one else may have put the apostle's teaching in his own language. After these we have in succession Dionysius and Peter Martyr, Alexander and Athanasius, ascribing the epistle to S. Paul without hesitation, as before them writers like Justin Martyr and Clement of Rome show by their informal use of its language that it was familiar to

<sup>1</sup> ἁγίου . . . τινὸς καὶ θεο-  
οπνεύστου.—Dion. ap. Eus., *H.*  
*E.*, VII., 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Hom. in Jos.*, VII., 1.

<sup>3</sup> ὡς φησὶν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει  
ὁ Ἰωάννης.—Clem., *Strom.*, VI.,  
13. (Cf. *Pæd.*, II., 12, 19.) Joannes

Domini discipulus in Apocalypsi.—  
S. Iren., *c. Hæres.*, IV., 20, 11.  
Apostolus Johannes in Apocalypsi.  
—Tert, *adv. Marc.*, III., 14.

<sup>4</sup> VI., 14. S. Clement seems to  
refer his suggestion to his predecessor,  
perhaps Pantæus.

their minds. Clement of Rome refers in like manner to the Second Epistle of S. Peter, which is found also in the ancient Latin version, and is apparently recognized by Polycarp and Origen. The Second and Third Epistles of S. John and the Epistle of S. Jude are supported by the Muratorian Canon, an authority as old as A.D. 170. Dionysius of Alexandria distinctly recognizes the Second and Third of S. John, while one or the other is referred to by Clement and Alexander of Alexandria, by Origen, Irenæus, Eusebius, and others. S. Jude's Epistle is plainly recognized in the Muratorian Canon and by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Tertullian. The Epistle of S. James, besides being in the Peshito as we have said, is referred to by Hermas and probably by Clement of Rome, but quite clearly by Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in one part or the other of the Church, in Syria, in Alexandria, in Rome, in Carthage, in Gaul, with more clearness in one place than in another, but eventually with one consent in all, the whole seven *Antilegomena* are received into the canon of the New Testament. It is a silent, instinctive process, without argument or controversy, but none the less certain in its result.

There can be no doubt, moreover, that the leading heretical sects recognized the same books of Scripture and witnessed to their authenticity as did the Church. S. Irenæus expressly affirms this: "The heretics themselves bear witness to the Gospels, and . . . each of them endeavors to establish his own peculiar doctrine. For the Ebionites, who use Matthew's Gospel only, are confuted out of this very same, making false suppositions with regard to the Lord. But Marcion,<sup>2</sup> mutilating that according to Luke, is proved to be a blasphemer of the

<sup>1</sup> See Westcott on the Canon of *Authorship of the Four Gospels*, Albany, 1885. See also the exposure

<sup>2</sup> A modern attempt to rehabilitate Marcion (by C. B. Waite and others) has been well answered by an American lawyer, Judge Wm. Marvin, in the preface to the fourth edition of Westcott on the Canon of the N. T., especially pp. xvii-xxiii.

only existing God, from those passages which he still retains. Those, again, who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus who suffered, preferring the Gospel by Mark, if they read it with a love of truth may have their errors rectified. Those, moreover, who follow Valentinus, making copious use of that according to John, . . . shall be proved to be totally in error by means of this very Gospel.”<sup>1</sup> So the Montanists<sup>2</sup> and Manichæans<sup>3</sup> establish the authenticity of the apostolic writings while they profess respect to their authors; and Celsus<sup>4</sup> and Porphyry<sup>5</sup> bear witness to the objective reality of the Scriptures, which they attack with sophistry and scorn. The emphatic testimony of the Donatists, who were schismatics rather than heretics, has been already mentioned. In brief, while it is the Church alone that establishes the sacred canon, she makes use, in the process, of the attestations of foes as well as friends; she exhibits the progress from ignorance to knowledge, from doubt to certainty; and her own triumph and manifested unity coincide with the complete enumeration and separation of the books of Scripture alike from spurious and heretical, and from apocryphal and ecclesiastical books.

There can be no more certain historical or literary fact than that the canon of the New Testament at the end of the second century was the same as we have it now. In any question purely literary, no further evidence would be deemed necessary. But Christian and profane writings attest the authenticity and credibility of the Christian Scriptures up to the very time when their writers still lived. Of course, the literary remains of this early period are comparatively scanty. “A few letters of consolation and warning, two or three apologies addressed to heathen, a controversy with a Jew, a vision, and a scanty glean-

<sup>1</sup> Irenæi, *Cont. Hæres.*, III., 11, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Orig., *Cont. Cels.*, II., 13, 74.

<sup>2</sup> Tertull., *De Monog.*, IV.

<sup>5</sup> *Ap. Hieron.*, Comm. in Galat.,

<sup>3</sup> S. Augustini, *De Utilitate Cre.* I., 15, 16.

*dendi*, III., 7.

of fragments of lost works," chiefly in Eusebius, comprise pretty much all of the Christian literature. Writers and preachers near the apostolic day would more naturally refer to the apostles and evangelists themselves than to their writings. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that Tatian, a disciple of S. Justin Martyr, made a harmony<sup>1</sup> of the Four Gospels. The apologists Papias, Quadratus, Aristides, Dionysius of Corinth, Hegesippus, Melito, Apollinaris, Theophilus, Athenagoras, and others quote and summarize the doctrine of nearly every book of the New Testament. The wonderful fragment known as the Muratorian Canon, published by Muratori at Milan in 1740 from a MS. brought from Columban's Monastery at Bobbio, and written in the seventh or eighth century, is believed on good grounds to be translated from a Greek writer of about A.D. 170. See the whole document in Westcott, Appendix C. It bears witness to the Gospels, the Acts, thirteen epistles of S. Paul, two of S. John, that of S. Jude, and the Apocalypse. The Bible was already translated into the Syriac and Latin, and in the third century into the languages spoken in Egypt.<sup>2</sup> Almost a complete summary of the life and discourses of Christ, as contained in the Gospels, has been made from the Apology and Dialogue of Justin Martyr.<sup>3</sup> The apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas, write letters, rather than essays or apologies,<sup>4</sup> uttering their counsel or warning, or feeling of fellowship, in the very words which apostles and evangelists had graven on

<sup>1</sup> διὰ Τεσσάρων (in music "the concord of the fourth," συλλαβή), Euseb., *II. E.*, IV., 29. *Epiph. Har.*, XLVI., 1. Westcott answers the aspersions of Credner upon the *Dialessaron*.

<sup>2</sup> See Lightfoot's account of this Egyptian version in Scrivener's introd. to the *Criticism of the N. T.*, pp. 319-357.

<sup>3</sup> Westcott on the Canon, P. I., § 7. Justin makes 197 quotations

from the Old Testament with exact references; 117, indefinitely. He quotes from the New under the title of Memoirs (*i. e.*, the Gospels), and in his Apology and Dialogue have been counted *seven* adaptations of the text, and *twenty-two* instances of combination of several texts. There is a marked resemblance between Codex Bezae (B) and Justin's citations.

<sup>4</sup> Möhler, *Patrologie*, sect. 50.

their souls. Finally the creeds, the liturgies, which go back to these early days and are identified with certain words of the New Testament, the sacramental language, Christian habits, and maxims crystallized in the universal tradition of the Catholic Church, bear their irrefutable testimony to the authenticity of the sacred books, and witness to their truth with the energy of that voice that can never pass away. To sum up, then, the conclusion to which the evidence we have imperfectly sketched most unmistakably points: there are no books in the world, old or new, whose authenticity is better attested than that of the books of the New Testament, by MSS., by quotations, by versions, by the acknowledgments of adversaries.<sup>1</sup> The marvellous contents of these books do not weaken this evidence, but, rightly viewed, rather strengthen it; for the peculiar contents of the books in a marked way drew attention to their authors. The three most ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, the Vatican, the Sinaitic, the Alexandrine, all probably over fifteen hundred years old, and in the possession each of a typical branch of the Catholic Church—the Roman, the Oriental, and the Anglican—most fittingly remind us of the substantial unity of these branches in the all-important point of their witnessing to and keeping of Holy Writ. And with regard to the canon of the New Testament in particular, we may employ against every heretical teacher or denier, within or without the Church, the language of the reformer Carlstadt, in his remarkable treatise upon Canonical Scripture,<sup>2</sup> wherein, speaking of Luther's objections to the Epistle of S. James, he asks: "Why, if you allow the Jews to stamp books with authority by receiving them, do you refuse to grant as much power to the churches of Christ, since the Church is not less than the

<sup>1</sup> This subject has received fresh and interesting treatment in Dr. George Salmon's *Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*, London, 1885, who, as has been said by a reviewer, "has

proved the authenticity and antiquity of the New Testament with a force not likely to be seriously weakened." The book has wit as well as learning.

<sup>2</sup> Carlstadt, *De Canonis Scripturis*, § 91, ed. 1520.

synagogue?" Fatal the mistake, inexcusable the presumption, that shall substitute the judgment of any individual, however accomplished with learning or resplendent with genius, for the judgment of Christ's bride in the days of her first glory, when East and West were still one, when she set the seal of apostles, prophets, and martyrs to the charter deeds of her great inheritance, and the learning and power of the world, beholding her unity, yielded to her sway. We have this consolation at least amid modern schism and confusion, that from the fourth century, to which the three great manuscripts of Russia, Rome, and England take us, we can go back to the apostles' days amid authorities for the sacred Canon honored still without dispute in every branch of the Church.

## LECTURE V.

---

### MIRACLES.

THE subject we have just been considering supplies an admirable illustration both of the nature and the limits of the evidence given to religion by miracles. The Church believed her sacred books to be the word of God in a sense as real as if the finger of God had traced the syllables on the holy page, even as it put the Ten Commandments upon the stony tablets given to Moses. But this miracle did not imply or necessitate the further miracle, that every copyist of the sacred volume, or of any of its books, should be supernaturally guarded from the errors and inaccuracies that overtake human scribes. The original inspiration of Scripture was not a guarantee that after some hundreds or thousands of years a single copy should be found, in every letter, syllable, and word an exact transcript of the first book; far less that amid a multitude of copies, many variations, mistakes, omissions, corrections, inaccuracies proceeding from the ear and eye as well as the wrong judgment of the writer, should not be discovered. In truth, the most sound and religious judgment, reflecting upon God's usual dealings with His creatures, would rather expect some such variations than anticipate their total exclusion from the inspired pages. The divine truths intrusted to ink and parchment do not insure to these material instruments of their preservation any more absolute exemption from change, than did the ideal perfection of the first created man and

woman furnish any guarantee against the endless variations among different races in the various climates of the globe. The truth of God's word may remain not only undestroyed, but hardly even obscured by the inaccuracies of human copyists, even as the immortality of the Church and her certain testimony to the truth can survive the defection of individuals, and even branches cut off from the true vine. Nay, the variations themselves of manuscripts may prove to thoughtful minds a guarantee of the perfect original, in a manner similar to the testimony given to some great truth or rule of duty by the imperfect expression or inconsistent conduct of individual scholars and disciples. Should it be made certain, for instance, that the Sinaitic manuscript had been copied in the Gospels from the original inspired autograph, this fact need not compel us to reject the possibility either that some of its leaves might come to light a convent fire, as Tischendorf discovered in 1844, or that some ill-advised harmonist should attempt by three bold erasures (S. Mark, xiv. 30, 68, 72) in this manuscript to make S. Mark's account of S. Peter's denial coincide with that of the other evangelists. Such things might happen even to the evangelist's autograph itself, or even stranger things, like its obliteration and recovery in a palimpsest (as in Codex Ephræmi, C), and still there would be nothing contrary to the analogy of many other events in the history of works that have come direct from the Creator's hands.

Miracles, whether we view them as works exhibiting power greater than human, or interruptions of the usual order of nature, are never separated in Christian evidence from the holy truths they are wrought to prove. They are the credentials of God's messenger, and certify that the revelations made by him truly come from God. The religion described in the Old and New Testament has this mark of truth to challenge our reverent attention, that it is the only religion ever set up in the world upon the express authority of miracles. "The law was given by Moses," we are told, "but grace and truth came by Jesus

Christ." Both the Jewish and the Christian lawgivers appealed to the mighty works wrought in proof of the doctrines disclosed by them. Moses bound the children of Israel to perpetual faith and obedience by their experience of "the temptations, the signs, the wonders, the mighty hand, the stretched-out arm, the great terrors," the voice of thunder from the midst of the fire, which had accompanied and effected their beginning as a nation. Christ said of the Jews of His day, "If I had not done among them the works that none other man did, they had not had sin;" and to them directly He said, "Though ye believe not me, believe the works." <sup>1</sup> That is, if ye hesitate to receive what seems from me to be simply the words of man, yet yield to what are proven to be God's words by the fact that the words of the same messenger can open the eyes of one born blind.

To a believer in God, who is infinite yet a Person, the Creator of all yet absolutely independent of all, the Father and the Judge of His rational creatures, and in particular of man made in the divine image, there is nothing incredible in a miracle; neither any *à priori* difficulty in conceiving it, nor any peculiar obstacle to the proof of it. The God who made everything after the counsel of His own will can, as He pleases, create or modify anew.<sup>2</sup> The majestic uniformities of nature, the immediate antecedents of every outward change, which the scientific curiosity investigates with so keen an interest, are, nevertheless, no more real than the comprehensive moral government of God which invests and

<sup>1</sup> S. John, i. 17. Deut. iv. 34; vi. 21-24. S. John, xv. 24; x. 38. τῶν ἔργων πιστεύσατε. Cf. Ex. iv. 29, 30. S. Luke, viii. 46, compared with S. John, iii. 34. See also S. Mark, xvi. 20.

<sup>2</sup> "The original act of creation is the foundation of all exhibitions of supernatural power, whether by *word* or *act*; whether they be, in short, revelations, properly so called, or

miracles. 'In the case of the physical world,' Twisten observes, 'there have been certain epochs in which plants and animals and man have for the first time appeared; and it is capable of demonstration that, up to a certain point of time, none of these existences had as yet made their appearance.'—Lee on *Inspiration*, Lect. III., p. 120.

penetrates the material world, the affairs of men, and the interior of each individual life. We do not know enough, in fact, either of this physical or moral government with reference, *e. g.*, to the beginning or extent of each, to enable us to say that such miracles as Scripture records are either a violation or even an interruption of a natural law, or deserve to be viewed as in any respect incredible. They may, in fact, be examples of strict conformity to a larger order than our experience or capacity has yet been able to grasp. Even if, at times, the physical order seems to interfere with the moral government, as when the good die prematurely or bad men retain natural advantages, we are still able to behold enough to convince us that the Ruler of the world is against vice and on the side of virtue.<sup>1</sup> If we reflect on the subject, we naturally expect Him, at times, to emphasize this His preference in some striking and memorable way. The truth is, that any orderly succession of events, sunset and sunrise, the ebb and flow of the tides, suggest, to the reason, intelligence and will rather than mechanical necessity, because no machinery can either construct itself or indefinitely maintain its own action. The uniformity of nature, therefore, if considered apart from its personal Author, becomes a perpetual miracle, the wonder being that it goes on at all, rather than that it should at any time stop or be interrupted. The reason refuses to consider any extensive combination of movements and powers, working harmoniously, without ascribing to them some end or purpose—that is, a final cause—as instinctively and irresistibly as it refuses to contemplate any one event, material or spiritual, apart from an immediate proximate cause, spiritual or material.<sup>2</sup>

If, then, this world had an intelligent Author; if the reasonable beings upon it reflect in their own nature the attributes of Him who made them; if He the Father continues to feel an interest in the children fashioned after

<sup>1</sup> Butler's *Analogy*, Pt. I., Ch. III. in particular Note 5 on Lect. VII.,

<sup>2</sup> See J. B. Mozley on "Miracles," pp. 286-294. He quotes Bacon, *De The Bampton Lecture for 1865*. See *Aug.*, L. III., Ch. IV.

His own image ; if their happiness and misery, their well-doing or ill-doing, their safety or peril, affect or touch Him at all—then is it incredible that He should speak to them from time to time by word and deed—that is, by revelation and miracle—to instruct them, to guide them, to redeem them from the sin and misery into which they have run by the abuse of their own responsibility, and to save them from eternal loss? Evidence that made any such interference probable would deserve examination. What would be deemed sufficient proof of any other matter of fact of dignity and importance should be deemed sufficient proof of miracles wrought to attest the truth of a divine message to man. There can be no excuse for the summary rejection of such testimony, as if brought in support of something quite inadmissible.<sup>1</sup>

Now, there is one religion in the world, whose history runs farther back than all human records, and comprehends the beginning and career of a nation and people the most wonderful in all the world, and after it the formation of a world-embracing kingdom more marvellous and more enduring than any nation ; and this religion offers to us proofs of great and notable miracles wrought at the important crises of its mighty history, and attested not only in written documents, but by sacred rites and sacraments, commemorations and anniversaries, observed without interruption through all the ages since. Here, it will be observed, the miracles stand as important evidence of religion, the credentials of the heavenly messengers from God to men, but they do not stand alone : they witness to the divine message, which, in its turn, witnesses to them by its own unearthly character ; while prophecy, which is a miracle for a future generation, and the transforming power introduced by the divine system among human lives,<sup>2</sup> at times transcend the very miracles that

<sup>1</sup> “Modern educated society is not unmoored from the belief in the hodiernal supernatural, as a possibility. This is a question of fact.”—Mozley, p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> Origen, in a well-known passage, maintains the superiority of the moral miracles.

first commended them to human regard. The full force of any part of the evidence for religion can be seen only by viewing it in connection with the whole evidence; but it will be of advantage to make an especial study of the Scripture miracles. It is not difficult to show that they are distinguished from all other miracles, the wonders wrought in heathenism, by fanatics, false prophets, pretenders, or jugglers of whatever kind, no less by their own essential character than by the evidence which attests them.

Looking at the character of the miracles themselves, the first trait which solicits our attention is, that from beginning to end of Scripture they are wrought in attestation of God's revelation to man. They have, therefore, a moral end, and are not merely physical wonders. It is, hence, superficial to consider them merely as violations of natural order, or as implying any imperfection in the visible world, or to examine them by the rules, scientific or judicial, which ignore their religious aspect. In the period from Adam to Moses, the Almighty kept alive the faith of the patriarchs in Himself by direct disclosures, intervening to guide and protect them. To deliver His people from Egypt, He placed the powers of nature under the control of the rod in the law-giver's hand. He wrought miracles of mercy and of judgment to encourage those who believed, and to punish the disobedient. He destroyed the enemies of Israel. The miracles of Scripture are grouped chiefly around three great eras<sup>1</sup>—the formation of the Hebrew Church

<sup>1</sup> See the following texts: Exod. Luke, i. 18-20; ii. 11, 12; v. 24; iv. 1-9, 29-31; vii. 9, 17. Numb. vii. 15, 16; ix. 2; x. 9. S. John, xvi. 3, 28, 29. Deut. iv. 36-40; ii. 22; iii. 2; v. 36, 37; ix. 33; x. xviii. 21, 22. Josh. iii. 7-13. I 24-38; xi. 15, 41, 42; xiii. 19; xiv. Sam. x. 1-7; xii. 16-19. I Kings, 10, 11, 29; xvi. 4; xx. 30, 31. Acts, xiii. 3; xvii. 24; xviii. 36-39. 2 i. 8; ii. 22, 33; iii. 15, 16; iv. 33; Kings, i. 6, 10; v. 15; xx. 8-11. v. 32; viii. 6; x. 38; xiii. 8-12; xiv. Jer. xxxviii. 15-17. Ezek. xxxiii. 3. Rom. xv. 18, 19. I Cor. ii. 4, 33. S. Matt. x. 1-20; xi. 3-5, 5. 2 Cor. xii. 12. Heb. ii. 3, 4. Rev. 20-24. S. Mark, xvi. 15-20. S. xix. 10.

and polity, the reformation in the times of the idolatrous kings of Israel, and the first preaching of the Gospel. And they have always the one grand object—to certify the truth of God's revealed message to men. The plagues in Egypt aimed against the superstitions of the land; the thunders and lightning amid which the Law was given; the parting of the Jordan; the arresting of the sun's course by Joshua; the harvest thunder at the prayer of Samuel; the rending of the altar at Bethel; Elijah's sacrifice on Mount Carmel; the cure of Naaman by Elisha—all have a dignity, we need not hesitate to say, worthy of the Supreme Being. Their performance is for the most part intrusted to His especial messengers the prophets, not to the priests or kings, as if to call our thoughts to their extraordinary character. The miracles of Christ, moreover, which have the character in addition of always expressing His mercy and goodness to man, and are often instructive parables as well as miracles, conveying a spiritual lesson or supporting an important doctrine, still further heighten our conception of the nobility and beauty of the Scripture miracles. As we look through these marvellous works wrought by prophets, by the Son of God, or by His apostles, we find nothing indecorous, light, ridiculous; but everything grave, simple, unambiguous, majestic. The miracles recommend and attest each other as part of a sublime plan running through many ages, and therefore nothing less than the steady and sustained purpose of one sovereign Mind. They are never poured forth at random, or to amuse the fancy, or for mere display, nor usually for individuals merely, but to spread the truth amid communities and whole nations.

Bishop Butler<sup>1</sup> has noted that there are also invisible miracles, like the Incarnation, which, in strictness, are not proofs of a mission, but themselves “require to be proved by visible miracles.” But its truth, when received, becomes the assurance and keystone of religion

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, Pt. II., Ch. II.

itself, and of every marvel which it reveals.<sup>1</sup> Others of the Scripture miracles, which at first view seem inferior in dignity to the rest—like the account of Eve's temptation by the serpent, of the speaking of Balaam's ass, that of Jonah and the whale, and of the devils sent into the herd of swine<sup>2</sup>—derive their meaning and importance from their connection with the rest. But even these are separated by an impassable interval from the prodigies of the apocryphal gospels; for instance, which ascribe to our Lord, when a child, the changing of his playmates into kids, the animating of clay figures of beasts and birds, and the like;<sup>3</sup> or from the miracles of Simon Magus, who pretended he could assume the appearance of a serpent, exhibit himself with two faces, etc.<sup>4</sup> This impostor, according to the legend, strove deliberately to simulate the miracles of Christ.<sup>5</sup> But such works as were attributed to Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Empedocles, Apollonius, are distinguished from true miracles by the very fact that they are attributed by the authors themselves to their superior wisdom or to the agency of spirits and demons, never to authenticate a message of divine truth. Other marvels, like that told by Josephus of the charmed ring of Solomon; or the unauthorized legends connected with the early martyrs, as that of the dove issuing from the body of Polycarp, the stones weeping at the cruelty of the persecutors, inundations rising to the roofs of churches without entering the open doors; or some of the Breviary legends, like the miraculous uniting of the two chains that had bound S. Peter, or the burial of Paul the Hermit by lions, or S. Denis carrying his own head after decapitation; or the Rabbinical won-

<sup>1</sup> The Incarnation "is the great miracle which makes the miraculous credible."

<sup>2</sup> It is a fault in Sherlock, Clarke, Locke, and others, that they dwell too much on the distinction between *great* and *small*, *many* and *few* among the miracles.

<sup>3</sup> Jones on the Canon, Pt. III.

<sup>4</sup> Lavington's *Enthusiasm of Meth. and Papists Compared*, Pt. III., § 43.

<sup>5</sup> He died by a fall from the Capitol at Rome, it is said, when striving to exhibit himself as "a sign from heaven."

<sup>6</sup> *Antiq.*, VIII., 2, § 5.

ders, as that of the flies killed by lightning for settling on the Rabbi's paper; or the miracles ascribed in later times to Muhammed (he claimed none for himself),—how the trees went out to meet him, the stones saluted him, a camel complained to him—of all these works one does not hesitate to say that they are puerile, or monstrous, and unworthy to be ascribed to God's agency. The simple but exalted language of Scripture describing the true works of God brings out the contrast most strongly. "O God, when Thou wentest forth before the people . . . the earth shook, and the heavens dropped at the presence of God. . . . Mine own will I bring again as I did sometime from the deep of the sea." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with Him."<sup>1</sup>

Miracles disjoined from the instrument of the divine message, or having no professed object, are justly discredited simply on the score of antecedent improbability. Of such sort are many ascribed to relics, like those, *e.g.*, attributed to the Abbé Paris's tomb. The contrast between such miracles and those of Holy Scripture is most strongly emphasized by the very examples in the Bible which at first seem like them, as, for instance, the raising of the dead by Elisha's bones, or the healing of the sick at the pool of Bethesda;<sup>2</sup> for in the first was a testimony from a true prophet to both Moabites and Israelites, and in the second an opportunity to recommend the healing power of the Physician of men.

The absence of an object in the worker of miracles, or diffidence of his own power, would discredit his work, and separates such cures as Tacitus ascribes to Vespasian from the accounts in Scripture. The instance in the Gospel of the exorcist who did not follow Christ<sup>3</sup> seems, from the Lord's words, the case of a learner who had the

<sup>1</sup> Psalm lxxviii. 7, 8, 22. Acts, x. 38.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Kings, xiii. 20, 21. S. John, v. 1-9.

<sup>3</sup> S. Mark, ix. 38. S. Luke, ix. 49.

beginnings at least of faith. And still miraculous power, though lending warrant to the message immediately accompanying it, does not certify all the words of the messenger, either for a considerable time before or after. The apostles, after their Lord's ascension, we are told, "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and *confirming the word with signs following.*"<sup>1</sup> But not less plainly are we told of those who, after having been intrusted with miraculous power, either fell into temporary error or were even finally disowned of their Lord.<sup>2</sup> A *sustained miracle*, it has been said, is inconsistent with that frugality in the application of power which is observable in the general course of Providence; and, as we have noted in the case of the manuscripts of Holy Scripture, there is no "waste of miracles."<sup>3</sup>

The miracles described in Scripture cannot, either in the Pentateuch, the Gospels, or the Acts, be separated from the rest of the narrative, or from the discourses and divine truths connected with them. Many of the most important words and parables of Christ sprang directly out of His miracles; and the conception of His character itself, the most transcendent of miracles, rests as much upon one as upon the other. As we reflect upon the most characteristic miracles of either dispensation—Elijah's calling down fire upon his sacrifice, Christ walking upon the sea—how far removed in dignity and elevation do they appear from the marvels ascribed to the sages and hierophants of false religions, the political or party miracles of Vespasian or the Abbé Paris, or even Tertullian's angelic vision to prescribe the length of a woman's veil! On the other hand, precisely on the ground of its congruity with Scripture miracles, and the fitness of the occasion, we may admit the probability of the miraculous prevention of Julian's attempt to rebuild the

<sup>1</sup> S. Mark, xvi. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. ii. 11-14. Heb. vi. 4-6. S. Matt. vii. 22, 23.

<sup>3</sup> See Scrivener, *Int. to Crit. of N. T.*, Ch. I. It has been ob-

served that they who copy manuscripts in a language unknown to them are less likely to make mistakes than they who understand it.

temple, attested, as it is, so abundantly by friends and foes.<sup>1</sup> The miracles of Scripture, then, are neither unaccountable nor unmeaning, extravagant or useless—faults justly chargeable against all imitations or rivals of them. Neither can their source be considered at all doubtful, since, even if we grant the existence of spirits intrusted with power over the order of nature, the miracles of the Bible, wrought as they are in the name and to the honor of Almighty God, must be conceived as directly authorized by Him.<sup>2</sup> Neither is it reasonable to suppose that any laws of nature, however wonderful may be the powers within it still undiscovered, can ever explain the giving life to the dead or sight to the blind with a word, or the feeding of five thousand men with five loaves of bread. The miracles of Scripture also can with as little reason be classed with those whose origin is either a mistaken word, or an allegorized narration, or an exaggeration of some natural event, or the working of an excited imagination. Under every variety of circumstances, in every part of the world, their publicity, clearness, number, instantaneous production, and completeness separate them from all inferior prodigies wrought by man.

This preliminary view of the character of the Scripture miracles enables us to give a just and impartial consideration to their evidence. There is certainly no antecedent improbability in all evidence whatever in their favor. They are not burdened with any suspicious trait, such as would demand especially strong evidence to overcome it. They attest truths of greater importance and clearness than natural religion discloses, and which are therefore worthy of being proved by miracles. The evidence for the miracles themselves need not, therefore, from the nature of the case, be different in kind from the evidence of any other external event. As a matter of fact, however, the

<sup>1</sup> See Gibbon's *History and War-* Disc. II., p. 201. Van Mildert's  
burton's *Julian*. *Boyle Lectures*, Sermon 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide* Fleetwood, *On Miracles*,

evidence for these is far stronger than the evidence for a multitude of historical events that are received without question. The miracles of the Old Testament are susceptible of independent proof. But if we establish those of the New, we virtually prove both, since they who wrought the Christian miracles bear the strongest testimony to the former.

“The fact, then, of the Christian miracles may be proved, first, by the sufferings and consistent story of the original witnesses; secondly, from the actual conversion of large bodies of men in the age in which they are said to have been wrought; thirdly, from the institution, at the time, of a day commemorative of the Resurrection, which has been observed ever since; fourthly, by collateral considerations, such as the tacit consent given to the miracles by the adversaries of Christianity, the eclectic imitations of them, and the pretensions to miraculous power in the early Church.”<sup>1</sup> These arguments are in some measure independent even of the genuineness of the Scripture narrative, which we have already proved.

Now, in a witness we consider the qualities of honesty and competency. Has he the disposition and the ability to give us the truth in a given matter?

I. In regard to the honesty of a witness, one of the first questions we naturally ask is: 1. Did his testimony bring him anything of the nature of *gain, power, or temporal advantage*? It is well known that Philostratus, for instance, gave his account (at the distance of nearly a century) of the miracles ascribed to Apollonius,<sup>2</sup> at the desire of the Empress Julia, who patronized the eclectic cause. So, in regard to the miracle wrought upon the doorkeeper of the cathedral at Saragossa, the interest of the canons, on whose testimony it rests, was greatly concerned in its reception. But the miracles attested by the apostles and

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Newman's *Essay on the Miracles of Scripture*, compared with those elsewhere related, etc., § 4, pp. 396, 397.

<sup>2</sup> Hierocles, the prefect of Bithynia, made use of this account to attack Christianity. He was answered by Eusebius.

evangelists brought them the loss of every worldly advantage, and the certainty of actual and lasting suffering.

2. There is a singular evidence for the honesty of the apostles, in the peculiar style of the Gospels, which must be irresistible to every candid and thoughtful mind. We have the spiritual experience of twelve humble Galileans, transformed from peasants into apostles, pictured with a simplicity and a fidelity that has no parallel. While they recount the miraculous life of their Master, they make such confessions concerning themselves as seldom fall from human lips. For three years, they own, they heard His wonderful teaching, while stupidly misconceiving its meaning, or interpreting it by their own selfish and mean ambition. The night before His death they disputed for the first place in His Kingdom. They confess they were out of sympathy with their Lord in some of the most expressive and touching moments of His ministry—when He blessed the little children, when He cured the daughter of the Syrophenician woman, when the penitent bathed His feet, and in the agony of Gethsemane. Massillon, the great French divine, is said to have declared that, in all his experience as confessor, no one had ever owned to him the sin of avarice. But the apostles have caused it to be recorded how one of their number calculated the price of the perfume poured on the Saviour's feet, and afterward sold that Saviour to his enemies for money. Few men will own to abject cowardice; yet the apostles tell us in the Gospels how, in His last hour, they all, in utter terror, forsook Him and fled, and how the boldest of them, thrice with an oath, denied that he knew Him! They confess that feeble women stood by the cross which they had forsaken; that a robber went before them with Christ to the place of honor in His newly founded kingdom; that a woman who had been possessed by Satan was permitted first to announce the glorious tidings of the Resurrection.<sup>1</sup> The imperfections and

<sup>1</sup> See Sermons par Eug. Bersier, T. VI., Serm. II., *Le Témoignage des Apôtres*. Paris, 1880.

human weaknesses, the artless confessions, the growth in moral stability and intellectual clearness, revealed by the Gospel witnesses, affect us more powerfully because of their air of truth, than would the testimony of faultless characters, or of those accomplished in science.

II. When we consider next the competency or the intelligence of the witnesses to the miracles of Christ, we observe of it first that they are plain men of average capacity. The Galileans, living in a maritime and border country, engaged in commerce; and many of them, it is likely, speaking more than one language, were not probably inferior in sagacity to any of the inhabitants of Palestine. It is so far from being an objection that they were without professional education, that it puts them, on the contrary, in the very class from which the law <sup>1</sup> prefers to take its judges of matters of fact—plain men of sound sense, whence juries are chosen. Such men often use their outward senses with more precision and calmness than professional men. It has many times proved a disadvantage, as is well known, to be pre-occupied with a theory. The apostles and evangelists, moreover, were evidently not acting upon the suggestion of social superiors: on the contrary. Instead of witnessing to miracles in support of an established system and cherished beliefs, they present to us the spectacle, altogether new and unique in the world's history, of a religion introduced by miracles. We can watch, in the graphic narratives <sup>2</sup> of the Gospels, the very process by which the new thoughts and truths took possession of their souls and reversed within them the currents of sympathy and anticipation. When the crowning miracle of the Resurrection had finally

<sup>1</sup> It seems likely, from the *ἐδίωκον* of S. John, v. 16, that one of our Lord's miracles was subjected to a legal examination.

<sup>2</sup> The variations in these narratives can be harmonized. Their very independence is suggestive of truth and reality. There is nothing in them

like, *e. g.*, the description by Philostratus of Apollonius's five years' Pythagorean silence, where the marvels ascribed to the sage are inconsistent with the Pythagorean rule of seclusion. In II., 12, he is made to have been in India twenty years *before* he was at Babylon.

wrought its work with them, we can see how it became the one purpose of their lives to make its truth known and felt by all mankind ; how they required its exact and full confession of those who became members of the Church ; how they ordained others who should be able out of their own knowledge and belief to testify to it. Their own thoughts had been drawn to the visible and tangible proof of the miracle : one had been permitted to touch the very wounds in his Master's hands and side ; all had conversed with Him or eaten with Him, been absolved or encouraged or blessed by some personal word from Him.

If we consider the place of this great event in the world's history, with all that had gone before and that has followed after it, not less when the Son of God came forth from the prison of the grave, than when Israel, also God's son, whose life was hidden in its great antitype, went out from the bondage of Egypt, was there "an adequate occasion for the sounding forth of the voice of God from the majestic stillness of eternity, calling on the world by the trumpet-tongue and thunder-peal of miracles." <sup>1</sup> When we consider, again, the victory of these plain and earnest men, the apostles, who by their preaching alone subdued the pride, the wisdom, and the power of the world, we may well say with the greatest of Christian poets : <sup>2</sup>

" That all the world should have been turned  
To Christian, and no miracle have been wrought,  
Would in itself be such a miracle,  
The rest were not an hundredth part so great."

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Wordsworth's Preface to *Notes, etc., to the Old Testament*, p. xii. London, 1864.

<sup>2</sup> Dante.

## LECTURE VI.

---

### PROPHECY.

#### PART I.

IN Holy Scripture a "prophet" is "one who speaks for God," as well as "one who foretells events to come," and prophecy is a general name for Divine Revelation, including moral lessons and truths of the spiritual world, along with predictions of events in human history that were beyond mortal foresight, and whose disclosure, therefore, witnessed the presence and aid of the omniscience of the Almighty. It should not be forgotten that to proclaim by words and courageous deeds the laws of morals, and to assert God's righteous government of the world amid the disorders and corruptions of society, may be a true evidence of God's presence and help, even though such evidence may not strike the imagination or produce conviction so powerfully and readily as the clear announcement of events to come. Hence every prophecy is intimately connected with some vindication of God's moral government of the world: it either sets forth His law or it forbids the transgression of it, or it threatens the punishment of some conspicuous offender, or it unfolds a series of great events in whose issue at least, if not in its progress, the divine presence and rule are unmistakable. Prophecy, therefore, in its most comprehensive sense, is a powerful support of religion; it keeps alive in the world faith and hope; it brings home to each

heart God's loving providence; it shelters the weak and tempted, and checks the violent and lawless.

In the formal argument for the evidence of a divine and special revelation, we naturally turn to the most striking and conspicuous meaning of prophecy, because every one feels that a single clear prediction of some memorable fact, plainly established, would be sufficient to authenticate a revelation. No one but the Maker and Ruler of the world can foretell with certainty in the distant future any one event depending on the concurrence of a multitude of unknown forces and independent wills, whose springs are in His hands alone. It has been well said that every true prophecy is also a real miracle.<sup>1</sup> And as the miracle rightly understood vindicates God's freedom and independence of His own creation, while not derogating in any respect from the perfection of natural laws, so prophecy (it is worthy to be said with emphasis) witnesses to the perfection of God's omniscience without depriving man of either his freedom or responsibility. We may not be able and we are not required to frame a philosophy or to construct a statement reconciling divine sovereignty with human freedom, or showing how there may be certain foreknowledge at all of an event strictly contingent on the choice of free beings. But we are permitted to receive both classes of truths upon their own proper evidence, without possibility of reasonable question. Our own consciousness assures us that we are free, and our conscience makes it certain that we are responsible; miracles vindicate God's sovereignty, and prophecy witnesses to His omniscience. The power and knowledge of the Almighty, like His justice and His goodness, are doubtless the same in essence as these attributes in the creatures whom He framed after His own image; but in Him they are names of perfections without defect or limit of any kind, the objects of boundless trust and

<sup>1</sup>What the miracle is in the department of action, prophecy is in the department of knowledge (*miraculum potentiae scientiae*).—Beck, *Propäd. Entwicklung*, S. 178.

love and satisfaction. We need not hesitate to say that what we, with our limited faculties, do not know and cannot imagine of Him is doubtless far more wonderful and glorious than what we can and do.

Almighty God seeks the love and service of His creatures by methods suited to their capacities and situation. He addresses their reason and heart as well as their conscience. If we here seek to describe prophecy in its office as, next after miracles, the great pillar of the external evidence of religion, we say it must fulfil three conditions: First, it must be known to have been uttered before the event; second, the event must be of such a nature, or at such a distance, as to be undiscoverable by human reason; and, thirdly, the terms of the prediction must clearly and adequately correspond to the particulars of the accomplishment. These three conditions, it is plain, will effectually exclude forged prophecies coming after the event, or probable anticipations, or, lastly, equivocal coincidences. We are never to forget that neither the clearest predictions, nor in fact the evidence of miracles, or evidence of any sort, can literally compel belief in the truth of religion. No external evidence can win a real submission from the mind or heart. It might be safely concluded, on general principles, that even as the Almighty does not force obedience from his responsible creatures, so neither does He thrust supernatural evidence of heavenly truths upon the attention of the unwilling and the unprepared. These, then, are almost axioms in the subject of religious evidence. It is no objection that some of its most important branches should be probable rather than demonstrative, moral rather than physical or scientific. The most suitable evidence that can be addressed to a being such as man, who has strayed from the right path and whose nature has become disordered, but has still noble powers and is responsible for their use, is such proof as appeals not only to the reason and the feelings, but also to the will. The free and responsible creature must be left with power to

listen or to close the ears, to be convinced or to doubt, to receive or to reject. The evidence, in other words, is not purely logical, nor merely an address to the feelings, nor simply authority, nor a display of naked power. It partakes at times and in parts of all these, and is strong or weak according to the interior state of those addressed. What can be thus said of religious evidence as a whole finds striking illustrations in the department of prophecy in particular. First, it must not be forgotten that prophecy is but one of many kinds of evidence for revelation.<sup>1</sup> Though a single prophecy could establish a divine communication, and a series of prophecies abundantly prove a religion, still, as a matter of fact, prophecy authenticates the same heavenly truths as are attested by miracles, recommended by their own sublimity or beauty, verified by their effects upon individuals and upon society. The collective or cumulative force, therefore, of miracles, prophecy, moral fitness, benign effects, and temporal triumphs over material power and unwilling witnesses, should in fairness be considered when we strive to estimate the just weight of each. Prophecy, though wonderful and divine, is after all but one evidence amid several kinds. But, secondly, it is plain from the very conditions of an unimpeachable prophecy that no one can form an intelligent and fair judgment of its claims to our acceptance without research, patience, and candor. It may be said that no one can reasonably expect these from unbelievers or the indifferent, much less the prejudiced and hostile. And we must admit, in reply, that religion offers no evidence that can convince any of these classes against their will.

Since no prophecy can be either refuted or verified till after the event, it is naturally liable to remain for some

<sup>1</sup> The "evidences are exceedingly other; they are connected only in dissimilar. . . . They are not the subject which they conspire to necessarily connected in their origin; attest."—Davison on *Prophecy*, Disc. I., p. 31. they are independent in their principle; they do not infer each the

time after its delivery neglected as an ambiguous oracle. It is only such testimony as the Church (first the Jewish, then the Christian) has preserved to the authenticity of the prophetic writings, and the date of their composition—testimony of an especial witness appointed to guard and preserve them, beside the ordinary evidence for any celebrated writing or book—only such abundant proof as this might seem able to fix beyond question the time of the delivery of the prophecy. And even though this may not be disputed without manifest captiousness, still it requires some candor to admit that the terms descriptive of a future event are quite beyond the natural sagacity of some mind speculating on a kindred theme. Or, if this point be conceded, it may not still be practicable to remove every scruple concerning the possibility of fortuitous coincidences between the terms of the prediction and the terms of the fulfilment. A reasonable certainty that there has been an actual fulfilment of any important event, or series of events, cannot be reached without some knowledge of history, often not without considerable research, weighing of events, balancing of authorities. It might be thought that this circumstance removes much of prophecy from the possibility of being evidence to any but the learned. But though we grant that the leading events of history may be safely accepted on the ground of general notoriety, still, as the very problem which prophecy lays before us involves the comparison of distant and dissimilar events, often the criticism and sometimes the translation of language, and some ability to examine witnesses and weigh evidence, it is quite manifest that its evidence is rather probable than demonstrative. Though abundant to convince a thoughtful and candid inquirer, one who has patience enough to carry him through a laborious search, and to give him a motive for life and a support in death, this evidence will yet never force any one to believe; it will not even seem strong to the mind that will not submit to the conditions of its discovery; it may even be proclaimed to be no evi-

dence at all by the lazy and indifferent. Its evidence, in effect, does not virtually exist for them any more than for the actively hostile and unprincipled, who pervert evidence, invent difficulties, and impute failures where none are found.

We are now prepared to survey the prophecies contained in the Bible. They are found in every book of both Testaments, we might almost say on every page. Taking the word "prophecy" in the comprehensive sense to which we have referred, the revealing of a truth to man by God's help, how wonderful is the disclosure, in the first chapter of the holy volume, of the orderly progress of creation through the different stages of the material framework—the chaotic mass, the light from darkness, the solid from the liquid, the light-bearing orbs; then the still more wonderful construction of living organisms, the water population, the air population;<sup>1</sup> then, lastly, the land population, consummated in man—the three leading steps in this great process being marked by the emphatic word "create."<sup>2</sup> That all the steps in this majestic march of creative power should receive confirmation, and, amid the mysterious details upon which the greatest discoveries of modern science have thrown light, have become demonstrated conclusions and established facts, as men like Sir John Herschel and Cuvier<sup>3</sup> assure us, is something like a fulfilled prophecy. Who but He that planted the secret springs of life and movement in every creature, animate and inanimate, should guide them through all their wondrous course, from the world's beginning to its end, by

<sup>1</sup> "In the larva of the libellula, which lives constantly and has still long to live under water, are described the wings of a fly which two years afterward is to mount into the air."—Paley's *Nat. Th.*, Ch. XXVII. With this and kindred facts before him, how can a philosopher like Huxley insist that the "air population" cannot immediately succeed the "water population"?

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i. 1, 21, 27. Cf. Ps. civ. 2-20; cxxxvi. 5-9; "Song of the Three Children," 57-60.

<sup>3</sup> Cuvier says: "Moyses hat uns eine Kosmogonie hinterlassen, deren Genauigkeit mit jedem Tage in einer bewunderungswürdigen Weise bestätigt ist." Quoted in Reusch's *Bibel und Natur*, pp. 2, 63.

His intimate and loving providence, ruling, overruling, checking, forewarning, that He may be known and trusted at all times by hearts watchful and prepared?

The articulate prophecies of Holy Writ may be distributed under three great classes—the fortunes of the Hebrew or Jewish people, the formation and triumphs of the Catholic Church, and, lastly, the various history of different pagan powers. All three are often found interwoven in intimate connection throughout the pages of Holy Writ, from first to last, the prophecy of the Messiah in particular illuminating every part of the career of the Jewish and Christian churches, and the fortunes of worldly powers deriving their interest and significance from their relation to God's kingdom.

1. The most striking and convincing prophecy of Holy Writ, beyond doubt, is that of the Messiah, running through all parts of the Old Testament, having its fulfilment recorded in the New, and Himself becoming the Author of new predictions reaching onward to the end of time. The formation of the chosen people who inhabited Palestine, the vital and organizing principle of its very existence, is found in the human nature of the Incarnate Son of God. Our first parents, freshly fallen into sin, derived their first hope of redemption from the mysterious promise, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" the wonderful ministry of suffering was suggested by the words, "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." When Abraham received the promise of Canaan and of the multiplication of his posterity "as the stars of heaven," and then that "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," both the extent and the nature of the blessing had their explanation only in the work of the Messiah. The fortunes of Abraham's descendants, both in Egypt and in the promised land, anticipated and summarized the history of the great Deliverer, even as He in some sort comprehended in Himself the history of the whole race: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." More than

fifty particulars concerning the coming and character of the Divine Redeemer are contained in writings from fifteen hundred to four hundred years before His birth. They have a wonderful cumulative mark or quality, growing in particularity and clearness as time rolled on. After the general promises, already mentioned, of One to come, and of His coming through Abraham, the period when He should appear is specified. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come."<sup>1</sup> Here we have further the tribe of Jacob specified, as we have soon after the family, that of David, from which the Messiah should come. Then the mysterious miracle of the Incarnation is announced: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son;" then the very place of its accomplishment named: "And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah." His forerunner, S. John; the place whence His ministry began, "Galilee of the nations;" His character as prophet, legislator, priest, and victim; the peculiar miracles of His ministry, "opening the eyes and unsealing the ears" of the maimed, raising the dead, teaching with authority and with gentleness; His entrance into Jerusalem; His strange death and burial, and His marvellous resurrection—these and many other things are contained so plainly in the prophecies that a complete history, corresponding minutely to that in the Gospels, could be extracted from them. There is no fact in history or in literature more certain than the existence of these prophecies hundreds of years before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth. His history fulfilling them is perfectly attested not by Christians only, but by

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xlix. 10. Haggai, ii. 7. 25, 26. Is. xlii. 2, 3. Ps. lxix. 9. Mal. iii. 1. Dan. ix. 24, 25; Gen. Zech. xi. 12, 13. Ps. lxix. 25, 21, 4, xii. 3; xviii. 18; xxvi. 4; Is. xi. 1. 17. Is. liii.; ix. 7; lxi. 1-3, 14; xlix. Ps. lxxxix. 4, 27. Is. xi. 9; xli. 27. 7; viii. 14. Zech. xii. 10. Ps., Haggai, ii. 6-9. Is. liii. 2. Ezek. xxii.; xxxi. 5; xvi. 10, 11. Jonah, xxxiv. 23, 24. Micah, v. 2. Is. vii. i. 17. S. Luke, iv. 16-29. See 14. S. Matt. i. 21-23. Gen. iii. 15. Horne's Introduction, Vol. I., App. Hosea, xi. 1. Judges, xiii. 5. I VI., Ch. I., pp. 451-456. Sam. i. 11. Zech. ix. 9. Ps. cxviii.

Jews and pagans ;<sup>1</sup> a history, we are to remember, containing a career and a character, unique and original, the one of all impossible to invent amid the annals of mankind.

The fortunes of the Jewish people from which Christ came, and to which He gave shape, are marked in prophecy with a like precision, and attested in the records of the world, as well as of Scripture, with similar and unmistakable signs of certainty. Among the promises and threats throughout the Law and the Prophets, observe in particular what is said of the degradation and exile of the Jewish people,<sup>2</sup> alluded to by Nehemiah as an ancient prediction at the time of the return from Babylon, made the subject of new prophecies by Christ, fulfilled to the letter at the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and in the subsequent dispersion and preservation of the chosen race. The endurance of this strange branch of the human family, thriving in some preternatural way amid the tyranny of Egypt and of Babylon, as amid their most lasting and more fearful martyrdom since their rejection of Christ, forms the meeting-ground of miracle and prophecy, so that the oldest and most unmistakable of predictions is fulfilled in the most certain yet most unlikely of histories. Their very continuance at once renews the prophecy and attests the miracle.

2. It is not the least marvellous fact in the career of the Hebrew people that they preserved in their sacred

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Ant. Jud.*, L. XVIII., Ch. V., § 2 ; L. XX., Ch. VIII. (al. 9), § 1. (See Horne, I., 463, App. VII.) *Suetonius in Claudio*, Ch. XXV. Tacitus, *Annal.*, XV., 44. In reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, *Hist.*, V., 13.

<sup>2</sup> Neh. i. 8. Deut. xxviii.; xxvi. 27; iv. 25; ix. 8. Lev. xxvi. 33. Jer. xliii. Ezek. v. 15. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 21. Is. lxx. 1-9. 1 Kings, ix. 7, 8. 2 Chron. vii. 20. Jer. vii.; xxvi. S. Matt. xxiv. S. Mark, xiii. S. Luke,

xxi. For accomplishment, see Josephus, *De Bell. Judeic.*, L. VII. ποῦ δ' ἡ μεγάλη πόλις ἢ τοῦ παντός Ιουδαίου γένους μητρόπολις κ. τ. λ. (orat. of Eleazar). Tacitus, *H.*, V., II., 12. Josephus (*De Bell. Jud.*, VI., IV., 5) says the temple was burned down by the Babylonians and by the Romans on the same day of the same month, the tenth of Lous, (The Macedonian λεῶος answers to the Attic βοηδρομιαιών, parts of Elul and Tizri or of our September.)

oracles prophecies of the extension, through their Messiah, of the true religion through all Gentile nations—or, in other words, of the formation of the Catholic Church—though the very conception was most odious to their narrow national temper, and bitterly opposed by them at every step in its actual fulfilment. This great event was assured to Abraham in the pledge, “All the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him,” as it was afterwards announced by the greatest of the prophets among the prerogatives of the Messiah, “The Gentiles shall come to Thy light, and kings to the brightness of Thy rising;” “All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee;” “The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.”<sup>1</sup> The universal conquests of the true religion, itself the supplement of the earlier revelation, and complete in the work of the suffering and triumphant Messiah, are not predicted in one or two separate texts alone, but are intimated in every book, suggested in the ritual, shadowed forth in the kings of the chosen people. “The ritual types were a *concealed* prophetic evidence, the force of which was made apparent by the presence of the Gospel system.”<sup>2</sup> The triumphs of the religion of Christ in the first three centuries have no parallel in any other events yet seen in the world; they proceeded from missionaries that came out of Judæa; it was a direct and systematic propagation of a religion, using *persuasion* as distinct from worldly force or politics; it wrought in the individuals and communities that received it a moral and spiritual change. There is no record like this in the rise of any false religion or imposture. Muhammedanism was a fanaticism spread by the sword, and its very miracles and prophecies were an afterthought. Brahmanism and Bud-

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xviii. 18. Is. lx. 3. Cf. Is. xviii.; 43, 44; xlvi. 8; cii. 15; xxii. ii. 2-4; xlii. 1, 7; lii.; liii.; liv. 27. Is. xi. 9-11.

Hab. ii. 14. Mal. i. 11. Ps. ii. 8; <sup>2</sup> Davison on *Prophecy*, Disc. III., p. 151.

dhism were at one time concessions and again negations of human weakness, giving voice by turn to passion and to despair. The wisdom and the morals of the best of the heathen are in sharpest conflict with their religion and its worship. But the religion revealed in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New has fostered and produced the highest types of virtue, become the mother of knowledge, the defence of nations, the champion of domestic honor, of the family, of freedom, of all real civilization. These are not theories, but facts. They are substantial events foretold in prophecy, attested by history, brought about in the teeth of every antagonism, in contravention of all human probability, against the currents of sympathy, the expectations of the wise, the fears of the brave. The prophecies, moreover, that foretold the unexpected victories of Christianity foretold also a mysterious and inexplicable perversion of it, that should prove well nigh as memorable as its triumph. Only the faith nurtured by Christ could survive the hideous diabolism and tyranny of Antichrist.

‡ It is not wonderful to hear, as we do, such men in the early ages as Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Lactantius, and Arnobius, all originally heathen, attribute their conversion to the prophecies. Justin<sup>1</sup> in his controversy with the Jews, was able to say: "There exists not a people, whether Greek or barbarian, or any other race of men, by whatsoever appellation or manners they may be distinguished, however ignorant of arts or agriculture, whether they dwell under tents or wander about in covered wagons, among whom prayers are not offered up in the name of a crucified Jesus to the Father and Creator of all things." Tertullian,<sup>2</sup> with the vigorous originality peculiar to him, grasped not only the splendors of prophecy, but the dark outlines of the great apostasy in S. Paul and the Apocalypse.

3. It remains to glance briefly at the prophecies concerning pagan powers, and in particular about Nineveh,

<sup>1</sup> *Dial. cum Tryph.*, p. 341.

<sup>2</sup> *De Resurr. Carnis.*

Babylon, Tyre, and Egypt. We have already noted how an outline of the world's history was delivered by Noah in his predictions to his three sons.<sup>1</sup> Individuals and particular nations of the heathen become the subjects of prophecy when their careers touch the development of God's kingdom, or when they furnish, in God's providence, signal examples of judgments upon crime, or the acceptance of repentance.

(1) Nahum is the chief prophet, though not the only one, who announces the destruction of Nineveh.<sup>2</sup> On the authority of the Jewish Church, witnessed by Josephus,<sup>3</sup> his prophecy was uttered one hundred and fifteen years before the fall of Nineveh.<sup>4</sup> The following is part of it: "For while they be folded together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry." Again: "The gates of the rivers shall be opened, and the palace shall be dissolved,"<sup>5</sup> or "molten." A heathen historian, Diodorus Siculus,<sup>6</sup> in his account of the taking of the city, describes two remarkable facts corresponding to the prophecy: first, of the state of drunkenness in the Assyrian camp, during a general festival, when, "folded together" and hedged in as "with thorns," they were surprised and overwhelmed by the enemy; and, second, that in the third year of the siege of Nineveh, an inundation of the Tigris laid open the walls of the city to the extent of twenty *stadia*, whereupon the king in despair raised a vast pile, and consumed himself in the flames of his wealth and of his palace, thus fulfilling what is said of "the gates of the river" and of "the palace" being "molten."

(2) It is curious to note at once the resemblances and the contrasts in the fate of Babylon, also a great city upon a river, the river Euphrates. There was also at

<sup>1</sup> Gen. ix. 25-27. See First Course (I., 106), must have taken place after the expulsions of the Scythians from Asia, B.C. 596.

<sup>2</sup> See Dr. Pusey's Introduction.

<sup>5</sup> Nahum, i. 10; ii. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Antiq. Jud.*, IX., 11.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist.*, LII., pp. 112, 113, ed.

<sup>4</sup> This, according to Herodotus Rhod.

Babylon a scene of revelry and intoxication, but it was at the moment of capture, not, as in the case of Nineveh, the surprise of the army, before the siege began. The river also became the means of overthrow, but in a very different way; for the Euphrates was turned from its channel, leaving a dry passage into Babylon, while at Nineveh the Tigris had carried away the walls. These circumstances are noted in the prophecies. Thus Jeremiah said of Babylon: "In their heat I will make their feasts; and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, saith the Lord." "I have laid a snare for thee, and thou art also taken, O Babylon, and thou wast not aware: thou art found, and also caught." "A drought is upon her waters; and they shall be dried up." This had also long before been predicted in Isaiah: "That saith to the deep, Be dry; and I will dry up thy rivers."<sup>1</sup> The Grecian historian's account is well known, how Cyrus obtained entrance by draining off the river so secretly that the people were "taken as in a net," and one part of the city knew not of the entrance of the army till the other part was in their power. Zephaniah thus foretells the desolation of Nineveh: "He will stretch out His hand against the North, and destroy Assyria; and make Nineveh a desolation, and dry like a wilderness. And flocks shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations; both the pelican and the bittern shall lodge in the upper lintels of it; their voice shall sing in its windows; desolation shall be in its thresholds; this is the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart, I, and none beside me: how is she become a desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in!" And so Nahum says: "She is empty and void and waste." Isaiah and Jeremiah predict in similar terms the perpetual doom of Babylon. "It shall never be inhabited; . . . neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their folds there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there." "Cast her

<sup>1</sup> Jer. li. 39, 57; l. 24, 38. Isaiah, xlv. 27. ..

up as heaps, and destroy her utterly: let nothing of her be left."<sup>1</sup> For many centuries the very sites of these mighty cities have been unknown. The recent explorations of Nineveh seem to emphasize its wonderful overthrow. By the annual overflow of the Euphrates morasses have been formed on the site of Babylon, converting it, as the prophet said, into "a possession for the bittern and pools of water."<sup>2</sup>

(3) The prophet Ezekiel foretold concerning Tyre its subjugation and restoration after a servitude of seventy years; its later calamities, capture, burning, demolition; then its religious conversion; then the final desolation of the city. "I will scrape the dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock; it shall be a place for the spreading of nets; thou shalt be built no more; though thou be sought for, thou shalt never be found again."<sup>3</sup> This is one of those prophecies whose existence is perfectly well known in the canon of Ezra, a century before Alexander laid siege to Tyre. The favorable situation of this great emporium of commerce and the arts rendered its continuance very probable. Yet nothing can be more exact than the correspondence of the present condition of its site with the terms of the prophecy. The traveller Shaw<sup>4</sup> says the port of Tyre is so choked up that "the boats of the fishermen, who now and then come to the place and dry their nets upon its rocks and ruins, can hardly enter."

(4) Bishop Newton affirms of the prophecies in Daniel relating to the kingdoms of Egypt and Syria from the death of Alexander the Great to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, a period of one hundred and forty-eight years: "There is not so complete and regular a series of their kings, there is not so concise and comprehensive an account of their affairs, to be found in any author of those times. The prophecy is really more perfect than any

<sup>1</sup> Zeph. ii. 13-15. Nah. ii. 10.  
Is. xiii. 20-22. Jer. l. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Ezek. xxvi. 14, 21, etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Travels*, Vol. II., p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> See Buckingham's *Travels*.

history."<sup>1</sup> Porphyry, an ancient enemy of Christianity, felt the correspondence of the prophet's words to the facts of history to be so clear that he denied their authorship to Daniel, in violation of all the evidence.<sup>2</sup> Modern unbelievers (like Payne), not being able to make this old denial good, admit the authenticity, but deny the correspondence! Thus, while refuting each other, they establish the truth. Egypt may be said to be the oldest seat of policy, arts, and civil grandeur. The prophet Ezekiel first foretold a conquest of Egypt, and a captivity of her people to last forty years. Then he subjoins this second prediction: "Yet thus saith the Lord God: At the end of forty years, I will bring again the captivity of Egypt, and will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation; and they shall be a *base kingdom*. *It shall be the basest of kingdoms*; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations; and there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt."<sup>3</sup> This is a unique and remarkable prophecy. In his thirty-first chapter the prophet draws a memorable comparison between Assyria and Egypt, "the loftiest cedars in the garden of God." Yet one was to be utterly destroyed, while the other dragged on a peculiarly degraded existence. Egypt has been compared to one of its own mummies—a withered figure, preserved in decay. It has been "the basest of kingdoms," ruled by a dynasty of slaves. Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Saracens, Mamlukes, Turks, have been its masters in turn. The Ptolemies were a foreign race, so that their rule did not violate the prediction, "there shall no more be a prince of the land of Egypt" (Ezek. xxx. 13). The gifts of nature and the treasures of art and science have not preserved this land from its long, exceptionless degradation.

While we survey such marvellous tokens of the pre-

<sup>1</sup> Newton on *Prophecy*, Vol. II., p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> See Lardner, Vol. IV., p. 215.

<sup>3</sup> Ezek. xxix. 13-15.

science of the Almighty illuminating the minds of the prophets, what reflection can be more suitable than that which so powerfully affected the acute and earnest Tertullian in the beginning of the third century? Is not this foreknowledge of the destinies of cities and kingdoms part of that same Wisdom that daily rules the universe? "Since, the fortunes of kingdoms, since the downfall of cities, since the vanishing of nations, and the conditions of different periods thus exactly correspond to the prophetic words, how were they foretold thousands of years before?"

<sup>1</sup>"Cum dispositiones regnorum, bus respondent, quemadmodum ante cum casus urbium, cum exitus gentium, cum status temporum ita omnia millia annorum prænunciabantur?" —Tertull., *Apol.*, Ch. XIX., frag.

## LECTURE VII.

---

### PROPHECY.

#### PART II.

AFTER a survey of the leading prophecies of Holy Scripture, such as we have just made, we are best prepared to form a general estimate of their weight and cogency, and to put the argument from prophecy in its right place among the evidences of revealed religion. No one can deny that there is something very startling and wonderful in these disclosures of things to come; it is mere obstinacy and captiousness to dispute their existence, often in several languages, before some of their most striking fulfilments; and still it is felt that the prophecies do not all affect us alike, are not all equally plain, and some, if considered by themselves, we might even doubt to be prophecies at all. We shall have to acknowledge of the whole of prophecy, what must be said of all religious evidence, that it is not of a nature to force conviction; that it appeals to the reason and the feelings, but at the same time leaves to us the possibility of choice. We need not wonder at this when we reflect that cultivated men think that, being still of sound mind, they can yet make a question whether to trust in their senses, to demand proof of axioms, to doubt all history, to set aside testimony that does not pass technical legal tests, and to consider all statements in language—familiar facts, the tritest maxims, even the meanings of words—to be liable to be treated as open questions. There is, in fact, no

physical preventive, except health, to save any human being from thus abusing his or her powers. Since the language in which prophecies are uttered must be governed by the laws of all language, which when plainest can never remove every doubt; since the very end of prophecy is usually to give such a description as may raise expectation, but cannot be exactly verified till after the event; and since the account of events themselves must be derived from human witnesses, like Diodorus, Herodotus, and Josephus, of different degrees of credit, and yet none of them infallible, it is certain that we shall have to be reconciled to varying degrees of strength in the argument from prophecy. These considerations, rightly regarded, ought in truth rather to strengthen than to weaken our confidence in the argument, because they are signs that we have to do with a reality and not with an imagination.

It will help to confirm this conclusion, I believe, to glance briefly at some miscellaneous points hitherto but lightly touched; as, first, the natural instinctive expectation of prophecy found among men in any time of stress or urgency; then the actual prophecies, whether of known or unknown authors, that have had currency respecting real matters; finally, some manifest marks of distinction that separate divine prophecies from those of confessedly human origin.

1. The poet Virgil in the opening of his great work fairly expresses the instinctive conception of prophecy when he represents the king of the gods thus allaying the anxiety of his daughter concerning the destinies of the Roman people. "Spare thy fear: . . . the destinies of thy people remain unshaken for thee. . . . Unto thee alone will I declare it,<sup>1</sup> since this care continually distresses thee, and, causing them to revolve, will set in motion for thee, far in the future, the secrets of

<sup>1</sup> Tibi fabor enim, quando hæc te cura remordet  
Longius et volvens fatorum arcana movebo.

Virgilii *Æn.*, I., 261, 262.

the fates." The future history of a mighty empire is here viewed as one of many vast concentric cycles, the Deity being the common centre, and by His disclosure setting it in motion, as it were, before the mind to which the future is unveiled. The peculiar confidence of a Roman in the greatness of the empire is expressed in Virgil's poem, as by many other Latin writers; and the famous prophecy of the augur Vettius, preserved by Varro,<sup>1</sup> concerning the duration of Rome, is a good specimen both of the strength and of the weakness of these prophecies that have been set up as rivals to those of Divine Revelation. The words of Vettius are: "If it was so, as the historians related, as to the auguries of the founding of the city of Romulus and the twelve vultures, since the Roman people had passed one hundred and twenty years safe, it would reach twelve hundred." This prophecy, therefore, can claim to be no more than a conjectural inference upon a hypothetical fact. "*If there was* such an appearance to the Roman founder!" The augur at most predicts "safety" to the city for some decuple of twelve years; and since it had passed one hundred and twenty, it would reach twelve hundred years! We may grant that the ordinary dates A.U.C. 753 and A.D. 476 for the beginning and end of the Western Empire would come pretty near the twelve centuries. But the first date is simply conjectural, two hundred and forty years in it being assigned to the seven kings to make their period double that (one hundred and twenty) given to the consuls down to the burning of the city by the Gauls.<sup>2</sup> There is no evidence that the prophecy produced any fixed expectation. Sidonius and Claudian, *e. g.*, expected the destruction of Rome before the twelve centuries had expired. Again, it might be maintained that "new Rome" continued the empire in fact for nearly

<sup>1</sup> Antiq., L. XVIII. Quoted by the  
grammarian Censorinus, circ. A.D.  
238, in a work *De Die Natali* (Ch.  
XVII. fin.) treating of the influence

of one's genius, and of the stars, upon  
one's birth period.

<sup>2</sup> Mommsen, *D. Röm. Chron.*, p.  
133.

another twelve hundred years; or even that old Rome was not destroyed, but exchanged a temporal for a spiritual dominion over many millions more than the temporal sway had ruled.

We can hence see that though the conception of a true prophecy existed, nothing was found truly answering to it. A prophecy is mentioned by Thucydides as having arrested much attention at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. It contained an ambiguity, however, caused by the resemblance of two words, which leads the historian to a general remark upon such prophecies. When the plague came upon the Athenians, cooped up in their city, Thucydides says: "In their misery they remembered this verse among other things, *as was natural they should*;<sup>1</sup> the old men saying that it had been uttered long ago: 'A Dorian war shall come, and plague with it.'<sup>2</sup> Now, there was a dispute amongst them, and some asserted that it was not 'a plague' (λοιμός) that had been mentioned in the verse by the men of former time, but 'a famine' (λιμός). The opinion, however, at the present time naturally prevailed that a plague had been mentioned; *for men adapted their recollections to what they were suffering*."<sup>3</sup> It may be said that the ambiguity in this old prophecy, handed down as a tradition in popular speech, is precisely of the kind in which the oracles delighted—as when Cræsus was told<sup>4</sup> that "upon crossing the Halys he would destroy a great kingdom," or Pyrrhus received the pledge, "Dico te Romanos vincere posse"—and is at the same time one that could have been detected (which the two latter could not), if the words had been carefully written down and preserved amid some sacred archives, for instance, like the Hebrew Scriptures.

When men systematize their rejection of the supernatural, they object to the idea of prophecy by narrowing

<sup>1</sup> οἷα εἰκόσ.

ἔπασχον τὴν μνήμην ἐποιούv

<sup>2</sup> ἦρει Δωρικὰς πόλεμος καὶ το.—Thucyd., II., 54.

{ λοιμός }  
{ λιμός } ἄμ' αὐτῶ.

<sup>4</sup> Κροῖσος, Ἄλυν διαβάς, με-  
γάλην ἀρχὴν καταλύσει.—Dio-

<sup>3</sup> οἱ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς αἶ

dorus, Excerpt. 7, § 28.

the scope of the divine foreknowledge of contingent events,<sup>1</sup> so that in essence it will not differ from human sagacity, though its degree may be heightened. This is analogous to the objection to the miracle by constricting the conception of law. It is alleged that the advance of civilization renders men incredulous in regard to both. But, as Major Knollys has recently said of the Chinese, it is not impossible for "the incredulity of civilization" to exist side by side with "the crass stupidity of ignorance." He pronounces their "psychological characteristics" to be "scepticism, superstition, and indifference, plus a lingering suspicion that, after all, religion may turn out after death not to be a fraud, and that it will be prudent to provide for this eventuality, and to keep an eye to the main chance."<sup>2</sup>

Some such feeling as that here suggested may perhaps account for the degree of credit that has been granted to certain prophecies at times set up in rivalry to those in Holy Scripture.

2. Whether any real prophecies had ever been uttered, or could exist, was discussed in a formal treatise by Cicero, in which he first puts what can be said in their favor into the mouth of his brother, Quintus, and then expresses his own doubts. His own conclusion, if he reached any, appears to be that, since divination could not arrive at any of the results reached through the senses, or by any art, or from the study of philosophy or of politics, it was, in fact, non-existent: *vide igitur ne nulla sit divinatio*. Still he puts in this claim for himself:<sup>3</sup> "From Plato and

<sup>1</sup>Ut mihi ne in Deum quidem cadere videatur, ut sciat, quid casu et fortuito futurum sit. . . . Rerum igitur fortuitarum nulla est præsensio.—Cicero, *De Divin.*, II., 7. On the other hand, compare Bp. Butler's remark: "Nothing which is the possible object of knowledge, whether past, present, or future, can be *probable* to an infinite Intelligence."—*Analogy*, Introd.

<sup>2</sup>*English Life in China*. By Major H. Knollys, Royal Artillery. Lond., 1885.

<sup>3</sup>Id enim ipsum a Platone philosophiaque didiceram, naturales esse quasdam conversiones rerum publicarum, ut eæ tum a principibus tenerentur, tum a populis, aliquando a singulis.—*De Divin.*, II., 2.

philosophy I had learnt this lesson, that certain revolutions are natural to all republics, which alternately come under the power of monarchs and democracies and aristocracies." Cicero quotes a Greek proverb pronouncing him to be the wisest prophet who can guess the best. It might be said that any one can predict concerning any mighty city that it will, at some time or other, be taken or fall.

Such a prophecy concerning Constantinople, for instance, was at one time ascribed to Muhammed. In the mosque of Sultan Muhammed II., finished eight centuries after Muhammed's death, on a marble slab to the right of the main door, there was said to be the inscription: "They will conquer Constantinople," referring to the Moslem armies. But, on tracing out the sources of the prediction, it was found to rest only on a passage in the *Sahih* exhorting the hosts to *attack* the city of Cæsar, and promising forgiveness to the sins of the first army that shall do so.<sup>1</sup> Another prophecy promised that the three walls of the imperial city would fall before "the sons of Isaac" (*i.e.*, Arabs through Esau), when they should utter the cry, "There is no God but God, and God is great"—something after the manner of the fall of Jericho.<sup>2</sup> In fact, however, the Arabs besieged Constantinople seven times without success (from A.D. 654 to 1422), and it was finally taken by the Turks (in A.D. 1453). It was taken by assault, and its walls did not fall. All the details of the prediction were contrary to the fact.

It has been alleged that in Seneca's *Medea* is a prophecy of the discovery of America, because he says that in the "late years" (*annis seris*) "Thule shall not be the utmost land." These words of the chorus, however, seem to refer to that Atlantis described by Plato in the *Timæus*.<sup>3</sup> It was pointed out, in answer to Collins, that strictly no discovery in the direction of Thule was likely, except of

<sup>1</sup> Ockley, *Hist. of Sarac.*, II., 128.

<sup>2</sup> Von Hammer, *Gesch. d. Osmann. Reiches*, L. XII., T. I., 522, 3.

<sup>3</sup> P. 20 D.

polar ice; or that, if the words be literally pressed, Australia fulfils the prophecy as well as America.

Again, it has been gravely said that there is an anticipation or prophecy of Shakespeare in that passage of Plato's *Symposium* which says, "It belongs to the same man to know how to compose comedy and tragedy, and that he who is by skill a composer of tragedies is also a composer of comedies." But, in the first place, there is here no prediction of that highest excellence which is the peculiar glory of Shakespeare; and, in the next, it might be said that Plato's words are fulfilled even by Homer, who portrays, beside tragic themes, a Thersites, or the ridicule of Venus and Mars; or that Plato himself is an illustration of his own words, in the account of Socrates put into the mouth of Alcibiades, or in the picture of Aristophanes. It has been fairly said, besides, that, admitting the soundness of Plato's maxim, "it would rather be marvellous that tragedy and comedy were not more frequently combined, than that they were remarkably in one mind."<sup>1</sup>

The alleged "prophecies of S. Malachi" are a very instructive instance of the difficulties that lie in the way of any deliberate attempt to forge predictions. They swarm with errors and anachronisms, as well as violations of common-sense. Reference is made, *e. g.*, to Cardinal Simoncelli, in whose interest the forgeries were contrived, by the words "De antiquitate orbis," because he was of Orvietto, in Latin *urbs vetus!* The words "Lilium et Rosæ," applied in the prophecy to Pope Urban VIII., are asserted by the interpreters to be "fulfilled to the letter, since that Pope had in his coat-of-arms bees, which suck lilies and roses!"<sup>2</sup>

It would certainly be remarkable if able and sagacious writers, with minds filled with certain important subjects,

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Pusey's *Daniel*, Note F, appendix, p. 646. Malachie, Albion. Menestrier published *A Refutation of the Pre-*

<sup>2</sup> *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique, tendent Prophecies of S. Malachi* in par MM. Chaudon et Delandine, *s.v.* Paris, 1689.

did not at times utter anticipations that are afterward strangely verified. Newman, for instance, in one of the Oxford tracts, written in 1838, said, "This is what the age is coming to. . . . The Bible will be given up as well as the Church. If we were not defending our belief in the Catholic doctrines, we should at this very time be defending our belief in the Canon. . . . Give up the Catholic doctrines, and what do you gain? An attack upon the Canon, with (to say the least) the same disadvantages on your part, or rather, in fact, with much greater."<sup>1</sup> Now, at the end of nearly fifty years, the venerable author has survived to witness what it is likely may seem to him a lamentable fulfilment of the augury in his own earnest words.

It is curious, though possibly there is good reason, why the persons who have discovered in Plato a prophecy of Shakespeare should never have found in the philosopher a prediction of the Author of the Christian religion. Yet in the second book of his *Republic* Plato has drawn the following sketch of the probable fate of a perfectly just man upon earth: "Let him be stripped of everything but justice, and, without doing injustice, let him have the reputation of doing the greatest, in order that he may be put to the test for justice, by not being moved by ignominy<sup>2</sup> and its consequences, but rather be unchangeable till death, seeming, indeed, to be unjust through life, though really just. . . . The just man thus situated will be scourged, tortured, fettered, have his eyes burned out, and lastly suffer all manner of evils and be crucified."<sup>3</sup> That the soul of man, reflecting in

<sup>1</sup> "Tract" 85. Lect. VII., VIII., pp. 99, 102.

<sup>2</sup> Literally, "by not being softened" (made limp or moistened) "by infamy." τῶ μὴ τεγγεσθαι ὑπὸ κακοδοξίας.

<sup>3</sup> ἀνασχινδυσλευθήσεται. Πολιτεία. Bk. II., Ch. IV., V. Cicero has a similar passage, *De Rep.*, III., 17. "The fathers agree in declar-

ing that Job prefigured Christ; that as David typified the Conqueror, Job typified the Victim, and that, put before us in the one special character of an undeserving sufferer, he foreshadowed the great undeserving Sufferer of all, the Sufferer upon the Cross."—Mozley in *Ch. Remembrancer*, Jan., 1849. *Essays*, II., 228.

seriousness on [the mysteries of probation and of God's moral government of the world, should, by its very longing, be guided to the one source of hope, is not less probable than that it should here and there anticipate political or personal fortunes, the mutations of knowledge and opinion.

3. The survey we have taken enables us to discriminate apparent, or what we may call natural, prophecies from such as are real and divinely inspired. There is something in the very style of the one different from that in the other; a difference that may be compared to that in the language of one who speaks from knowledge and that of one who utters conjectures and abstractions.<sup>1</sup> Prophecy is at one time as definite as history, and again so enigmatical that events alone can explain its meaning. But its clearness and its mystery are both equally tokens of its truth. They are each addressed to the faithful heart, which recognizes the love as well as the wisdom of the most minute and the grandest disclosure.

A true teacher has always something to communicate, precise, exact, definite; and the accent of authority is by no means peculiar to the teacher of religion. Knowledge of every kind, moreover, secular as well as religious, must be arranged with reference to the interior condition of the recipient, the stage of progress he has reached; it can have no fruitful growth without interest and effort in the receiving mind. Indifference or prejudice will find difficulties in the simplest fact, and obscurity in the clearest disclosure.

The following are some striking examples of the definiteness of Scripture's prophecies, and certainly separate them by a strong line of demarcation from the class of probable conjectures. Among the particulars in the prophecy of Moses, contained in the twenty-eighth chap-

<sup>1</sup> Compare the predictions mentioned by Livy as heralding the second Punic war: "The prophetic tablets had spontaneously become less, and one had fallen out thus inscribed, 'Mars shakes his spear.'" "Mavors telum suum concutit."—Livy, *Hist.*, XXII., 1

ter of Deuteronomy, fulfilled in the last siege and destruction of Jerusalem, that of "the tender and delicate woman," driven by hunger to devour her child (vs. 56, 57), is very memorable. Josephus recounts the details corresponding to the prediction, though without apparently referring to it, with a singular particularity, giving the woman's name, Mary, the daughter of Eleazar of Beth-zub, and saying there were "innumerable witnesses" to this fact, "the like to which," he remarks, "no history relates, either among the Greeks or barbarians."<sup>1</sup> Josephus also says that the incident made a special impression upon the Roman general.

The following is an instance of a prediction, both minute and exact. The prophet Jeremiah foretold to the last king of Judah, Zedekiah, that Jerusalem would fall into the power of the king of Babylon, with this particular added: "Thine eyes shall behold the eyes of the king of Babylon, and he shall speak with thee mouth to mouth, and thou shalt go to Babylon." But the prophet Ezekiel says of the same king, "I will bring him to Babylon, . . . yet shall he not see it, though he shall die there." At first, it seems a contradiction to say that Zedekiah should be taken to Babylon, and should see its king, and yet not see Babylon. But the narrative in the Second Book of Kings, written in apparent independence of the prophecies, reconciles the statements; for it relates how the king of Judah saw his captor at Riblah, where his eyes were put out, so that, although carried to Babylon, he never beheld it."<sup>2</sup>

The mention of Cyrus by name in a prophecy uttered by Isaiah one hundred and fifty years before the monarch's birth has seemed to some interpreters so incredible—that is, so unlike their conception of what a prophecy should be—that they have been tempted, in violation of all the evidence, to assert that this portion of the book of Isaiah must have been written by another and later Isaiah.

<sup>1</sup> *Wars of the Jews*, Bk. VI., Ch. III., pp. 748, 749.

<sup>2</sup> Jer. xxxiv. 2, 3. Ezek. xii, 13. 2 Kings, xxv. 6, 7.

It may be safely said that no such objection, the objection of over-exactness, has ever been made against any mere conjectures or probable guesses uttered before the event. It seems to have been forgotten, moreover, that the name "Cyrus," which means "the sun," may have been employed generically for a monarch, much as Pharaoh was in Egypt.<sup>1</sup> And, again, even the mention of his name so long before is not more wonderful, if one considers it carefully, than the accurate description, in a succeeding verse, of the work he should perform as God's instrument. "He shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of Hosts."<sup>2</sup> What worldly sagacity reflecting on political change would ever have dreamed of such a service being performed by a heathen monarch for the troublesome Jews!

It is almost an adage among some interpreters of prophecy, that the terms of the prediction referring to the agents of its fulfilment are with design left indefinite, so that their free agency may not be impeded. This is, in general, founded in truth, and may be safely said of most of the prophecies. One can readily imagine how otherwise a prophecy might be found to have brought about, or again to have hindered by too great particularity, its own fulfilment. But beside the instance in the case of Cyrus just mentioned,<sup>3</sup> there are others equally remarkable where the principle appears not to be observed. What, for example, could be more definite than our Lord's prediction to S. Peter of the time and circumstances of that Apostle's denial of his Master? It can hardly be alleged that their very definiteness may have been designed to prevent their accomplishment. Besides the irreverence of ascribing to the Lord a prediction that should defeat itself, we can perceive from the after history that the Apostle's experience, painful as it was, became the source of important benefits to himself and to his brethren. The

<sup>1</sup> See Burnouf.

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah, xliv. 28; xlv. 1, 13.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the prediction of Josiah's

name (1 Kings, xiii. 2) is the only other precisely similar instance.

warning of the prediction, clear and precise as it was, did not produce its natural effect on S. Peter, because his self-confidence seems to have led him to dismiss it at once from his thoughts. This is confirmed by his Lord's subsequent admonition to watchfulness.<sup>1</sup> But what in a single individual might thus prove no obstacle to the accomplishment of a plain prediction of a future event, could hardly be reckoned upon in a nation, or in the world at large.<sup>2</sup>

Some curious speculations might be founded upon the precise prophecies uttered by S. Paul in his famous voyage and shipwreck on his way to Rome. When it became evident that the ship must perish, the Apostle said to his companions: "Be of good cheer; for there shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship." Then subsequently, to prevent the desertion of the seamen, S. Paul said to the soldiers, "Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved," where he seems to make the truth of his former prediction now to become conditional upon the prompt firmness of the centurion and his men. The centurion's interposition finally saved the life of the prisoners when the soldiers would have killed them.<sup>3</sup> The free action of men, assisted at one time and thwarted at another, is here seen to be part of the very means by which the Ruler of all accomplishes a prediction made known to the agents themselves.

Definite predictions like these strike the mind most powerfully, and are better calculated to produce instant conviction than even a series or system of prophecies

<sup>1</sup> S. Matt. xxvi. 34, 40, 41.

<sup>2</sup> That David should be king was predicted when he was anointed. The fulfilment was brought about by a series of events, in the ordinary course of Providence, without a miracle. "No other single narrative of Scripture," says Davison, "is so prolix and circuitous as that which describes the accomplishment of this

particular prediction (from 1 Sam. xvi. 10 2 Sam. v.). . . . It suggests to us . . . how the divine prescience penetrates through the perplexity of human affairs, and its predictions *without a sensible miracle* pass to their near or their remote fulfilment." —On *Prophecy*, Disc. IV., p. 197. London, 1825.

<sup>3</sup> Acts, xxvii. 22, 31, 42.

whose accomplishment can be seen only through the events of a long connected history. Yet to a reflecting mind the system of prophecies ought to be vastly more wonderful and convincing. There is first the element of probability, which can be mathematically calculated, against a given number of particulars concurring by chance in any one event.<sup>1</sup> One or two examples of these calculations may be given. If we select out of more than fifty say twenty of the more remarkable predictions, some of them miraculous, descriptive of the Messiah in the prophets, and apply the mathematical principle to calculate the probability of their all concurring by chance in the same person, we find the probability against the concurrence more than a million of chances to one.

Again, there are twenty-four distinct predictions relative to the siege of Jerusalem, the subjugation of Judæa, and the subsequent condition of the Jews. Reckoning in the same way, there are more than seventeen millions of chances against their joint occurrence.

Once more, the prophecies in the Old Testament relative to Gentile nations around Judæa and the great empires Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, Egypt, present about fifty particulars worthy of notice in such a calculation. But if we take but twenty-five of them, we can deduce the expectation of their united fulfilment in about the ratio of one to thirty-three millions.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the imagination would be influenced even more powerfully than by these numerical results, if it could realize the vast complexity of some of the subjects of prophecy. It has been said: "What a prophecy would the formation of language have been at the beginning of the world! What genius of detail could have approached to the faintest conception of the grand slowness and minuteness of the actual process of which that was the miraculous issue? Who could have pictured the multitudinous labyrinthal growth of inflections, genders, tenses, parts of

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Venn's *Logic of Chance*.

<sup>2</sup> See Gregory's *Letters*, McIlvaine's *Evidences*, appendix to Lect. VIII.

speech, governments, constructions, the creation of words, the incorporation of metaphor? What a prophecy would the civilization of the world have been! What a prophecy would the growth of any art have been! What a prophecy would civil government have been!"<sup>1</sup> Yet a real, true vision of the future of man, such as the very beginning of Scripture contains, seems not less wonderful than a prophecy of language, one of His instruments, such as is here supposed. Various forms of civil government are made by symbols to pass before the prophetic vision. But the main subject of prophecy is the development of that religion which is the mother of civilization, and of the arts that collectively unfold and constitute it.

This branch, then, of the evidence of religion, the argument from prophecy, derives its power finally from the fact that it brings us most vividly face to face with the Ruler of the world. Through it we recognize something of His vision of all things, their end from the beginning. The confusion of affairs is reduced to order. Our hearts revive with a new trust. He who has so mightily controlled the past will vindicate His laws also in the present and in the future. He has told us enough before, that we may, without disturbance, still believe. Nothing can escape Him, whose strength, and wisdom, and goodness are alike without limit. The end of religion, as of prophecy, is to see all things in God.

<sup>1</sup> Mozley's *Essays*, Vol. II., p. 361.

## LECTURE VIII.

---

### AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION.

THE aspect of the evidences we are now to present is of extreme importance, yet requiring delicate treatment. The Christian advocate has to be on his guard against awakening antagonism among Christians, knowing that the army which cannot appease internal strife in the presence of the foe, by that very impotence yields the battle to the enemy. It seems a mere truism, however, to say that no army can fight without some commanding authority, since no body of human beings can act together, for any purpose, without yielding to this supremacy. But the very mention of "authority" among Christians is the reminder of almost inappeasable strifes.

It seems necessary, therefore, here to remind ourselves of some elemental truths and principles. Revelation, a real, supernatural disclosure of truths and facts from Almighty God to human beings here on earth, we cannot but think must be intended to redeem them in some way from their miseries, and to lead them to true happiness here and hereafter. The real purport and meaning of the revelation, then, however made known, by vision or audible voice, and recorded whether in writings or by institutions, must be considered as the very revelation itself. That cannot be a revelation which has no definite sense, and no one can defend a revelation who attaches to it no ascertainable meaning. This statement does not exclude the reception of mysterious truths, or the acknowledg-

ment of supernatural persons, in the revelation ; for the plainest truths of science have a mysterious side, and our own personal identity, the fact nearest to us, cannot be fully explained. But a divine truth must be one that we can firmly grasp ; a Divine Being, one to whom there must be a definite relation of duty and service ; and a religious rule of life, such as is practicable and suited to our state of probation. These are almost axioms, and cannot well be denied without self-stultification.

But many persons who claim the name of Christian will not follow us, but will suspect us of taking up a party position, if we proceed to say, what I confess appears to me inevitable in logic, that no one can defend a revelation who has not made up his mind whether Christ the Redeemer, announced by it, is divine or human, God or man, or I may add really yet mysteriously both, and not a mere man like Socrates or Confucius. I say this because the latter alternative seems to me nothing less than the definite denial of a revelation.

Equally certain does it appear to me that no one can successfully maintain that the books of Holy Scripture, whose authenticity, credibility, and integrity we have been proving, are a Divine Revelation, if he deny the authority of the Church or Kingdom of God, the Catholic Church, to pronounce upon the meaning of those books. As we have said before, the right meaning of the words of the revelation is the real revelation. It is an aspersion upon the Divine Wisdom to suppose that it could make a revelation whose meaning could not be ascertained. And still we are left to this supposition, if we admit that the right meaning of Scripture is only that which seems such to each individual soul reading it in independence. The result of such a method of interpretation is not a question of theory, but has been demonstrated a thousand times by facts. Recall some of the most notorious. There have been in the earliest and latest ages of the Church persons of intelligence, sometimes of great personal attractiveness, who, rejecting the

authority of the Church's councils, have maintained that Scripture describes Christ as less than God,<sup>1</sup> as a creature, whether above the angels, or the most perfect of men. Again, these same and other persons, not at all agreeing with them in their view of the Redeemer, have refused to find in the Scriptures any testimony to a visible, organized Church, indefectible, preserved in the world by divine power, having authority to witness to and teach revealed truth; and have likewise declined to find in the sacred text any proof of a special grace in Holy Sacraments of a power to bind or to loose, to unite with or separate from the body of Christ. To some minds Scripture appears to reveal a peculiar logical scheme of doctrine, bordering on fatalism, whose reception in all its coherence is of more consequence than the articles of the Apostles' Creed, the existence of the Church, or the grace of the Sacraments. Scripture, they are persuaded, recognizes no other Catholic Church than the collection of individual believers, who believe in original sin, grace, election, sensible conversion, perfection, and, while holding some or all of these tenets, are scattered over the world, amid all sects, and are known to God alone.

The leading historical branches of the Catholic Church, the Oriental and Western, whether Roman or Anglican, condemn these independent views of Scripture, plainly hold up our Redeemer before us as the Christians' God, insist upon reverence to His Church as no less than the continuance of His Incarnation, the vital necessity of the Sacraments to begin and to continue our union with His Body, the reception of her dogmatic decisions upon articles of the faith and the canon of Scripture, and the subordination of all private views upon either Scripture or its meaning to her authoritative determinations.

<sup>1</sup> "The more I endeavor to realize the manner of thinking and speaking current in the New Testament, the more I feel called upon to give it as my decided opinion, that the historical Son of God, as such, cannot be called God, without completely destroying the monotheistic system of the apostles."—Lücke, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840. I., p. 91.

My purpose now is, of course, not to engage in any polemic of the Church against her rebellious children, or against those who claim the name of Christian but resist her claims. I do not hesitate to say, with the utmost explicitness, that I believe it impossible successfully to defend Revelation at all except upon the ground of the Church; still I would not lightly speak evil of any who exhibit the miracle of true faith amid whatever logical inconsistencies. I believe that God has spoken to individual prophets, that His Revelation has been committed to Sacred Writings, that these writings have been certified to us, first by the Jewish, then by the Catholic Church; but it does not seem to me possible that a book alone—that is, apart from its author, or from the community that possess and interpret it—can be a real religious authority to any man or to any number of men. Plato has shown the weakness of this imagination in one of his exquisite dialogues.<sup>1</sup> Some strong bias, some peculiarity of temper or experience, will cause even one who may wish to act honestly with himself to read into the sacred text the thought of his heart and the desire of his eyes. A book apart from its author cannot repel or correct this injury put upon its sense. And Christians who put from them the thought of the Church as their spiritual mother, the spouse of Christ, enlightened and supported by her Heavenly Lord to teach His truth with authority to her children, have no defence against this perversion which the soul in its proud independence inevitably puts upon the Divine Word. The result is not a matter of theory, but is made known to us by a multitude of facts. There are as many divergent and contradictory interpretations of Scripture—and these, too, made in apparent good faith—as there are new and clashing sects or venturous innovators seeking to strike out a new path.

No serious man should permit himself to think that the Almighty would seek to direct His creature to the truth it most concerns him to know, by a method so utterly

<sup>1</sup> The *Phædrus*.

precarious. Moreover, the separation of God's Word from His Church leads inevitably to a fatal misconception of the holy volume. If its true meaning be that which each independent, sincere inquirer finds in it, then has it many not only contrary, but contradictory meanings. But to admit this is simply to discredit and to reject the Bible. Contradictories cannot be true. The voice of reason, therefore, is merely reëchoed by the great teachers of the Church in every age, S. Justin Martyr, Dionysius, S. Augustine, when they say with one voice: "I dare not either imagine or assert that the Scriptures contradict each other; but were any passage to be adduced which has even the semblance of being opposed to another, being altogether persuaded that no such opposition really exists, I will rather confess that I myself do not understand what is said."<sup>1</sup> "Let us not suppose that the evangelists differ, or that they are at variance with each other."<sup>2</sup> "I have learnt," says S. Augustine, who had made trial of the independent treatment of Scripture, "to pay such deference to the books of Scripture, and to them alone, that I most firmly believe that none of their writers has ever fallen into any error in writing. And if I meet with anything in them which seems to me contrary to truth, I doubt not that either the manuscript is in fault, or that the translator has missed the sense, or that I myself have not rightly apprehended it."<sup>3</sup> No one can preserve this sound and rational reverence for Scripture in its entirety who separates from the Catholic Church or rejects her authority.

No champion of Christianity can safely assume the position: "I will neglect all the differences of those who acknowledge the Christian name, and content myself with simply proving that there has been a revelation, that the religion which Christians profess is divine." This is inadmissible, because we cannot believe that there has

<sup>1</sup> S. Justin M., *Dial. cum Trypho.*, ap. Routh, *Rel. Sacrae*, T. III., p. Ch. LXV., p. 162. 225.

<sup>2</sup> S. Dionys. of Alex., *Epist. Canon.*, <sup>3</sup> Aug., *Epist. ad Hieron.*, LXXXII.

been a revelation whose sense cannot be ascertained, for this is really admitting and denying with the same breath. And if we say that some books, or maxims, or rules of life are divine, without pretending that we possess their meaning, we certainly do not pay them any honor different in kind from that we render to many natural works. It cannot be a thing indifferent whether the Author of Christianity be a man merely, or also God: for if He be God, to neglect to worship Him is impiety; and if He be only man, such worship is idolatry. We might be excused for thinking that can be no real revelation which leaves such a matter in the least doubtful. Still, the perennial janglings of verbal critics, sophists, philologists, commentators, old and new, make it perfectly evident that even the vital truth of our Lord's Divinity cannot be maintained by Scripture alone without the aid of the Church and the decisions of her councils. The same might be said of other articles of the faith—the nature of God, the Holy Trinity, the sacraments, the warrant of prayer, the resurrection, and the life everlasting. Left to the authority of a book only, the faith of every Christian degenerates to a hypothesis, and his most sacred devotions rise no higher than will worship.

It is not necessary for the Christian apologist or advocate to formulate a theory of inspiration. I do not hesitate to say that for myself I should adopt, in substance, what is known as the dynamic theory, so ably expounded by Lee,<sup>1</sup> according to which the real and supernatural disclosures of truth and fact from the Almighty to the human race appear in Holy Scripture, with such modifications of speech and style as show that the natural powers of the sacred writers are used, not suppressed; and that, although God be truly the Author of the written Word, He still speaks through the idiom and free choice of each of His prophets. Moreover, I think that the distinction between revelation and inspiration is soundly taken,

<sup>1</sup> *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture: its Nature and Proof.* Wm. Lee, Trinity College, Dublin. Reprinted in New York, 1857.

so that while we rightly admit that in Scripture are many facts, say, for example, of history, attainable by man's native powers, and not, therefore, like the truths of our redemption, requiring a special divine disclosure, still that the form and measure in which everything, natural and supernatural, is put down in the Divine Record, are suggested and overruled by the Inspiring Spirit, "Who," as the creed proclaims, "spoke by the prophets." This bestows upon Holy Scripture, from the first page of the Old Testament to the last page of the New, a perfect unity, fitly compared to that of a living, breathing organism.<sup>1</sup> And still we are not hampered by the insuperable difficulties, not to say absurdities, of the mechanical theory, born of the worship of the sacred text as a kind of book oracle, or fetich, that can dispense with the interpretation or guardianship of the Catholic Church. Nor are we involved in the intellectual mystification and spiritual perils of either the "ordinary inspiration" theory—a polite repudiation of revelation—or what are sometimes called the "illumination" or "essential"<sup>2</sup> theories of inspiration, which savor more of human arrogance and self-sufficiency than of the reverence of real faith. We can, in other words, claim a substantial integrity and divine authorship for the sacred volume, and a clear, consistent meaning animating it from beginning to end, without being committed to the defence of the miraculous indefectibility of any particular manuscript, or edition, or version, or the absolute authority of any commentator, however distinguished. This is on the well-known principle, applied to the body of believers, that no one man is as wise as all men. God has, moreover, intrusted with real authority over us, even in things divine, those who are themselves neither impeccable nor infallible. The inspired teacher himself is not

<sup>1</sup> This is a sufficient answer to *essions of an Inquiring Spirit*, p. the rash language of such as allow 50.

themselves to speak as does Mr. <sup>2</sup> This theory has for its formula, Coleridge in Letter IV. of *Con-* "The Bible contains the Word of God."

always inspired, nor can the worker of miracles always put forth his superhuman power. The divine kingdom, imperishable by the Divine Presence and promise, inherits and represents the gifts and perfections of her individual children. The Scriptures bear to her the relation of constitution and statute-book to the states and commonwealths of this world. And as those who, either at home or abroad, represent the authority and discharge the functions of a worldly state, though secure in the immunities of their office, are neither themselves raised above the laws, written or unwritten, nor exempt from the liability of having their words and acts modified or overruled, explained or supplemented; so we need not fear to say that the prophets and evangelists, apostles and teachers, though inspired organs of Christ's imperishable bride, the Holy Church, are still each of them, and the greatest of them, but utterers in part of her entire message to the world, God's true revelation, which began, indeed, in her humblest beginnings, but will not be completed till the last syllable of recorded time.

It is not, therefore, now as a polemic against schismatics and heretics that we call attention to the authority of the Catholic Church, but as the most important confirmation of the certainty of the revelation contained in Holy Scripture, already commended to us by miracles and prophecy, by its own marvellous character and wonderful preservation. Not only the Church's authority, her calmness and deliberation checking the excesses and correcting the rashness of individuals, but her very existence, to which Scripture bears witness as "the pillar and ground of the truth," as well as of a holy life in the world—language which S. Irenæus, as we have seen, applies to the relation of Scripture to the Church itself—form the most shining attestation, in fact the only sure evidence, of the sufficiency, the infallible certainty and perfection of the Scriptures themselves. You remember it is the same great teacher, S. Augustine, who declares his conviction that no sacred writer had fallen into any error, who also

made the memorable declaration,<sup>1</sup> "I indeed would not believe the very Gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church moved me thereto." One of the greatest of human intellects, penetrated with the sense of religion, truly believing the Scriptures, yet taught by a sad experience and speaking from the depths of self-knowledge, here confesses its impotency to retain its grasp of the truth, or to reach it in the first instance, without the aid of the heavenly kingdom, the divine mother of souls, in whose bosom Christ's little ones are new-born, and nurtured to spiritual manhood, and protected alike against their own weakness and the unfriendly atmosphere of the world's unbelief.

We do not now, therefore, present the authority of the Church in any aspect that should awaken antagonism in a single breast that believes the Scriptures, or that believes there has been a revelation. It is no assertion of Apostolic Succession, or of visible Church unity, or of outward pomp of worship, or of anything material and visible surmounting a spiritual and vital religion, but simply a proof of the reality and power of the religion of the Christian Scriptures, given by a vast organized body of human beings in the first three centuries, when, according to the expression of the first Latin apologist, "Christians did not *talk* great things, but *lived* them."<sup>2</sup> The nature of man was formed for society; his very life, for many years, depends on mutual help; his ideas, his intellect, his progress, his enjoyment of every kind, his very soul, depend on sympathy, on the fostering touch of others, on the breath of the community about him. Nothing great was ever accomplished by individual man in isolation. Not only can there be no statesman, no hero in war, or champion of human rights, without a tribe, a city, or a state for which to labor; but there cannot be even literature,

<sup>1</sup> Ego vero Evangelion on crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.—*Cont. Ep. Marcellin.*, Ch. V.

<sup>2</sup> Non eloquimur magna sed vivimus. M. Minucii, *Octavius*, Ch. XXXVIII.

any immortal song, any fruitful philosophy, any true advance in science, without a strong and vigorous national life to prompt and reward such efforts. The nature of man is not changed in its essence, but restored and elevated, by religion. He who made it what it is would certainly impart to it the truths and principles of religion by the means most efficacious to that result. His truth, without doubt, would appear as the formative principle of a nation or community. It is an impeachment of divine wisdom to conceive of a revelation coming from Him, solely as a book, written or printed, addressed to each individual in every nation, young or old, male or female, to be understood, interpreted, practised, in whole or in part, by each for himself, in self-sufficient independence. As a matter of fact, the books of completed Scripture are first found in the possession of a world-wide community, bound together by a unity of which all other ties are but faint symbols; men and women, young and old, wise and simple, believing the same things, as with one soul, loving one another, walking by the same rule of life, with a clearness and a firmness that were undisturbed alike by sophistries, by temptations, by the threatenings of power, by the tortures of cruel deaths. The Christian community to which the Roman world, religious, political, philosophic, at length submitted, was remarkable alike for its unity and for its strength. It was a real community, not an appendage of the State, nor an aggregation of parties, religious or philosophic. It knew what it believed. It knew what were its sacred books. It knew what to assert, or to deny, concerning them or their contents. If it could not fathom the infinite wisdom of God, it could still protect itself and its children from the deceptions and chicanery of man. The same teaching resounded from ten thousand congregations, East and West. The same confession of faith was heard; the same expositions, in substance, of Scripture, or of controverted points, were made, whether in Greek or in Latin, in the Coptic of Egypt or the Teu-

tonic of the German woods. An electric sympathy bound together the extremities of the world. Irenæus in Gaul enters into a controversy with the speculative teachers of Antioch, Edessa, or Alexandria; while Tertullian, in his rude African Latin, denounces or advocates opinions which sprang up in Pontus or in Phrygia."<sup>1</sup>

Now, what relation has the authority of this vast Christian community, so united in faith and sympathy, to the inspired character of the books of the Bible? There is an august and impressive ceremony connected with the ordination of its ministry—bishops, priests, and deacons alike—described in the Apostolic Constitutions, and retained to this day not alone in the ritual of the English and American churches, but in the Roman Pontifical and in the Greek and Syrian Rituals. In the English Prayer-Book the rubric in the Ordinal, immediately after the imposition of hands by the archbishops and bishops present upon the head of the elected bishop, directs: "Then the Archbishop shall deliver him the Bible, saying, 'Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this Book.'" In the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. the Archbishop was required to "lay the Bible upon his [the elected Bishop's] neck." This part of the ceremony is described in the Apostolic Constitutions,<sup>2</sup> and has been retained in the Roman, Greek, and Syrian ordinals. The whole rite suggestively represents the function of the Church known as tradition. Scripture is itself strictly a part of tradition, or what is handed on from age to age. It is the Church which assures each of her members that each of the books in the sacred collection is truly and peculiarly

<sup>1</sup> Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, II., 113, 114. *Latin Christ*, T. I., 27-29. copus cum ordinatur duo Episcopij ponant et teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem ejus."

<sup>2</sup> τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ θεῖα εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου κεφαλῆς ἀναπτύξμενα κατεχόντων. L. VIII., Ch. IV. So also the Fourth Council of Carthage, Ch. II., directs: "Episcopus cum ordinatur duo Episcopij ponant et teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem ejus." S. Dionysius in *Eccles. Hist.*, Ch. V., explains this delivery of the Gospels to imply the necessity of knowing, preaching, and meditation on them. Cf. *Durandus*, L. II., Ch. XI. P. Damian, Sermon I. de Dedic.

from God. There is a *consensus* of every branch of the Church—Greek, Roman, Anglican—as regards the books of the English Bible, described in the Sixth Article. The English Church followed in her language here, concerning the Apocrypha, or ecclesiastical books, the words of S. Jerome,<sup>1</sup> the greatest scholar of the Western Church; though the Roman Church, that professes to revere him as one of her chief doctors, afterward placed these books in the sacred canon.

Tradition, it should be observed, tells us whence these books came, that God was their Author, though it has not transmitted the name of the human writer of every one. “What avails it,” asks Theodoret, “to know whether all the Psalms were written by David, it being plain that all were composed under the influence of the Divine Spirit?”<sup>2</sup> “It is needless,” says S. Gregory the Great, “to seek who wrote the Book of Job, since we may faithfully believe that the Holy Ghost was its Author.”<sup>3</sup> But of this capital fact, of which these faithful sons of the Church had no doubt, it is quite obvious there can be no assurance for one who rejects the very being along with the authority of the Church. And her authority is equally necessary to establish the inspiration of the books of Scripture, the names of whose human writers are known. It is not possible in logic to retain belief in revelation after this authority has been rejected. The legitimate weight of the principle of authority must not here be denied, even though we grant that the principle, sound in itself, has been pushed by some branch of the Church—the Roman, for instance—beyond its just limits.

The just influence of the Church, setting the seal of her authority upon every book of the sacred volume, forbidding the irreverent disparagement or careless rejection of any portion, large or small, commanding and urging its careful study and meditation, leaving to her children

<sup>1</sup> See his *Prologus Galatæus*.

<sup>2</sup> Præf. in *Moralia in Lib. Job*, T.

<sup>3</sup> *Prothecoria in Psalmos*, T. I., p. I., p. 7.

a large liberty within the limits of the faith defined by her united voice—this alone can enable her sons, even those of the highest erudition and genius, rightly to grasp and maintain the majestic unity and fulness of meaning of the Bible as a whole. S. Paul declares that “all Scripture is produced by the inspiration of God,”<sup>1</sup> comparing the inspired human soul to a musical instrument swept by the wind of the Spirit. “Scripture as a whole,” says Origen, nobly carrying out this comparison, “is God’s one perfect and complete instrument, giving forth, to those who wish to learn, its one saving music from many notes combined; stilling and restraining all strivings of the Evil One, as David’s music calmed the madness of Saul.”<sup>2</sup>

The meaning of Holy Writ witnessed by the Christian consciousness, as represented in the decrees of the œcumenical councils, and in the teaching of the Churches, great doctors, and schools, has a consistency, a gravity, a seriousness, a majesty, and a power of resistance, which attest its truth and stamp it with immortality. This may be illustrated both negatively and positively.

1. It is easy to see what became of doctrine and of truth, even though illuminated by the light of Scripture, when taught in the early schools, with whatever of genius and learning, outside of the Church. The Gnostics, whose name covers a variety of sects characterized by intellectual power and science and great literary activity, affected to ignore the abominations of heathen immorality, and to comply with the rites of idol worship in a spirit of contemptuous indifference. It was nothing to them that the sages, statesmen, and philosophers of paganism were tainted with the pollutions for which the nations of Canaan and the cities of the plain were extirpated and blotted out. Virtue and vice were for them but

<sup>1</sup> πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευτος. εἶναι πᾶσαν τὴν γραφήν κ.τ.λ.  
<sup>2</sup> S. Tim. iii. 16. Comm. in S. Matt. v. 9, T. III., p.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐν γὰρ τὸ τέλειον οἶδε καὶ 441.  
 ἡρμωμένον ὄργανον τοῦ Θεοῦ

phases of intellectual enlightenment. The very deeds of Christ Himself they allegorized as the clash of mighty spiritual forces in a new mythology which personified Depth and Silence, Wisdom and Power. Abstractions took bodily shapes, and passed in and out of each other, as in the phases of a dream. Christianity was a theosophy rather than a religion; not a doctrine so much as a poem; not a rule of life, but rather a system of the universe. Tertullian complains of a motley confusion of Stoicism, Platonism, and dialectics, perpetually going over the old questions, "Whence comes evil? Why is it permitted? What is the origin of man?" Nay, "Whence comes God?"<sup>1</sup> This great man in his better days helped to supply the Church's children with the literature that closed their ears to the profane fables and philosophic speculations of paganism.

Other sects, with perhaps more devotion to the letter of Scripture, would at one time, like Marcion, cast away such portions as displeased them; or again, rejecting all discipline, make no distinction between catechumen and believer, or even heathen, admit women to teach, make light of ordination, proclaim the common priesthood of all, and end with being "motherless, houseless, creedless, spiritual outcasts." It was in reference to such that S. Irenæus wrote: "It is not necessary to seek among others the truth which it is easy to obtain from the Church, seeing that the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth, so that whosoever will can draw from her the water of life; for she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers."<sup>2</sup>

2. The service of the Catholic Church in witnessing to the sense of Scripture can be illustrated positively by perhaps no more striking or important example than her successive decrees concerning the nature of the Incarnate Son of God, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.

<sup>1</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæres.*, Ch. VII.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Hæres.*, Bk. III., Ch. III., § 2; Ch. IV., § 1.

These have never been better summarized than by the greatest of English divines, the judicious Hooker, of whose words I here venture to remind you. "There are but four things," says Hooker, "which concur to make complete the whole state of our Lord Jesus Christ; His Deity, His manhood, the conjunction of both, and the distinction of the one from the other, being joined in one. Four principal heresies there are which have in those things withstood the truth: Arians, by bending themselves against the Deity of Christ; Apollinarians, by maiming and misinterpreting that which belongeth to His human nature; Nestorians, by rending Christ asunder and dividing Him into two Persons; the followers of Eutyches, by confounding in His Person those natures which they should distinguish. Against these there have been four most famous ancient general councils: the Council of Nice, to define against Arians; against Apollinarians, the Council of Constantinople; the Council of Ephesus, against Nestorians; against Eutychians, the Chalcedon Council. In four words—*ἀληθῶς, τελέως, ἀδιαίρετως, ἀσυγχύτως*, truly, perfectly, indivisibly, [*distinctly*: the first applied to His being God, and the second to His being man; the third to His being of both One, and the fourth to His still continuing in that one Both—we may fully, by way of abridgment, comprise whatsoever antiquity hath at large handled, either in declaration of Christian belief or in refutation of the aforesaid heresies."<sup>1</sup>

Upon the doctrine so incomparably stated in this famous summary there are several obvious things to be said: First, that it is strictly and logically consistent in all its parts, so far as logic can be applied to so transcendent a subject; next, that though proved by Scripture, the average of readers, however intelligent and devout, would not be apt to derive it without the Church's aid from the text of Scripture; that still it is the very cornerstone of the Christian faith; to miss it is to miss the sub-

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's *Eccles. Polity*, Bk. V., Ch. LIV., § 10.

stance of revelation, and to relapse into natural religion, if not into heathenism ; that as this great truth could never have been grasped, even in the Holy Scriptures, without the aid of the Church, so it can never be retained by those who leave her fold—a result of which we are certified not by theory, but by a multitude of facts, old and new. As natural religion revealed God the Father, the first Person of the Trinity, but provided no authoritative witness and guardian of this truth among men, who hence corrupted and lost it: so the essential truth concerning the second Person of the Trinity, though revealed in Holy Scripture, could not be maintained by the bare and unaided words of the book, but would have been lost amid contending sects but for the authority of the Church. Her decisions and decrees give a repose and a certainty to the faith of her children in this great article of their belief, comparable to the security of property and civil rights that results in a well-ordered state from successive decisions of the highest courts in conformity with the constitution and the laws.

In our own day there has sprung into being a kind of hierarchy of natural science, which, though sought at times to be arrayed against the Church's interpretation of Scripture, may with more propriety be employed to illustrate her function in the world as "the pillar and ground" of sacred truth. No remark is more common, no style more familiar, in scientific manuals, than "it is now agreed," "no one any longer disputes," "few will still maintain," as if this were spoken in a learned assembly or council, which has a common doctrine, similar rules of proof and standards of evidence. It is an ostensible profession of the highest authorities of this learned assembly, that it considers no truth as pertaining to its province but experimental truth, such as can be investigated and verified by man's natural faculties; and that man's reason is the ultimate, the only arbiter and judge of whatever truth it considers. This profession, which is at times very loud, is nevertheless in fact accompanied by

a very real subservience to authorities in science, leading at one time to a very hasty adoption, at another to an equally unreasoning abandonment, of some view or theory supported only by some eminent scientific name. As an instance of this, I do not hesitate to mention evolution, by no means a new theory, but known to ancient philosophers, and even in India<sup>1</sup> and China, but grown into sudden favor, though without proof, in the scientific world of to-day. It is thus placed in the mouth of a fashionable lady by an eminent English writer and statesman: "Read this new book, *The Revelations of Chaos*. . . . What is most interesting is the way in which man has been developed. You know all is development. The principle is perpetually going on. First there was nothing, then there was something; then I forget the next—I think there were shells, then fishes; then we came—let me see, did we come next? Never mind that, we came at last. And the next change there will be something very superior to us, something with wings. Ah! that's it; we were fishes, and I believe we shall be crows."<sup>2</sup>

Now, no objections could be made rightly to the procedures of the scientific world if it kept itself strictly to the province of experimental truth, accepting no theories without proof, compelling each science to observe its own bounds, never assuming that there is no truth beyond the limits of its discoveries, or that there is no God who can directly make known to us truths we could not of ourselves discover. And since rules of right and wrong, and obligations to believe and act, may be conceived to result from such disclosures, the scientific world is bound by its own principles to refrain from pronouncing upon

<sup>1</sup> Brahma is conceived as the eternal self-existent being, which on its material side unfolds itself to the world by gradually condensing itself to material objects, through the gradations of ether, fire, water, earth, and other elements." "In the later

system of emanation of Sankhya there is a more marked approach to a materialistic doctrine of evolution."—Mr. Sully on "Evolution" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

<sup>2</sup> Disraeli's *Tancred*, Bk. II., Ch. IX.

the ultimate principles of morality and religion. "It is wonderful," we might say, in Bishop Butler's words, "that such an attempt should be made by any but such as are weak enough to think they are acquainted with the whole system of things."<sup>1</sup> We do not condemn the deference to the collective wisdom of the scientific world: what all men, or, more specifically, what all cultivated men know of natural knowledge is more than what any one man knows, and such knowledge is increased and certified by sympathy and coöperation; and, as a matter of fact, the majority of the educated hold their knowledge of the highest scientific truths upon authority rather than their own research or verification. We condemn the assumption that there is no real knowledge beside this experimental knowledge of God's works. We hold that there is evidence of a vast and complex revelation in God's Word; that this revelation is not simply in the words of the sacred books, but in the constitution and history of the heavenly kingdom to which they were given, and whose possession they are. That kingdom bears to their interpretation a relation similar to that of the learned world to scientific truth. The Church knows the whole of divine truth, revealed with a completeness, a certainty, an assurance, which can belong to no individual, but may be imparted to each according to his measure. She is the nearest copy upon earth of that utopian commonwealth imagined by the great author of the *Analogy*,<sup>2</sup> that might be reasonably conceived as taking possession of the whole earth, because in her the greatest capacities have recognition and employment, and all, of whatever degree, find themselves safe and happy in her protection and guidance. Her faith expresses the best wisdom of all, and her achievements the united strength of all. In it is help for every individual weakness, and protection from the utmost effort of external violence. The very existence of this heavenly kingdom proves how superior are her wisdom, public spirit, inviolable union, and mutual fidelity to the

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, Pt. I., Ch. I., p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Part I., Ch. III., § 8.

false self-interest, the confederacies in injustice, the factions and treacheries that are banded in the world against her. To her, as Christ's bride, belongs the promise: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that shall rise in judgment against thee, thou shalt condemn." And to her Head, the heavenly Bridegroom, is given the assurance that "all people, nations, and languages should serve Him."

## LECTURE IX.

---

### HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

HISTORY, as part of education, is of practical benefit, a regulator of life and conduct (*vitæ magistra*), correcting the vagueness and extravagance of theory, giving useful examples and inspiring incentives to action. The secular history of states and polities is the substance of the instruction in a school for statesmen; it is a training in various learning, in the laws of evidence, and in the knowledge of man. It exhibits principles in action, the strength and the weakness of beliefs, of customs, and of forms of government, the power of race and of climate. While individual history or biography has a peculiar interest, the career of communities, or masses of human beings, is more striking and more valuable, because man's nature, as Aristotle remarked, is essentially "political," or gregarious, and its highest qualities are developed only by union or antagonism.

Secular history is part of the evidence for religion, because the subject of prophecy, as for example the career of the five empires. But the Church besides being a religion is also a visible polity, called sometimes, in reference to the relation of its members and rulers, a republic or an association of republics; and again, with reference to its Head, always in its midst, whether visible or invisible, a kingdom governed by officers and laws, having forms of admission and exclusion, rewarding, punishing, supporting, educating, and having active and vital relations with

all human beings, in every race, under every government, as citizens or as individuals, believing or unbelieving, indifferent or hostile. The Church has a career, as an external, real organization in the world, whether as a theocracy or monarchy among the Jewish people, or as the Kingdom of God, or of Christ, or of Heaven, since the birth of the Messiah. This very career is in one of its aspects part of human history. If it be also, as we firmly believe it is, the history of the interposition of the Almighty for the enlightenment and redemption of the human race, the evidence of that supremely important fact will appear in the great outlines of the history itself. Not alone in signs and wonders and the outstretched arm of Omnipotence, in the case of individuals or upon great occasions, but in the flow of events through the lapse of centuries, in the issues of struggles where at one time nations, at another doctrines or schools, were the combatants, in permanent changes in the fortunes of the human race upon the wide theatre of the world, we are to look at the proof that in one polity at least, existing in the world, and drawing human creatures to itself, yet not deriving its life from human wisdom or strength, God has been present, as He has been nowhere else, to preserve among men truth and goodness, religion and virtue.

The history of the Church since the birth of Christ is often grouped under three great periods: the first extending to the recognition of Christianity by the first Christian emperor, just before the Council of Nice; the second comprising the Middle Ages, in the first part of which was the final struggle with paganism, and in the second part the founding of new nations; and, lastly, the third period since the Reformation. In the first of these periods the Church may be said to have conquered the *indifference* of the world; in the second, to have triumphed over the stupidity and rudeness of man; and now, in the third period, to hold aloft the witness to supernatural truth, amid the dissensions of Christians themselves, and the perversions

of the very light and knowledge for which she has made a home amid mankind.

To different minds the tokens of divine power will appear with greater or less evidence in each of these periods. The perfect unity, the meek endurance, the holy firmness, the unclouded faith, the flaming charity, which in the first period were crowned with so splendid a triumph, will to many minds always appear as almost the only victory worthy of the bride of Christ. To such in the spectacle of the second period, when not the knowledge alone, but the wealth and power of the world passed into the Church's possession, and the shadows of idolatry, cruelty, and pride made schism possible in the heavenly kingdom, there was a deeper humiliation than when Christians worshipped in upper rooms and catacombs. There is without doubt a class of believers to whom the simple direction of the world's affairs in Christ's name, or by nominal Christians, seems a higher honor to the true religion than the unworldly virtues and patient endurance of the saints and martyrs of early days. They also in their hearts, though not perhaps in theory, imagine there is some compensation for the loss of unity, in the greater independence and energy of disciples who, refusing the Church's yoke, do not, nevertheless, despise the Christian's name. The characteristic evils that have afflicted the Church in its successive ages are not unlike, though in a reversed order, the characteristic perils that come upon the different periods of the life of man. Her triumph over physical pain and varied trial in the early ages, when she came forth with a clear faith and settled canon of Scripture, resembles the calmness of mature wisdom after the combat of life; her condition in the Middle Ages is like the struggle between two wills in the breast of the adult servant of God; the contradictions and rebellions of modern days are more akin to the loud clash of youthful passion chafing at the restraints of God's law. Thus her Lord in His humanity endured the temptation of appetite, of worldly ambition, and of spiritual

pride. And the order of their presentation to Him we find, by comparing the holy Gospels, was varied.

There was a peculiar anticipation in Jewish history of the fortunes of the Catholic Church. The period of the theocracy may be likened to the ante-Nicene age, for in both, terrible external suffering was followed by singular peace, and then a new order of trials, arising from pampered hearts and internal dissensions. The substitution in Israel of the monarchy for the theocracy finds its parallel in the development of the papacy, a change for which similar arguments of expediency pleaded among Jews and among Christians. Finally the dissolution of national unity and the loss of independence that followed the captivity in Babylon anticipated the schisms that have vexed the Church since the Reformation, introduced, among other portentous signs, by the warfare upon the pope made by a king of France, who took for his battle-cry, "I will destroy Babylon."<sup>1</sup> The popes, on the other hand, characterized their residence in Avignon as a "Babylonish captivity."

Now, looking in turn at the three chief periods of the Church's history, what are the special evidences of God's Presence, the proofs of a supernatural religion, that appear in each?

I. In the period which extends to about the Nicene Council, A.D. 325, this is what presents itself to our view: A new religion had taken possession of the Roman world, and of regions besides, as Tertullian says,<sup>2</sup> into which the Roman arms had not yet penetrated. This is a fact difficult to grasp in its just proportions. The Roman dominion was then virtually an universal empire; it governed the best part of civilization, the regions and the races which still rule the world. From the Euphrates to farthest Spain, from North Africa, then densely popu-

<sup>1</sup> Louis XII. issued coins stamped which are given in Liebe's *Commentatio*.  
 "Perdam Babylonem" or "Perdam  
 Babylonis Nomen," engravings of

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Jud.*, Ch. VII. Cf. *Apol.*,  
 Ch. XXXVII.

lated, to Britain and the forests of Germany and Scythia, imperial roads prepared for the legions a march swift and effective. Yet over all these, with an advance as steady and in quicker time than the empire had been reared, the twelve apostles of the Prince of Peace, and their successors, had passed, and had reared a structure not only in every province of the empire, but beyond its limits, and destined to surpass it in continuance. Amid barbarous tribes, in the remote East where civilization stagnated, in Ethiopia, in Armenia,<sup>1</sup> in Persia, in India, on the Malabar coast, and probably beyond, the preaching of the cross resounded, and its echoes many generations after came to the ears of those who, from Western Christendom, by another route, penetrated these forgotten regions.

Perhaps it may be useful to attempt a kind of material measure of this great fact. The population of the empire in the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41-51) is estimated by Gibbon at 120,000,000.<sup>2</sup> By the time of the reign of the Antonines (A.D. 138-180), the most prosperous period in the career of Rome, it is not unlikely that the population had more than twice doubled. Many disasters checked the increase of the next two hundred years. Yet certain typical facts will help us, if not to an exact enumeration, still to a probable estimate, both of the empire and of the number of Christians. In the reign of the elder Justin (A.D. 527-561), when 250,000 people perished in the earthquake that afflicted Antioch, it is believed that it had half a million inhabitants. S. Chrysostom (A.D. 354-407) states that in his time the Christians formed more than half of the population, and that 3,000 widows and virgins were supported in that city by the alms of the faithful.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This, the first *nation* that embraced Christianity, as is believed on good ground, it is curious should have been expressly excepted by Gibbon from conversion in the ante-Nicene age, a mistake he promised to correct, but never did correct, as

Porson often forcibly reminded him. *Decl. and Fall*, Ch. XV. Milman on note 178.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. II., Vol. I., p. 53.

<sup>3</sup> S. Chrysostom, *Opera*, L. VII., pp. 658, 810; T. I., p. 592. See Lardner's *Credibility*, XII., 370.

There were above 500 clergy in the church at Carthage at one time. Gregory of Nyssa found but seventeen Christians in his native Neo-Cesarea, and he left there but seventeen heathen. About the year A.D. 330, the bishops of twenty-three dioceses in Persia suffered martyrdom, and in one diocese 250 of the clergy died with their bishop. If we add the dioceses in thickly populated North Africa, a region 2,360 miles long, to those in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, we have about the year A.D. 450, 600 dioceses; the patriarchate of Antioch had 164; the patriarchate of Jerusalem, 48; the patriarchate of Constantinople, 600; the patriarchate of Rome, if we add Italy, Spain, France, England, and Ireland, 525: making a total of 1,937 dioceses, to which must be added 100 dioceses more in Persia, India, and Ethiopia. It has been estimated that in all these dioceses there were 225,000,000 of Christians; and of these 173,000,000 were in Asia and Africa—where at this day there are not, it seems likely, one-quarter of this number.<sup>1</sup> In Daniel's *Lehrbuch der Geographie* for 1885, there are said to be 432,000,000 of Christians out of the 1,435,000,000<sup>2</sup> of the human species.

The lapse of fourteen centuries may have changed the proportion of Christians to less than one-third of the population of the globe, while in the middle of the fifth century it seems nearly certain that they exceeded one-half, at least, of the known world. Upon this transcendent fact let us now try to fix our thoughts.

It was an outward change in that ancient world, a

<sup>1</sup> Chapin's *Primitive Church*, Ch. XXX., p. 404. New Haven, 1842.

<sup>2</sup> Distributed as follows: Roman Catholics, 208,000,000; Protestants, 123,000,000; Orthodox Eastern, 83,000,000; one hundred various sects, 8,000,000; Jews, 8,000,000; Muhammedans, 120,000,000; Brahmanists, 138,000,000; Buddhists, 503,000,000. Now (that is, 1886) two considerable

authorities, Dr. Legge, professor of Chinese at Oxford, thirty years a missionary in China, and Sir Monier-Monier Williams, Boden professor of Sanscrit at Oxford, and an Oriental scholar of wide reputation, have given the authority of their names to the statement that there are not more than 100,000,000 Buddhists in the whole world.

revolution whose measure could be taken by many standards of daily, sensible life. It powerfully affected the administration of the government, the conduct of the army, the schools of philosophy, the business, the pleasures, the social and domestic life of the great mass of the public. A change of religion must intimately modify in detail the customs, public and private, of every subject of the Roman Empire. And still what was outward in this marvellous transformation was little compared with the inward revolution and uplifting in every soul in that great pagan world that accepted with heartfelt faith the truths of the Christian religion.

The religion of Christ distinctly refused any compromise with the religions and religious customs of heathenism. The "inflexible obstinacy" with which Christians of every class declined to comply with familiar customs involving idol worship, joined to every station, occupation, important event, and practised often no doubt as a mere form, an indifferent matter, with little thought of its meaning, became a constant and obnoxious charge against this new religion. The emperor and the inferior magistrates reprov'd it as treason against authority, philosophers and the literary class denounced it as senseless and unsocial pride, while the mass who are readily stirred to panics by party cries and rumors of public danger, were often moved to treat the Christians on this account as the cause of the anger of the gods when any disaster fell upon the state. A famine, an earthquake, a plague, a defeat in war, would awaken the cry, "Death to the atheists," "The Christians to the lions." For to those who knew no more of Christians than this external and popular view, the belief in one God, invisible and supreme, seemed only a form of denial of the gods; and the Christians' horror of all worship offered to an idol, a morose and wicked contempt of sacred things. A Christian could enter upon no public office before the reign of Constantine, could not enlist in the legion, could hardly build a house, buy a piece of property, depart upon a

journey or return ; nay, could with difficulty walk through a public street, without doing some act, or refusing to do some act, or make some gesture, that awakened suspicion or kindled hostility against him. Now, the triumph of the religion of Christ in the Roman world meant no less than the omission and change of all such acts and customs, or at least the tolerance of their omission, even when no opposing custom took their place.

A change like this is difficult for the imagination to realize. But wonderful as it is, it is not more difficult to conceive than the methods by which it was accomplished. Christianity is the only religion that ever was disseminated solely by persuasion, by missionaries, arguing, teaching, offering intellectual and moral proofs of its truth. It won all its great triumphs by these methods alone, combined with the unmerited sufferings, the patience, the charity, the courage, of its early disciples and preachers. This religion taught believers to be good citizens, faithful in the family relation as fathers, mothers, children, helpful toward all human beings, truthful, industrious, self-controlled, while at the same time it disclosed an entirely new view of the Author of the world, and of the relation of man's race to Him, and of its members to one another.

Nothing can be more evident than that the religion which obtained the mastery in the Roman world in the fourth century possessed a clear, consistent doctrine, taught with authority as directly revealed from God, and incapable of being confused with either any phase of natural religion or any opposing or rival teaching. This doctrine was the animating life of the Church which enforced also the observance of certain sacraments and certain rules of life with a like inflexible and firm fidelity. The first and deepest instinct of a Christian was that he had heard a message directly from his Father in heaven ; that to keep it inviolate, to make others around him sharers in it, or to hear it for themselves, to avoid as spiritual death every form of the prevailing idolatry, was the highest of duties, the chief end of life, and martyrdom

for it a glorious honor. The inflexibility in faith, combined with firmness in action, characteristic of Christians, exhibits the same strong principle of life in its conflict first with the Jews, next with the pagans, and then with heresies either within or on the borders of the fold. Christians believed the religion disclosed to the Jewish people, but insisted without hesitation upon the Church's interpretation of the Scriptures of the old revelation. For this the Jews persecuted them often more implacably than did the heathen. Christians recognized all that was noble and sound in heathen philosophy and literature, but sternly refused to put any sage or any utterance on a level with Holy Scripture. The irritation which this caused is illustrated in the malice with which the philosopher Crescens hunted S. Justin Martyr to his death. The just authority of magistrates, the necessary services of citizens, were acknowledged by all Christians and discharged with readiness and fidelity; <sup>1</sup> but not even the threatening of torture or death, or loss of civic honor or property, could force the young and tender disciple, often a child or a woman, to pass the line that separated patriotism and loyalty from idol and demon worship, though this line was often hidden and seemed obliterated by indifferent and perfunctory acts. The unyielding consistency of the Church was perhaps never put to a greater strain, however, than in her contention with the heretics who claimed at times to be her own children, and almost invariably insisted that their tenets were sanctioned by Holy Scripture. It was comparatively easy to overthrow

<sup>1</sup>“The Christian religion has all the marks of the utmost justice and utility, but none more apparent than the severe injunction it lays upon all to yield obedience to the magistrate, and to maintain and defend the laws. What a wonderful example of this has the Divine Wisdom left us, which, to establish the salvation of mankind, and to conduct His glorious victory over death and sin, would do it after no other way but at the mercy of our ordinary political organization; subjecting the progress and issue of so high and salutary an effect to the blindness and injustice of our customs and observances; sacrificing the innocent blood of so many of His own elect, and so long a loss of many years, to the maturing of this inestimable fruit.”—Montaigne, *Essais*, T. I., p. 178. Paris, 1826.

the worship of Jupiter, of Apollo, or of Bacchus; to expose the abominations of the mysteries and many obscene rites; to point to the weaknesses of deified heroes; to lay bare the contradictions and levity of the philosophers and sophists. But when Jews denied and debased the sense of the Hebrew Scriptures whose letter they so rigidly guarded; when Gnostics mingled Persian dualism or Brahmanic mysticism with Christian doctrines; when Marcion profaned the Old Testament and mutilated the New; when Praxeas confounded the Persons of the Divine nature; when Apollinaris mutilated the manhood, and Arius denied the Godhead, of the Son of Man; when a defender like Tertullian narrowed the catholicity or surrendered the charity of the Church; while an Origen admitted too freely into Scriptural interpretation the theories and dreams of the speculative intellect: then the Church perceived both the strength of her divine organization and the clearness of her inspired apprehension of sacred truth put to a severer test.

The Church which triumphed in the fourth century gave these three tokens of supernatural origin, of being sent into the world as the messenger of the Almighty and the All Wise to the race of men: she brought to men who had lost the possession of truth a clear, consistent, noble doctrine concerning God and concerning man; she withstood, by the simple strength of innocence and spiritual purity, the utmost rage and tyranny of worldly power;<sup>1</sup> she finally answered, without self-contradiction, the difficult questions, the doubts, the ensnaring problems raised within and without her borders, concerning the leading doctrines and practices of the Christian life.

II. The second period of Church history, that from the Nicene age to the Reformation, is often divided into two—that which closed with the image controversy, and that which beheld the rise and development of the mod-

<sup>1</sup> Her reward may perhaps be expressed in Shakespeare's words of *II., 2.* poetic insight: "Nothing almost sees miracles but misery."—*Lear*,

ern nations of Europe. Looking at the comparative influence of Christianity in the first ages and in the whole mediæval period, it is somewhat like passing from the antediluvian world to that after the Flood. The Church conquered the Roman world, it is true, unmistakably and irrevocably; the cross was reared high over the seven hills, the halls of the Senate, and the monuments of the Forum; the legions marched beneath its sign; the multitude thronged its basilicas, and swelled the pomp of its worship; saints and devotees from every rank in life founded orders and religious houses; and the whole fabric of society, domestic, social, and political, was moulded anew upon Christian customs. But this momentous change did not advance without many a passionate struggle and portentous anomaly; without relapses, and apostasies, and scandals that seemed more terrible than persecutions. The world streamed in upon the Church—the indifferent, the coarse, the luxurious; dioceses found themselves ruled by bishops who either could not grasp the Church's truth, or would not maintain it, or would barter it for some temporal gain; an emperor apostatized and attempted to restore paganism; political disaster invaded, and threatening barbarians began to hem in a decaying civilization. Then a cry arose throughout the Roman Empire, something like this: We have lost by becoming Christian the world's supremacy, which to our hearts seems a greater thing than our Christian faith and hopes. The image controversy was often promoted in apparently reckless indifference whether the usages of the heathen should be sanctioned in Christian worship, or not. Then, over Christian Africa and Asia, rose like a judgment the dread portent of Muhammedanism, where the cunning of Satan built upon an assertion of God's honor a religion the most effective the world has yet seen to sanction cruelty and lust. The Church of Christ had then in Europe a task set for her, compared with which the conversion of the Roman world may at times have seemed easy. The most strenuous, the most manly,

the most vigorous portions of the human race had to be trained, brought out of barbarism to civilization, taught manners, taught religion, moulded into nations. Skilful teachers find their truest success in the lives of their pupils reproducing the best wisdom of those who are passing away. But when a pupil possesses strong and positive traits there comes the danger, lest in the result the scholar, and not the teacher, shall seem the true master. But the religion of Ignatius and Justin Martyr, of Athanasius and Chrysostom, was the same religion as that of Bede and Boniface, of Lanfranc and Anselm, though human nature cannot easily furnish a wider contrast than that between the populace of Alexandria or of Constantinople, and the Germans to whom Boniface preached or the Saxons and Normans of the time of the Conqueror. The religion of Christ produced heroes amid an enervated civilization; again, it brought forth saints from a nation of heroes. Even what was fantastic in chivalry was touched with a gleam of nobility and religion. Perhaps the most striking exhibition of the identity of the religion of the primitive and of the middle ages can be seen in the typical women, who, as Libanius, the pagan teacher of Basil and of Chrysostom, and the friend of Julian, perceived, were the peculiar product and glory of the Christian religion.<sup>1</sup> Anthusa and Monica, the mothers of S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine, have their parallels in the mothers of S. Bernard and Peter the Venerable. Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert, renewed the fame of Lydia and of Damaris; and with Helena, the mother of Constantine, we may compare Hildegarde and Beatrice, and the Countess Matilda, the friend of Hildebrand.

<sup>1</sup> "We see in the clever letters of S. Jerome the Roman matrons who claimed descent from the Gracchi and Emili . . . to what a pitch the Church had brought female education. . . The Vulgate was begun simply to satisfy the keen impatience [for knowledge of the Scriptures] of Paula and Eustochia; it was to them that he dedicated the books of Joshua, Judges, Kings, Ruth, Esther, the Psalms, Isaiah, and the twelve minor prophets."—Fred. Ozanam, *Hist. of Civilization in Fifth Century*, Vol. I., pp. 65, 66; Vol. II., pp. 79, 80. Lond., 1867.

The transformation of the Bishop of Rome, during the latter half of the middle period, from the primacy admitted in the great councils, to be universal pontiff,<sup>1</sup> infallible and irresponsible, a reflection in the Church of the Roman emperor in the State—a change not fully consummated till the Vatican Council of 1869—this change history shows to have rapidly advanced under the influence of the false decretals, and to have been welcomed by many, in days of violence, as a needful and desirable concentration of authority, with a feeling akin to that which doubtless led many in Israel to favor the setting up of the monarchy when threatened with such as Nahash the Ammonite, though they acknowledged in theory that “God was their king.” Experience, however, has developed the perils of pushing even a sound principle, like that of authority in religion, to extremes. The abuses of worldly rule, nay, the caprices of tyranny, have been combined with the divine constitution of the Kingdom of God. The great Eastern Church, since the middle of the eleventh century,<sup>2</sup> has been separated from the West. The primitive episcopate has been much modified, if not suppressed, under the Roman obedience.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The title “Universal or Ecumenical Patriarch,” used by Justinian (*Novell.*, VII., 16–42) of the Patriarch of Constantinople, was first assumed by John the Faster, A.D. 587, gave great offence to the bishop of Rome, “propter nefandum elationis vocabulum,” and condemned by Gregory the Great.—*Ep.*, VII., 33; V., 43.

<sup>2</sup> The legates of Pope Leo IX. laid the sentence of excommunication against the Eastern patriarch upon the altar of the Church of St. Sophia, in Constantinople, on the 16th of July, 1054. (Gieseler, II., 480.)

<sup>3</sup> The Greek view of the hierarchy was expressed by the imperial plenipotentiary, Baanes, in 869, thus: “Posuit Deus Ecclesiam suam in

quinque patriarchiis, et definiuit in Evangeliiis suis, ut nunquam, aliquando penitus decidant, eo quod capita Ecclesie sint. (*Mansi*, XVI., 140.) So in the letter of Peter of Antioch (in *Cotelerii Mon. Eccle. Gr.*, II., 114): *πέντε ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ ὑπὸ τῆς θείας ὠκονομήθη χάριτός εἶναι Πατριάρχας . . . καὶ τὸ σῶμα δε πάλιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἢ τῶν πιστῶν λέγω Ἐκκλησία, ὑπὸ πέντε αἰθρηθέντων οἰκονομούμενον τῶν εἰρημένων μεγάλων θρόνων, ὑπὸ μιᾶς ἄγεται κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ φημι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.* The Romans allowed this comparison, but added: *Sedes quia Romana præcellet, non immerito visui comparatur.*—Anastasii, præf. in Conc., VIII. Generale. *Mansi*, XVI., 7.

The existence of Jephthah and Samson under David and Solomon would have been not less incongruous than such bishops as Gregory of Nyssa, Basil and Athanasius, Cyprian and Augustine, under the pontiffs Hildebrand and Innocent III. Yet the Church as a spiritual monarchy secured obedience to laws—that of Christian marriage, for instance—from magnates and powers that could have been hardly influenced by a primitive council of bishops. At times, too, voices, like S. Bernard's, were heard addressing both pontiffs and kings with a power not unlike that of the prophets under the kings of Israel.<sup>1</sup> But no deflection in the Church's constitution can hide the fact that the whole course of history in this formative period of Europe, in Muscovy, Hungary, Bulgaria, no less than in Germany, France, England, and Spain, was guided by religion, and felt the influence of Christian ideas at times all the more powerfully because the authority of the Church had been centred in a single hand. How different is the career of the nations of the ancient world, Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Macedonia, Greece, Rome, in their pagan civilization, from that of the great powers in modern times that can be paralleled with them! The modern civilization proves that individual man can be exalted and strengthened while civilized; the ancient

<sup>1</sup> The following is a later example. In a book addressed by Marin Labbé, bishop of Tilopolis and Coadjutor Vicar Apostolic of Cochin China, to Pope Clement XI., on the subject of the conduct of the Jesuits in China in the matter of the "Chinese rites," he disputes the lawfulness of various concessions made by the Jesuits to their native converts in the matter of retaining certain usages of their former heathenism, such as the worship of the visible heavens, of Confucius, and of their ancestors. Bishop Labbé puts aside the Jesuit defence, that this "meant no more than affectionate

commemoration of deceased kindred and benefactors at social and festival gatherings," by pointing out "that the commemoration took place in temples," that the addresses to Confucius and to these ancestors were petitions to them "for the acquisition of graces, for the averting of perils and evils," and were therefore "blank idolatry, however speciously defended."—*Lettre de M. Marin Labbé . . . au Pape. Anvers, 1702.* It is certain that Bishop Labbé's principles would also condemn much of the popular invocation of saints in the Roman Church.

exhibits the degradation and corruption of the individual, surrendering all conception of his immortal soul.<sup>1</sup> This fact by itself marks the presence and influence of the supernatural religion.

III. The modern period of the Church, since what we term the Reformation, exhibits the excesses of the principle of individual independence, as the previous period had shown the exaggeration of the central authority. The great national Church of England, and the offshoots of the British Empire, returned to the primitive constitution of the Nicene age. This nineteenth century has seen a glorious revival<sup>2</sup> in it of Christian life and missionary zeal comparable to anything that has appeared since the apostolic days. But over the whole area of her labors, over every part of the world where the ruling races have penetrated, a hundred sects<sup>3</sup> jar the sweet harmonies of Christian truth into harsh discord, each claiming the Christian name, each raising aloft some fragment of the Scriptures or Christian principle, but all turning the Catholic Church and her majestic unity into a phantom or an abstraction, as the early gnostics, Ebionites, Marcionites, appellations now replaced by others no less un-Christian, turned the Lord himself into a

<sup>1</sup> "The spiritual quality was gone out of them, and the higher society of Rome was simply one of powerful animals."—Froude's *Cæsar*, p. 18. Am. ed.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Official Year-Book of the Church of England*, for 1885, it is stated that the sums contributed by Church people for religious purposes during the last twenty-five years amount to eighty-one million and a half pounds sterling (£81,500,000), of which £35,000,000 were for "church building, restoration and endowments, parsonage houses," etc. See, also, Dr. Schoell's article, "Tractarianismus," in *Real Encyclopædie*. Leipzig, 1885.

<sup>3</sup> There were 223 religious communities in England in 1886 (Whittaker's *Almanac*). A teacher in Harvard University, Joseph Royce, Ph.D., in a work just published (1886) on *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, says "he has no present connection with any visible religious body, and no sort of desire for any such connection." And it must be conceded that, logically, sectarianism leads to as many sects as there are individuals.

<sup>4</sup> See an eloquent passage in Kip's *Double Witness*, p. 76, "Two Voices," etc.

phantom Christ, that fled from Jesus the Son of Joseph and Mary at the moment of His crucifixion. Thus Protestant sectaries, among whom are found individuals, devout, learned, of great dialectic and pathetic power, earnestly and with apparent sincerity defend a revelation in which nothing certain has been revealed, exalt evangelic union which unites those only who have the right to differ, sets up a unanimity which expressly excludes unity, and contend above all things for the truth—that is, truth in general, which does not allow that any statement in particular can be pronounced true or false,<sup>1</sup> far less that any one can be saved by the truth or lost through error. Let no one suspect these statements of exaggeration or satire: they can be proved as easily from the pages of Schaff and Nevin and Bersier, as from those of Buckle and Lecky.

The fact already mentioned, namely, that since the loss of the Church's unity her missionary energy has been paralyzed, so that, while fourteen hundred years ago Christians were more than half the human race, now, after these centuries of contention, of enlightenment, of material progress, they are less than one-third—432,000,000 out of the 1,435,000,000, as Daniel affirms—this fact, I say, furnishes the true comment upon the experience through which we have passed. The Christian conquest of the world may be compared with the victory predicted to Israel in the land of promise. It was not to be instantaneous, but “little by little;” it was conditioned upon faithfulness, the making of “no covenant” with God's enemies, the avoidance of the snare of compromise and indifference. When Israel became faithless, they lapsed into a province of a pagan empire. In a similar way Christian sects treat the fragments of revelation like the different articles of natural religion.<sup>2</sup> But the religion of Christ has not been proved to be false. Has, then, the glorious host that “looked forth as the morning, fair as

<sup>1</sup> “Ay and no, too, was no good divinity.”—Shakespeare, *Lear*, IV., 6.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xxiii. 27-33.

the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," suffered defeat, or met with a check equivalent to a repulse? Four hundred and thirty-two millions—more, perhaps, than the population of the world in the Nicene age—cannot be viewed as the remnant of a defeated army. She hath still in her face that which the faithful servant in the tragedy yet acknowledged in his king, though discrowned, namely, *authority*.<sup>1</sup> What is it, then, that keeps back such a host, which contains the fairest and best, the flower and the prime of humanity, from assured and speedy victory?

This may rightly be considered as part of a larger, perhaps still darker, problem. The great master of analogy, when vindicating the moral government of God,<sup>2</sup> had to meet the difficulty that the world, as actually constituted, proves to multitudes a school of vice rather than of virtue, and that for aught we know its anomalies may go on through an indefinite future. Following Butler's lead in his reply, we may say of revealed truth what he says of virtue—that faith is not forced upon man any more than obedience; that the Almighty has plainly shown Himself to be the Author of a revelation; that both truth and certainty can be attained by the help already given; that the triumphs of the past are a real pledge and promise of future victory; that the glorious facts and truths of revealed religion are the rightful possession and perfection of immortal souls. Our probation as Christians is, then, a reflection of our natural probation as men; and the great problem of the world is continually reproduced in individual experience.

<sup>1</sup> *King Lear*, I., 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Butler's Analogy*, I., 5.

## LECTURE X.

---

### THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

OUR present argument is, in fact, but a branch of the more general argument, just considered, for the supernatural origin of the religion of Christ derived from the history of the Church. The importance and excellence, the consistency and unchangeableness of the doctrine of the Church, viewed as a whole, are the feature of the evidence we now seek to bring into view. It is necessary that the divine origin and authority of the Catholic Church, as a visible and organized body in the world, be recognized as an antecedent condition or foundation for a sound and effective argument from the character of Christian doctrine. The reason is because it is not possible to pronounce what is Christian doctrine except as the mind and meaning of the Church. No individual, inspired or uninspired, can teach us this in its fulness, except as the representative of the Church, which supplements his deficiencies. Not even entire Scripture can put us in possession of the body of Christian doctrine apart from the witness and interpretation of the Church.

It may be objected that we express an individual judgment when we pronounce even in favor of the importance and excellence of Christian doctrine. This is true. But what is here meant is that the body of doctrine on which the individual soul passes judgment is the doctrine proposed to it for belief by Christ's Church, not simply collected by its own ratiocination and search out of sacred

documents. And the argument I now make for the divine origin of this religion is that the Christian doctrine, witnessed not by one or two authorities, however eminent, nor even by any single branch of the Church at a particular time, but by the entire Church at all times and in all places, has an elevation, a firmness, a sublimity, a fitness for man's needs, indicating unmistakably that it was revealed to man by his all-wise and all-merciful Maker and Redeemer. The favorable judgment which each soul passes upon this message is in fact its reception and acknowledgment of its Creator's goodness.

It is almost an axiom, that the first step in every kind of knowledge is the confession of ignorance. No one will learn what he thinks he already knows. It is vain for any one to listen to evidences for a revelation, who repeats in his own soul the foolish blasphemy, either that there is no God, or that He can never be known, or that He cannot reveal Himself to man, or that man is the product of chance, or that there is no spiritual life, no duty, no virtue, no right and wrong. Every one, moreover, is further entangled in the snare of these degrading and wicked sophisms who is permitted to say without rebuke that no one person knows more about these subjects than any other person, and that no body of human beings can tell us more than any individual human being. This absurd fallacy has been swallowed by the enlightenment of our day, notwithstanding the evidence of all human history that man is a social being, and that whatever is valuable has been secured to him through society, and lost by him in isolation.

But even for those who have no doubt of the great articles of natural religion—the Being and unity of God, the immortality and accountability of man, the supremacy of conscience, the immutability of right and wrong—there is need of the further confession, that man is too weak to retain these truths without assistance, that unless God give him help he can neither think rightly nor act fittingly, but is likely to sink rather than to rise, as life

goes on. Here is a being whose powers are disordered, who sees better than he can do, and whose very power of seeing the truth and the right fluctuates, so that mists and darkness on the morrow intercept the bright vision of to-day.

Now, the judgment of a being in this condition we affirm may be sound and valuable upon the importance and excellence of a doctrine revealed concerning God, or concerning the nature of man, or concerning the relations between man and God, because it is a judgment upon a practical and not merely speculative interest, upon an offer of help in a real emergency, a guide amid obscurity, food and medicine to one sick and famishing.

I. What, then, do we learn from the history of Christian doctrine concerning the most important of subjects, that which lies at the foundation of religion, the nature of God? Has Revelation disclosed anything definite, has it borne steadfast witness to one consistent view of this the one chief truth? Let us first reflect for a moment upon what history has shown us to be the fortune of this primary fact of religion amid the various races of man. Nothing is more certain than that in Egypt, in China, in India, in Persia, amid the states of Greece, in Italy, in Germany and Britain, nay, even in the islands of the ocean and amid the early American races, some acknowledgment and worship of one supreme God prevailed in the very oldest period, and were succeeded uniformly by polytheism and idolatry. We need not repeat the evidence of this given in our first course, neither is it needful to repeat the lessons of Jewish history upon this great article of the unity of God. If that history teaches anything, it teaches that the tendency inherent in human nature was as powerful among the Jews as elsewhere, and was corrected by the only method ever found adequate to oppose an effectual resistance, God's visible Church, or people, teaching and upholding within its own borders God's revelation of Himself. The first Christian martyr was slain by Jews for expounding this same truth in con-

nection with their temple worship. The Jews would not understand S. Stephen proclaiming to them the true nature of Him "who dwelleth not in temples made with hands," because they had already determined to reject Him to whom their whole Scriptures and ritual pointed, whose Incarnation made of human nature the true temple, whereof that in Jerusalem was but a figure. S. Paul and S. Barnabas, when they wrought a miracle before pagans in Asia Minor in attestation of their message from the true God, found themselves in danger of being worshipped as the very false gods, Jupiter and Mercury, whose sway it was their purpose to overthrow. In the centre of enlightenment, on the hill of Athens, the Apostle to the Gentiles turned the thoughts of the acute and polished Greek to the truth and inference, so easy to the Christian mind, so invariably missed and lost by Greek and barbarian alike outside the Catholic Church, that man, being the offspring of God, bore witness by this very fact to that perfection in his Maker's nature of which gold and precious stones were but poor symbols.<sup>1</sup>

What was the fortune of the great truth touching God's nature, when the Church began to take possession of the wisdom and power of the world? The intellect of man did not yield to the authority of Revelation without many a fierce struggle. The dogmatic history of the Church has been likened to the voyage of a ship through a stormy and dangerous sea. It has still been preserved, in spite of the terrors and weakness of those who at once guide it and are conveyed in it. The doctrine concerning God, like other parts of the Church's system, has been defended and preserved by both her children and by heretics, who at one time were faithful and then fell into error; so that the result handed on as the Christian heritage is due to no individual teacher or school, but is like the work of one overmastering mind, controlling events, ruling amid disputes, so as to set the truth in the end high amid clear evidence. Eusebius, in a

<sup>1</sup> Acts, vii. 47-50; xiv. 11-18; xvii. 24-29.

well-known passage of his history, casts this retrospect over the career of the Church: "The attempts [of the enemy] did not avail him, truth ever consolidating itself, and, as time goes on, shining into broader day. For while the devices of adversaries were extinguished at once, undone by their very impetuosity—one heresy after another presenting its own novelty, the former specimens ever dissolving and wasting variously in manifold and multiform shapes—the brightness of the Catholic and only true Church went forward, increasing and enlarging, yet ever in the same things and in the same way, beaming on the whole race of Greeks and barbarians with the awfulness, and simplicity, and nobleness, and sobriety, and purity of its divine polity and philosophy."<sup>1</sup>

The earliest Christian writers had to meet the charge of atheism, and when they unfolded the argument from design<sup>2</sup> they at the same time pressed home the evidence for the unity of God. When it became needful to methodise and show the consistency of the words of Scripture, concerning God; and the two natures, divine and human, of the Son of God, and the mysterious Trinity, three Persons in one divine substance, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, had to be set forth in creed and catechism, commended to faith and reverence, freed from misconception, vindicated from the carping and petulance of heresy and unbelief—then the ark of salvation entered upon a perilous voyage, over treacherous waters, where the divine arm and wisdom alone could insure a safe passage. S. Justin<sup>3</sup> once seems to include the "host of good angels" in the same worship as that paid to the Son of God. Tertullian<sup>4</sup> is heterodox as to the Son's eternal existence; and Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatian, and Hippolytus make His generation temporary. Eusebius

<sup>1</sup> Euseb., *Eccl. Hist.*, IV., 7. τοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα . . . καὶ

<sup>2</sup> See this in Theophilus *ad Autoly-* τὸν . . . ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων  
*cum*, V., combined with a beautiful στρατὸν . . . σεβόμεθα καὶ  
appeal to man's innate consciousness προοικνυόμεν. *Apol.*, I., 6.  
(init.).

<sup>4</sup> *Contra Herm.*, III. Fuit tempus

<sup>3</sup> ἐμείνον τε καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐ- cum Filius non fuit.

was an Arian. On the other hand, we find the word "Trinity" in S. Theophilus, S. Clement, S. Hippolytus, Tertullian, S. Cyprian, Origen, and S. Methodius. It is clear that words not found in Holy Scripture were utilized and consecrated for the defence of revealed doctrine. A manner of speech formed by Platonists, or even Gnostics, was not rejected in the theology of S. John. It has been remarked that S. Gregory Nazianzen and S. Basil digested into form the theological principles of Origen, and that S. Hilary and S. Ambrose are indebted to the same great writer for their interpretations of Scripture; and traces of Tertullian, even in the nearly heretical treatises, have been detected in the finished sentences of S. Leo.

If we look through the course of the controversy that began with the denial of the two natures of Christ by Apollinaris, condemned by Damasus; mark how, in the reaction, the doctrine of two Persons was put forward by Theodore of Mopsuestia; then observe the error of Nestorius, till it was condemned by the third Œcumenical Council; the shifting of the controversy in the case of Eutyches, condemned at Chalcedon; then the rise of the old errors, in a new shape, in Monothelism, anathematized in the Sixth; then the final overthrow of Nestorianism in the form of Adoptianism in Spain, at the Council of Frankfort: it is easy enough to see that the Church's decisions were thoroughly consistent throughout; that she had a clear, single, exact vision of her great doctrine; that one false step in the long struggle would have led to irretrievable confusion and ruin. In this clear discernment, this quick and inflexible grasp of the divine truth, amid conflicting teachers and schools, we therefore discover the Divine Presence in the Church, promised for her preservation to the end of time. We should mark how the conclusion comes after a survey of the whole sweep and final result of many events, during which entire provinces and sections of the Church fell away; and three Popes, Liberius, Vigilius, Honorius, have left the burden of their defence to posterity. The Church made use

of every form of teaching and every variety of teacher; she assumed the direction of the world's power and learning; she proposed new laws, as she had overthrown the old laws, of nations; but through all, and at the end of all, she worshipped the same Lord who had first given her life, and had forsaken her at no period of her miraculous career.

She has presented to the faith and adoration of her children the noblest conception of God anywhere suggested by the wisest and best of the world, a Being one and absolutely perfect, having all power, all goodness, all wisdom, the source and cause of all other existence, animate and inanimate; this great truth the Church of Christ has inflexibly guarded. She has further enriched it with the disclosure that God is in very truth a Father to His intelligent creatures, regulating the career of each by His particular and loving providence; without seeking to explain the permission of evil, she has made it plain that God's government sets bounds to it and tends to overcome it. The Catholic Church has further made known that in the unity of the divine nature is a mysterious Trinity; so that as we are the children of an Almighty Father, we are the brethren of an Almighty Son who took to Himself our nature to redeem us, and that our spiritual life was begun and quickened by an omnipotent Spirit. The disclosure of what we owe to the Son and Spirit makes our duty of adoration and service to them as direct and imperative as that we owe to the Father. The mystery we acknowledge when we say three Persons and one God, describing a supernatural fact in inadequate human language, in no way detracts from the certainty of the great truth, which in its essence is at once the most certain and the most mysterious of all truths. For a Christian means by God one who is both above and beneath all things, the breath of every energy, material and spiritual, yet separated in His own essence by an abyss from everything created; the Author of all wisdom and of every intelligence that comprehends wis-

dom, bountiful and merciful, yet just and holy, giving to every nature whatever good it can receive, long-suffering, patient, rewarding the dutiful and faithful, opening to all, even the weak and sinful, a way of access and return to Himself, the Author of all felicity, whose perfections immeasurably transcend our highest conception. "As much," says Origen, "as the brightness of the sun exceeds the dim light of a lantern, so much the glory of God surpasses our idea of it."<sup>1</sup>

II. Man's conception of his own nature has an intimate dependence upon his conception of the God whom he worships. Man cannot lose the hope of immortality, and expectation of giving an account, while he believes in an Almighty Creator, at once good and just. The first page of Scripture teaches that man was made "in the image and likeness" of God,<sup>2</sup> carrying in his very nature some resemblance of his awful Original, and in his free practice of virtue a likeness to the divine government. The New Testament describes man as "body, soul, and spirit;"<sup>3</sup> a trinity, Origen remarks,<sup>4</sup> like that in God, though he usually seeks for the image of God in the soul of man. In this Christian writer, too, is found the description of man as "an intelligence served by organs," or, more exactly, "Man is a soul making use of the body."<sup>5</sup> The Church, as we have seen, condemned the heathen imagination of the preëxistence of souls; and, while it did not pronounce between traducianism and creationism, the Christian instinct may be said to have decidedly preferred the latter. Analyzing the soul after the manner of Aristotle, and reflecting upon its condition, the philosophy of man could discover traces of a fall in this nature, "manifest," as said S. Bonaventura, "in the want of God's intuition, in the ignominy that weighs upon reason, and in

<sup>1</sup> *De Princip.*, I., 5, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Thess. v. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. i. 26. Imago ad naturam, similitudo ad virtutes pertinet; proinde Adam peccando non imaginem Dei, sed similitudinem perdidit. Bellarm., *De Gratia*, Ch. II.

<sup>4</sup> *De Princip.*, II., 8, § 5.

<sup>5</sup> ἄνθρωπος, τούτεστι ψυχῇ χρωμένῃ σώματι.—*Cont. Cels.*, VII., 38.

the preponderance of evil desire.”<sup>1</sup> Or, taking the more precise analysis of S. Thomas Aquinas, whose theology was built, as to its form, on Aristotelianism: “There are four powers of the soul, which can become the conduits of virtue: namely, reason, wherein is recognition; the will, wherein is justice; the faculty of exertion, wherein is courage; the faculty of desire, wherein is temperance. In so far as reason has been diverted from its bearing toward truth, has arisen the wound of ignorance; inasmuch as the will has been diverted from its bearing toward good, has arisen the wound of wickedness; inasmuch as the faculty of exertion has been diverted from its bearing toward the arduous, has arisen the wound of frailty; lastly, inasmuch as the faculty of desire has been diverted from its course, as directed by reason, toward the term of pleasure, has arisen concupiscence.”<sup>2</sup>

The religion of Christ enters no further into the interminable disputes concerning the nature and powers of man, than to pronounce that nature, as originally constituted, good; to trace its disorders to the loss of divine grace; to offer its restoration, and with it nothing less than the renewal of man “after the image of Him that created him.”<sup>3</sup> Whatsoever fetters, therefore, bind the will of man may be stricken off; for, being redeemed, he is God’s free child. Controversies concerning predestination, fate, or necessity; concerning original sin, or imputed righteousness; concerning justification, faith, perfection—though they may occupy the minds of Christians, as some of them have always occupied the minds of thoughtful heathen,—need not disturb our clear perception that man was created for a happy immortality, that we are practically free, that God’s hand is held out to us, that His Incarnate Son, in His miraculous earthly career, has opened for us the supernatural Way, and Truth, and Life.

When we consider the firmness, the exaltation, the con-

<sup>1</sup>S. Bonavent., ad lib. II. Lent. dist., XXX., q. 11. Art. I., op. Lugd. 1668, T. VI., P. XI., p. 373.      <sup>2</sup>S. Thom. Aquin., *Summ.*, L. I., q. 85, Art. III.      <sup>3</sup>Col. iii. 10.

sistency, the sobriety, of the Church's doctrine concerning both God and man, the conflicts through which she has passed in the early persecutions, in her acceptance of earthly sovereignty and of the direction of the intellect of the world through its schools, the character of her teaching is surely a powerful witness to her divine origin. What other institution could have survived such a trial? What sect or party or form of doctrine can point to a similar triumph after a like experience? There have been times when all seemed lost, and no Christian voice able to be heard amid the violence and disorder that everywhere prevailed; again, a storm of contradiction, of fierce disputation, of sheer unbelief, has seemed to sweep Christian faith and unity from the earth: but the Church has arisen, like her Master, from the tomb, radiant with heavenly life, to renew among men her eternal lessons.

The success with which man's intellect in these later days has conquered various fields of science, his ability to preserve and consolidate his conquests—a power signally wanting in the brightest days of heathenism—is a testimony to the power of that religion which alone possessed the truth concerning the Author of nature, and concerning man, the interpreter of nature, and in these truths held the key of knowledge. The triumphs of science are in some sort a justification of the immortal hope planted by revelation in human breasts. In the Greek schools, from Pythagoras downward, the heliocentric theory of the universe was conjectured, mathematics were highly developed, the wonderful suggestion of chemical equivalents appears to have been made, the musical scale traced out, the shape of the earth known; and yet long ages of darkness succeeded, whose shadows fell before Christ was born, and were not dissipated but through Christian learning—ages when the earth was thought to be a plane, and fixed in the centre of moving sun and stars, when the wisest entertained childish thoughts on all the themes of natural philosophy, and

science was dead, and her method forgotten. The Christian progress in wisdom, beginning in knowledge of self, and advancing through humility over the often rough induction of Christian experience, is a type of most knowledge that is true and real, which is reached by patience, by diligence, by the submission of theory to trial, by the labors of many combined to one end.

III. This leads us to reflect, lastly, upon the history of the Church's doctrine concerning the relations of man to God and of men to one another. Religion is a name for the first of these relations, whether we refer it, with Lactantius, to the tie of duty that binds man to God, or, with Cicero, to the frequent study of the sacred oracles of Scripture and tradition. The reciprocal duties between human beings in the family and in the State, as well as in the Church, are an essential part of religion, viewed in either way.

The Church from the beginning and throughout her career taught what appears but dimly among the Jews, and not at all among pagans ; the importance, namely, of certain opinions or views on leading points of religion, and the danger of missing the truth on these points. The Church had a definite doctrine upon the great articles of religion. But the knowledge and reception of these were considered only as part of the preparation for the sacraments, through which believers were formally brought into union with God and with one another. The same strong principle of life asserted itself, doubtless, in the dogmas of belief as in the sacramental confession by act. Prepared for baptism by thorough repentance and steadfast faith, God's child received herein forgiveness of sin and a supernatural engrafting into God's kingdom, where by the Holy Spirit he might obtain, in union with his brethren, freedom from the power, and cleansing from the stain, of sin.<sup>1</sup> In the holy eucharist he was permitted to

<sup>1</sup>The defence of the sacraments 1826, by Wm. Vaux, chaplain to the as part of external religion forms the Abp. of Canterbury, to whom the subject of the *Bampton Lectures* for volume is dedicated.

feast upon the flesh and blood of the Sacred Victim offered upon the altar of the cross for the sins of all mankind, and coming to each faithful soul in the chalice and broken bread as the true food of immortality and the pledge of resurrection from the dead. The prayers and confessions of Christians were in a certain sense accessory to these acts of real organic union with their God and with one another. The love and gratitude which bound them to their Maker and Saviour were proven and made real by their self-sacrificing charity and labors for all whom they could benefit.

It is only since the Reformation that controversies have prevailed concerning the grace of the sacraments, the regeneration in holy baptism, and the Divine Presence in the eucharist. In the early ages they disputed whether the baptism of heretics should be admitted; and in the scholastic ages the method of Christ's Presence, though not its reality, was discussed by the advocates of rival theories, as impanation, transubstantiation,<sup>1</sup> etc. But that God unites believing souls to Himself, and nourishes them with the food of eternal life by outward and visible instruments, this is distinctive of the Christian religion, and, if we consider it rightly, an important evidence of its truth.

In the sacraments the words and acts of the Incarnate God are repeated and His miracles are renewed through space and time. The consecration of the elements in both baptism and the eucharist is said by the Eastern Church to be placed in the invocatory prayer; in the Western, rather in the words of institution; but in the view of both, He, God the Son, is truly present. Not through subjective emotion, but by a simple, outward rite He speaks and works. The worlds and the life that is in

<sup>1</sup>As early, perhaps, as the middle of the thirteenth century we may trace in some professors in the University of Paris, mentioned in a letter to Pope Clement IV., the dawning of the Zwinglian rationalism:

“Corpus Christi non esse vere in altari, sed sicut signatum sub signis.”  
Bulæus, Vol. III., pp. 372, 373.  
Ockham prepared the way for Luther's consubstantiation.

them, the angels and holy souls that lift to Him adoration and zealous service, were formed by Him, the Word of God, and live by the breath of His mouth ; and it is He who here cleanses and feeds the souls of men, lifts them in His arms, enlightens them with His truth, warms them with His love, unites them by the image of His own self-sacrifice into the power that can subdue the world's unbelief.

## LECTURE XI.

---

### SACRAMENTS: LORD'S DAY: MINISTRY.

A CHRISTIAN man, who habitually thinks and acts as if his religion were true, cannot realize without an effort the peculiar force certain external facts of Christianity should have for one outside the Christian fold. Three of these primary facts, it has been often noted, are unparalleled in their character and evidence: 1. A Jewish peasant, as far as the world knew Him, changed the religion of the world by persuasion alone, without force or worldly influence. 2. Upon His death, the result of His teaching, a few followers from the same rank in life asserted His supernatural character, and spent lives of danger, labor, suffering, terminated by cruel deaths, in order to make known to others what they had seen and heard. They did this without and against every motive of self-interest, solely in consequence of their belief in its truth. There is nothing else like this in the history of the world. 3. The third fact is that a few days after their Master's death, His followers proclaimed that He was alive in the very city and place where He had died, declared this fact as the ground of their confidence in the face of those who had killed Him, and preached it to the end of their lives as the foundation of their religion, requiring the faith and confession of it from every Christian. This, too, is a fact entirely without parallel in history. It should be observed, moreover, that besides the unexampled character of these three facts, they would have been thoroughly

proved and certain had not a page of the Gospels ever been written. They had and have, all three, a peculiar notoriety, and are attested by adversaries and foreigners with nearly the same clearness as by friends. The Christian story, so far as these three points are concerned, had never any rival account set up against it. Eye-witnesses of the events wrote down their accounts, and attested their accuracy by their blood. Among the manifold controversies between Christians and their adversaries, or among Christians themselves, these facts were never brought into dispute. In the innumerable treatises, discourses, histories, of the whole literature connected with this religion, there is a concurrence in the representation of these wonderful facts. They are made known to every Christian, without the aid even of the Sacred Writings, by certain institutions of perpetual obligation, that enter even into his daily life. The sacrament of the holy eucharist was instituted by the Lord Himself, the night before He suffered, "to show forth the Lord's death till He come." This purpose it has actually subserved over the wide earth, weekly, monthly, yearly, even daily, from then till now. Again, the weekly festival of the Lord's Day, and also the annual Easter, the queen of days, have ever since borne witness to the same Lord's resurrection, on that first Easter, from Joseph's tomb in the suburbs of Jerusalem. Again, a perpetual ministry, the successors of the first Twelve Apostles, has existed without interruption, in different parts of the world. The very names in these august lines, in the more important bishoprics, attest the fulfilment of their Master's promise to be with them "to the end of the world."

The object of this present lecture is, then, to offer to you that part of the external evidence which is furnished by the sacraments, the Lord's Day, and the Christian ministry.

I. The Christian sacraments are not merely positive commands or parts of external religion. In baptism and

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 26.

the eucharist we are indeed bidden perform certain simple actions—ablution with water, the eating of bread and wine—but these acts are parts of a covenant, in which God actually comes close to us, and enters into soul and body, to convey to us the beginning and the nourishment of immortal life. The very character and significance of both these sacraments point to the facts of their origin. They took the place among Christians of the Jewish rites of circumcision and the passover. They are not of the nature of Jewish rites, merely ceremonial or pointing to a future reality, for such rites were abolished; but filled with grace, powerful and efficacious, frustrated only by faithlessness in the receiver. They have, however, both of them, like the Jewish circumcision and passover, an external, commemorative aspect, which it is my present business to consider. Every Christian baptism, I mean, inevitably recalls, finds its explanation and significance, as a matter of fact, solely in Him who on the Mount of Ascension commanded His ministers to teach and to baptize in all nations in the name of the Trinity—just as circumcision was indissolubly associated with the covenant made with faithful Abraham. The Lord's Supper, in which was offered the very Paschal Lamb foreshadowed by the passover, assures to all succeeding ages, with even greater clearness and emphasis, the reality and certainty of the fact with which its commemoration began. Recall the well-known argument of Leslie in regard to the certainty of the event which the Jewish passover commemorated. His four rules are sound proof surely, if any exist, of the truth of any historical fact: 1. This fact must be such as that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it. 2. It must be done publicly in the face of the world. 3. Not only public monuments or memorials must be kept in memory of it, but some outward actions be performed.<sup>1</sup> 4. That such

<sup>1</sup> "This day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." "And it shall come to pass, when your children

monuments and such actions or observances be instituted, and do commence from the time that the matter of fact was done.

The first two rules are a security against any imposition upon the generation when the events are alleged to have occurred; the last two rules guard against imposition at any succeeding period. The deliverance from Egypt, and the death of the firstborn, were certainly events to which the nation of Israelites could bear witness; and its annual commemoration in the passover could never have begun at a later period, in memory of an imaginary occurrence. We may realize the absurdity of this supposition if we apply it, in a similar case, to the commemoration of independence, for example, in the United States, or to the 5th of November in England. A commemoration yearly, or at briefer intervals, by a few people, much more by an entire nation, of any event that intimately concerns them, is the most emphatic and perfect method known to human beings of transmitting knowledge beyond the limits of individual lives. The right to a piece of land under the feudal system was continued year by year by the repetition, on a fixed day, of some expressive ceremony; the will of some charitable person was executed by the distribution at an appointed place and time of food, clothing, or money; the memory of some cherished hero was kept fresh by annual rites, religious or festival, and songs or discourse, giving new life to recollection. But all these elements, legal, religious, moral, enter with combined strength into a commemoration in which an entire nation participates. To suppose that a nation may be deceived as to the actual fact which it celebrates, or that it could be brought to commemorate a fact purely imaginary, is to exhibit a deficiency of the historical sense. If facts are not transmitted thus, no

shall say unto you, What mean ye children of Israel in Egypt, when He smote the Egyptians, and delivered this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the Cf. Deut. xvi. 1-3.

tradition of facts is possible among human beings. The commemorations of particular events grow or decline in popularity; they become local, or they are entirely disused: yet the mere fact that they have ever been continued for a series of years, or that a monument has been reared as a memorial of them, though afterward destroyed, is a powerful evidence of the objective reality of the thing commemorated, a proof that must prevail over mere speculation or literary criticism. The stones at Gilgal that attested the miraculous crossing of the Jordan not only held the proof of that great event before the eyes of many generations, but after they were removed—as the ten tribes themselves, when they had lost faith, were removed—still witnessed, by the memory that clung to the spot, both to the miracle and to its commemoration. It is still absurd to doubt in cold-blooded speculation whether the monumental stones ever marked the spot, or that they referred to the miracle wrought upon the waters of Jordan. It is intrinsically absurd, because no such invention has any chance of success in a nation of continuous corporate life and of average intelligence, nor indeed anywhere save in Utopia or some province of fairyland. But the Jewish race has been ever conspicuously “shrewd, keen-witted, hard-headed, and peculiarly retentive in memory.” The absurdity is indefinitely heightened if one should attempt to ascribe to any late invention the origin of such a ceremonial as the passover<sup>1</sup>—a usage observed not on one spot alone nor by any single tribe, but in every tribe and every family of the sons of Israel throughout the land, rich and poor, judges and afterward kings, laborers and traders, in town or in country, by all without exception. The very appeals made by the prophets when the people grew slack in this observance, the celebration of the fame of the good kings who restored it to its place of honor after it had been slighted, are the most unmis-

<sup>1</sup> See this point well handled in a scholar, in answer to the theories of recent work on *The Hebrew Feasts*, Reuss, Wellhausen, and Kuenen. Reby Wm. H. Green, an American published in Edinburgh and London.

takable proofs of its place in history, and of its power over the national conscience through its association with the most cherished recollections.

Let us realize the analogous place, and the corresponding strength as proof, of the Christian sacrament of the holy eucharist. Instituted as it was on the memorable night of their Master's betrayal, designed to succeed the paschal solemnity, and to convey a real participation in the Divine Victim whom the Jewish rite for so many centuries had shadowed forth, it became from that day forward the central and characteristic act of Christian worship. At Jerusalem, at Antioch, at Ephesus, as later at Alexandria and at Rome, in Gaul, in Spain, in Britain, on land and at sea, always on the Lord's Day, and yet habitually at every solemn meeting or hallowed parting, in private houses, in catacombs, long before the stately basilica or temple beheld the simple rite adorned with rich ceremonial and song, Christians "showed forth" their "Lord's death," renewing the memories of the first Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter, with all their thrilling associations and unspeakable spiritual gifts. Five great groups of liturgies,<sup>1</sup> used in every part of the known world, and representing the united Christian worship from the earliest ages downward, on the Malabar coast

<sup>1</sup> See *Liturgies, Eastern and West.* principal liturgies of the Nestorians, *ern*, being a reprint, etc., edited by C. E. Hammond, M.A. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1878. See *Int.*, Ch. I., p. xvi. "The whole of the orthodox Eastern Church now uses the liturgy of S. Chrysostom, except on certain days of the year, when either that of S. Basil or that of 'the Pre-sanctified' is substituted. The liturgy of SS. Adæus and Maris is the chief liturgy of the Nestorian Church. The Coptic liturgies in Egypt and the Syriac liturgies all now belong to the Monophysite Churches of these two countries. . . . Neither in their liturgy, nor in the

Copts, or Syrian Jacobites, is there any trace of unorthodoxy." (Hammond has an excellent note on p. xix upon the eucharist sacrifice being offered to Christ.) Of the five groups three are Oriental, one Western, and one intermediate. The Hispano-Gallican liturgies are connected inferentially with Ephesus; the Mozarabic is known to belong to it. The African liturgy was very closely allied to that of Rome; while the Ambrosian and Sarum uses are offshoots of the Roman stem (pp. xvi, xvii).

and in Armenia not less clearly than in Asia Minor, in Rome, and in Gaul, with whatever differences in the arrangement of the parts, the oblations, the pro-anaphora and anaphora, *trisagion*, and communion—all testify unmistakably to the one great central Fact which is their life and soul. To illustrate the historical sense that inspired the devotion of these liturgies, it may perhaps be worth while to quote a sentence or two from that most exalted strain, the hymn *Exultet jam Angelica turba*, recited on Easter Eve, in the Ambrosian Rite, of the age of S. Augustine. “It is meet and right . . . that we should here and everywhere render thanks to Thee, Almighty Father, Eternal God; who didst Thyself dedicate the Passover of all people, not by the blood and fat of oxen, but by the body and blood of Thine only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, that the sacrificial rites of an ungrateful nation having been terminated, grace might succeed to the law, and One Victim, offered by Himself once for all to Thy Majesty, might expiate the sins of the whole world. This is the Lord prefigured in the tablets of stone; not lost from the flock, but exiled from heaven; not lacking a shepherd, but the Good Shepherd Himself, who laid down His life for His sheep, and took it again, that to us His divine condescension might manifest His humility, and the resurrection of His body might confirm our hope. . . . For the things that happened to the fathers in type, the same have been wrought out to us in very deed. [The great Easter taper is lighted.] Behold, now the fiery column shines forth which preceded the people of the Lord, during the season of this blessed night, to those salutary floods in which the persecutor is overwhelmed and the people of Christ emerges at liberty. . . . This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, far more excellent than that fruitful shower of ancient manna on which Israel then feasted, and yet, nevertheless, perished. The edge of Mosaic circumcision is blunted, and the sharp stones of Joshua, the son of Nun, have become

obsolete: the people of Christ is marked in the forehead, not in the loins; by a laver, not by a wound. [The deacon fixes the five grains of incense (like a flower) on the paschal taper.] . . . What more fitting, what more joyous, than that with torches wreathed with flowers we should watch for the flower of Jesse? Especially when Wisdom hath prophesied concerning herself: 'I am the flower of the field and the lily of the valleys.'"<sup>1</sup>

It is perfectly well ascertained that the substance of these great liturgies goes back to the first century, and there is very little doubt that in 1 Cor. xv., and other places in the New Testament, are direct quotations from them.

II. But the evidence of the death of the Lord, perpetually renewed in the sacrament through eighteen centuries, is supplemented by the weekly memorial of His Resurrection on the Lord's Day—the first day of the week—besides the annual commemoration of Easter, taking the place of the passover as Sunday took the place of the sabbath. There is in the Lord's Day not only a weekly commemoration of the miracle of the Resurrection, begun and continued from the first Easter, the memorial of the fact proclaimed on the spot by the apostles, and to preach which they henceforth lived and died; but their testimony is further emphasized by the transfer from this moment of the sabbatic rest, which had hitherto characterized the week, to the Resurrection feast, whence henceforth it was to take its rise and tone. The weekly division of time, at once the oldest and the widest spread in the world, was thus stamped with the memory of Christ's triumph over death. His members were now forever to celebrate the beginning of the new creation, in lieu of the former rest from the natural creation. The Christian Sunday was speedily sanctioned by the authority of the emperor of Rome.<sup>2</sup> And thus the

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. J. M. Neale's translation in *The Ambrosian Liturgy*, in *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History*, p. 192. London, 1867.

<sup>2</sup> Notes to the *Codex Theodos.*, T. I., p. 135, by Jn. Gothofred. Euseb., *Vita Const.*, IV., 18, 19, 20, 23. Sozom., *Ecc. Hist.*, I., 8. In

miracle of miracles became the best attested of all earthly facts, and the foundation of revealed religion had its evidence perpetually renewed before the eyes and ears of all men.

We should note that, while the first preachers of the Gospel were fully alive to the importance of the fact of the Resurrection, and frequently asserted that a hearty faith in it was the substance of the religion of the Christ, still its evidence would be quite certain and unmistakable, even if the written Gospels did not exist. It may be said that every page of Scripture implies the Resurrection. The testimony of enemies as well as friends points to the prominence of this great fact in the teaching of the apostles. And the Lord's Day is the one unanswerable demonstration of their triumphant vindication of the mighty truth. Every link in the chain of the argument here will bear the utmost strain of logical and legal tests. First, it is impossible for a candid mind to resist the evidence that the apostles themselves fully believed in the miracle of the Resurrection. No man ever gave, or ever could give, better evidence of sincerity. Were they, then, deceived? This is an equally impossible supposition. "It was not one person, but many, who saw Him [after He rose from the dead]; they saw Him not only separately, but together; not only by night, but by day; not at a distance, but near; not once, but several times. They not only saw Him, but touched Him, conversed with Him, ate with Him, examined His person to satisfy their doubts."<sup>1</sup> The Jews had the dead body of Him whom they hated in their full possession; buried on a mount in sight of Jerusalem, under the light of the Paschal moon,<sup>2</sup> at its full; guarded by Roman soldiers: they knew, besides, that He had predicted His own resurrection. And after that event the story told by

A. D. 321, Constantine required the inhabitants of cities and all mechanics to suspend their business on the Lord's Day. See *Cod. Inst.*, L. III., Tit. XII., leg. 1-11.

<sup>1</sup> Paley, *Evidences*, P. II., Ch. VIII.

<sup>2</sup> See Morgan on *Infidelity*.

the soldiers itself shows that they had been promised exemption from the penalty to which their own confession exposed them. Furthermore, if the Jews could have produced the body, they would have needed no further evidence; and if the dead body had been in the disciples' possession, as the Jews allege, they must have known themselves to be deceivers, and their case hopeless. The propagation of the religion of Christ under such circumstances would have been a miracle of Satan transcending all the miracles hitherto believed of the true God!

What the Scriptures of the New Testament say of the first day of the week, and of the Christian hallowing of it as the Lord's Day—the true fulfilment of the Fourth Commandment—harmonizes perfectly with what history reveals to have been Christian usage, but nowhere contains any precept changing the observance from the seventh to the first day. Its sanction is real but indirect, and given in this fashion: After our Lord's appearances on the day of His Resurrection, He seems in some sort to have abstained from again showing Himself till the *eighth day* after.<sup>1</sup> After this He certainly appeared again four times before His Ascension.<sup>2</sup> Then on the seventh return of the great day—that is, fifty days from Easter—the first day is made memorable at Pentecost by the gift of the Holy Ghost. S. Paul ordains at Corinth that Christian offerings be made on “the first day of the week.”<sup>3</sup> There are intimations of the observance of this day, both at Philippi and at Troas (the eucharist being mentioned in connection with Troas).<sup>4</sup> This may have been twenty years after the first Pentecost. Perhaps it was twenty-five years later when S. John upon Patmos was in his high communings “upon the Lord's Day.”<sup>5</sup> Then what Holy Scripture thus suggests and reveals is shown to be a fact early in the next century by the testimony of the heathen Pliny as to the habitual worship of Christians on the first day

<sup>1</sup> S. John, xx. 26.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, 17.

<sup>3</sup> S. John, xxi. 1-14. 1 Cor. xv. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Acts, xx. 7. Cf. xvi. 11, 12.

S. Matt. xxviii. 16, 17. 1 Cor. xv. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. i. 10.

of the week,<sup>1</sup> and by the still more explicit description of Christian worship in S. Justin Martyr<sup>2</sup> and S. Barnabas.

The controversies among Christians, running up to the earliest times, as to the rule for fixing the feast of Easter, the final harmony of East and West, the re-appearance of the same question some centuries after among the Christians of Britain, point to the continued observance, amid whatever differences, of the great memorial of the Resurrection, the historic corner-stone of the new religion.

III. When the risen Lord issued His final commands to the apostles of His kingdom, before He ascended into heaven, telling them to teach, to make disciples, to baptize in all nations, He sealed up everything with the wonderful promise: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."<sup>3</sup> The perpetuity of the ministry of the Christian Church, an authoritative teaching, ruling line, in distinct yet coördinate succession, whose very names have been preserved in certain leading cities and centres of life, running back through the ages of persecution to S. James and S. John, S. Mark, S. Peter, and S. Paul, in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Ephesus, in Alexandria, in Constantinople, and in Rome, preserved unbroken amid every disorder within and without, according to the tenor of the divine pledge—this, too, is an external solid historic evidence to the reality of the Christian religion as a fact which should be carefully weighed.

<sup>1</sup> *Essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.* Plinii, Lib. X., Ep. 96. (al. 97).

<sup>2</sup> *Dial. cum Tryph.*, Ch. XLI., 116, 117. *Apol.* I., Ch. LXXXV. In the *Epist. Barnab.*, Ch. XV., the observance of Sunday is presupposed as an established custom: ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν οὐρανὸν εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη, κ.τ.λ. In S. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Mag.*, 9) the sabbath is taken as

the very central point and representative institution of Judaism, and the Christian Sunday as holding the same position in the Gospel scheme: "If, then, those who had walked in ancient practices attained into newness of hope, no longer observing sabbaths, but fashioning their lives after the Lord's Day, on which our life also arose through Him, . . . how shall we be able to live apart from Him?"

<sup>3</sup> S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

“In the Christian Church,” says Gibbon, “which intrusts the service of the altar to a perpetual succession of consecrated ministers, the monarch [of Rome], whose spiritual rank is less honorable than that of the meanest deacon, was seated below the rails of the sanctuary, and confounded with the rest of the faithful multitude.” This was the “distinct and independent society” with which Constantine sought “to contract a perpetual alliance.” “The Christians had been obliged to elect their own magistrates, to raise and distribute a peculiar revenue, and to regulate the internal policy of their republic by a code of laws which were ratified by the consent of the people and the practice of three hundred years.”<sup>1</sup> The first mention of the “Catholic Church,” it is well known, occurs in the Epistle of S. Ignatius to the Christians at Smyrna,<sup>2</sup> and in the letter of the church at Smyrna, A.D. 169, concerning the martyrdom of S. Polycarp.<sup>3</sup> In S. Ignatius, reverence for the Church, and submission to the bishops, her constituted authorities, are first principles for Christian minds. S. Irenæus bids those whose ears have been assailed by heretical teaching to turn from all other voices and listen only to those of the apostles, repeated in the tradition of the Church.<sup>4</sup> The Church alone contains all the riches of truth; out of her there are nothing but thieves and robbers, pools with foul water. S. Clement describes her as a mother and a virgin, the body of Christ, wherein alone it is possible to have *faith*, while the heretics have only an opinion (*οἴησις*), and the heathen are in ignorance (*ἄγνοια*).<sup>5</sup> In the mild Origen we read the stern decision, “Out of the Church no one can be saved.”<sup>6</sup> “The rule we adopt is this,” says Tertullian: “if our Lord Jesus Christ sent

<sup>1</sup> *Decline and Fall*, Ch. XX.

ζεσθαι τὴν παράδοσιν. Cf. III.,

<sup>2</sup> Ἐποῦ ἀν ἡ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, 24; IV. 31.

ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

<sup>6</sup> *Pad.*, I., 5, 6. *Strom.*, VII., 14, 16.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb., *E. H.*, IV., 15. ἐκκλησία καθολικὴ.

<sup>6</sup> Nemo semetipsum decipiat, extra hanc domum, *i. e.*, extra ecclesiam

<sup>4</sup> Iren., *Cont. Hær.*, III., 4. τῆς ἐκκλησίας μετὰ πλείστης ἀσπα-

nemo salvetur. Origen, *Hom.* iii., in Josuam. Op. II., p. 404.

apostles to preach, other preachers ought not to be received by us. . . . No other rule should we adopt, moreover, to ascertain what they preached than the testimony of the same churches which the apostles themselves founded, first by preaching to them with the living voice, and afterward, as we may say, by their epistles." "If any teachers, therefore, claim to have an apostolic doctrine, let them set forth the beginnings of their churches, let them recount the line of their bishops running down in order from the beginning, how the first of the bishops in those respective lines had for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the apostles or of their companions who still continued with the apostles. For after this manner the apostolic churches hand down their sacred registers, as (for instance) the church of Smyrna reports that Polycarp was made their bishop by S. John, and the church at Rome that Clement was set over them by S. Peter."

The Ebionites, it was said, narrowed the Church into a Jewish sect, while the Gnostics resolved it into an idealistic world of æons—the first making it a body without life, the second a phantom without a body; while the Montanists refined it away into an invisible in lieu of a visible body. But Tertullian's great pupil, S. Cyprian, whose strong sense and clear faith alike protected him from either extreme, maintains the unity of the Church as a historical, visible reality, witnessed by the episcopal power not of Rome solely, but of the bishops collectively. She is the sun casting forth its various rays, the tree with its many branches. He that will not have the Church for his mother cannot have God for his Father. Even mar-

<sup>1</sup>Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ec-  
clesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferrunt, sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum. Tert., *De Præscriptionibus Hæret.*, Ch. XXXII Cf. XXI. This treatise belongs to the ante-Montanist period of Tertullian's life.

tyrdom outside of the Church he pronounces so far from being meritorious that it is rather an aggravation of sin.

Such maxims, then, as *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* are not to be traced for their origin to the times of the Donatists in their controversy with S. Augustine, but they utter the inmost feelings and vital principles of the Church from the earliest day. There is no certainty in religion, nor any one article that can certainly be preserved, save in the circle of revelation; this circle, the kingdom, the fold, the Body of Christ, is continued in the world in indestructible, visible unity, by the perpetuation of the chief officers of its organization,<sup>2</sup> protected by the divine power amid the lapse of time against hostile influences within and without, ever renewed with deliberation, with prayer, with solemn rites, as bearing in their keeping and handing on the hopes and safety of the world. The first successor chosen to fill up the first vacancy in the number of the original twelve apostles was selected to be with them "a witness of the Resurrection."<sup>3</sup> And what was said of the first might be affirmed with truth, according to his measure, of every bishop chosen since, in the long lines wherever the apostolic seed has manifested its vitality, in Canterbury, in Rome, in Constantinople; each has found the meaning of his office, the reason of his existence, only in the one mighty fact, when his Lord, upon the hill by Jerusalem, now more than eighteen centuries ago, rose on the first Easter morning out of Joseph's tomb. That alone explains, accounts for, the successions of bishops, the Church's continued being. Not less certainly does the line of English kings depend upon the battle of Hastings, or the succession of American presidents upon the events sealed by the surrender at Yorktown, or the honorable line that have presided in the

<sup>1</sup> S. Cypriani, *De Unitate Eccles.*, 5, 6. Ep. 4. Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est.

deacons, says: "Apart from these there is not even the name of a Church."

<sup>2</sup> S. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Trall.*, ii. iii.) speaking of the bishops, priests, and

<sup>3</sup> Acts, i. 22, *μάρτυρα τῆς ἀνάσ-  
τάσεως.*

Royal Society upon the charter of 1662, than does the Church's holy ministry upon the life and miracles of the Incarnate Son of God. Indeed, it might be said of these secular events that mark the career of political power, or the development of science, that though the dates and certainty of the great battles, 1066 and 1781, or of the important charter, are indisputably established by the succeeding facts that could have had no existence without them, still, that government once established is natural and essential to human beings, and that science once started in its career grows by a kind of inherent vitality; while, on the other hand, the Church's continuance and the perpetual succession of her ministry are in truth a standing miracle, because they exist only to bear witness to a supernatural fact, and are possible among men only by the perennial renewal of a faith, which is no product of nature, but simply a divine gift.

The Church lives<sup>1</sup> and spreads, and rises again after defeat and seeming extinction, as out of a grave, and renews the numbers of her children, and reinstates her governing powers, through all time, and in every land, not solely because her Lord, who died, has arisen, but because He still lives and is in truth in her very midst. He is not only in the natural world that was made by Him, though still it knows Him not, as the evangelist speaks,<sup>2</sup> but He is in the spiritual kingdom founded by Him, and still on earth, composed of mortal men, where His presence is manifested by new and wonderful and gracious methods, and still is often forgotten and neglected by those who have most reason to acknowledge it. The civilization, the life, the turns of speech, the names of persons and places, that human beings are called Mary, or John, or Paul, or Peter, or Matthew, or Thomas, that we

<sup>1</sup> Cette église qui adore celui qui a toujours été adoré a subsisté sans interruption. Et ce qui est admirable, incomparable, et tout à fait divin, est que cette religion qui a toujours duré a toujours été combattue. Mille fois elle a été à la veille d'une destruction universelle; et toutes les fois qu'elle a été en cet état, Dieu l'a relevée par des coups extraordinaires de sa puissance.—Pascal, *Pensées*, II., 200.

<sup>2</sup> S. John, i. 10.

are living here to-day, in such a city or under such laws, are all reminders, if we interpreted them with wisdom, of Jesus of Nazareth, of what He did for us on the hills of Judæa, more than eighteen hundred years ago, and of what His religion has since wrought up and down the high-ways of the world.

I am not stating imaginations, but facts. The wild Indian, the child of nature, knows by instinct, from a speck in the sky, from a tremor in the ground, the storm or the earthquake still hundreds of miles away; he can read in a broken twig or a crushed leaf the signs of a passing enemy or stranger, though they may seek to hide their going: and shall not man, whose cultivated powers have been sharpened by the insight of faith, recognize all around him the tokens of the coming long ago, and the nearness now, of Him who is the true Lord of man's life and thoughts? Go to the briefest Christian service; listen to the prayers and Scriptures; mark the administration of the sacraments, a baptism or a eucharist, with the simplest or with an ornate ritual—the syllables of the Divine Word vibrate on the air, the Word of Him whose command made the worlds. Space and time are annulled. Across the centuries come the accents of Him who creates, who renews, who feeds immortal souls. There are always present, blessed be God, faithful hearts who feel the awfulness of His words, as they repeat them: "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done." Every eucharist, every Lord's Day, every new consecration in the line of the apostolic ministry, renews and perpetuates a memory which can never die while the world lasts. On the first Easter, He explained to His wondering disciples, that it was the sense of the ancient Scriptures that "thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."<sup>1</sup> The Scriptures of the new Covenant that were written afterward; the world-wide kingdom whose foundations were laid and whose walls arose as the sacred canon grew to completion; the lives of each baptized member of

<sup>1</sup>S. Luke, xxiv. 46.

Christ, young and old, far and near, over the wide earth; the worship, the confessions, the martyrdoms; the new states, the laws, the languages, the customs—bear in every part, on the whole and in detail, their varied witness to the exact fulfilment of the wondrous prophecy. And the fact transcends all anticipation. “Christ is risen!” “He is risen indeed.” This the most marvellous, has by every evidence been made to us the most certain, of all events since the world began.

## LECTURE XII.

---

### FRUITS.

IT is fair to test a religion by its results, or its "fruits." These are, in fact, the most unmistakable and decisive of all kinds of external evidence. The Author of the Christian religion bade His followers apply this test for the detection of false teachers as well as of false systems: "By their fruits ye shall know them."<sup>1</sup> "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." In a general way it may be asserted that the truth remains true though misapprehended, or hated, or rejected by perverse human souls; and that striking testimony has often been yielded in history to high principles by the very judgments and punishments they have inflicted on those who fought against them. Yet still it remains certain that good fruit long and invariably put forth is the best evidence of the excellence of a tree, and that failure in such results, or the production of noxious fruit, irresistibly condemns the stock to excision and destruction.

We are now prepared to show accordingly that the religion of Christ has borne such fruit of various kind, spiritual and material, intellectual and practical, in the thoughts and in the lives of men, in the shaping of governments and in the moulding of society, as worthily to stamp it as a divine gift, the best of God's gifts to His children. These fruits could not in the nature of things

<sup>1</sup> ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτοῦς. S. Matt. vii. 16.

and never have in history been put forth by any system of fraud and imposture, nor are likely to have been reached by man's nature, acting without aid or divine suggestion. This highest mark of truth has been stamped upon His revelation by God's wisdom—that it was so adapted to man's need, and took such hold of his nature in every part, that he has actually put forth in its honor higher and more sustained exertions, virtues of nobler strain, than he has ever shown in any other cause or under any other influence, religious, political, or domestic, anywhere upon the earth.

The fruits which prove the Christian religion to be a gift from God may be seen first in the nobler conceptions or ideas upon the highest subjects, which it has made to triumph ; and next in the practical results, the good lives, the heroic labors, the beneficent institutions, of which it has been the parent.

I. We affirm that throughout the most intelligent, the ruling nations and population of the earth, Christianity has given firmness, currency, and supremacy to the noblest ideas concerning God, concerning man, and concerning government and society.

(a) The conception of Almighty God, One, infinite, perfect, all good, all just, the Maker and Ruler, the Father and Judge of all creatures, so familiar to Christians, the first elementary lesson in catechisms for children, is undoubtedly recognized and exerts a powerful influence in the great external world, the public, more or less educated, that utters its voice in the press and through literature, that neither believes precisely nor disbelieves, but speaks at one time gently, at another loudly, but has a tendency on the whole to forget or slight what is high, noble, and at the same time abstract, and to give its respect to what it calls real, successful, and powerful. A Christian preacher can deliver an effective sermon to a mixed multitude in modern days, semi-heathen, Jews, worldly Christians, and charge them with making money their God, or yielding to the prizes of ambition a religious

service, or trampling under foot conscience and reason at the solicitation of passion ; and the charge is felt to be a real one, not merely a figurative or allegorical portraiture of human actions. There is in men's minds an image or conception of the true God, real, and in some sort effective, alike in those who break and in those who keep His laws. Whence came this belief to the world of the present day? There can be no doubt in the mind of any impartial inquirer that it came only from the religion of Christ.

Let us look at some of the evidence of this. In the earliest literature of Egypt, of India, of Greece, and of Rome we find acknowledgments, sometimes wonderfully clear and striking, of the existence of one God, supreme, the Creator and Ruler of all things.<sup>1</sup> But, after some generations have gone by, this recognition of God appears to be everywhere forgotten, and the doctrine concerning Him to have passed, in one place into nature-worship and polytheism, in another into pantheism or philosophic negation, in Persia into dualism. Nowhere on the wide earth, save in one little corner among the hills of Palestine, did human beings acknowledge and worship Him who alone, in the eye both of reason and faith, is worthy of the supreme homage of the human soul. This fact, which is as certain as anything in history, inevitably suggests the inquiry, Whence came to man in the first place his high and worthy conception of the one true God? And though we admit the answer, that it so naturally and fully meets the demands of reason that it may be regarded as the instinctive discovery and recognition of reason itself, yet since there is no record that man ever without aid actually made the discovery for himself, and since there is abundant proof<sup>2</sup> that after being in possession of this

<sup>1</sup>See the evidence in Christlieb's *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, p. 266, etc., that "the knowledge of the Triune God was transmitted in a distorted form in all heathen religions," or that "a trinity of deities is common to all nations."—Ed., N. Y., 1875.

<sup>2</sup>"It is incontestably true that the sublimer portions of the Egyptian

highest of truths man by reason has not been able to keep possession of it, there seems little room for doubt that the knowledge of God, both among the Hebrew people and amid Christians, came from His direct revelation of Himself to men. This is now affirmed without hesitation by those who profess to reject theology. "If we are asked," says Max Müller, "how Abraham possessed not only the primitive intuition of God as He has revealed Himself to all mankind, but passed through the denial of all other gods to the knowledge of the one God, we are content to answer that it was by a special divine revelation. We do not indulge in theological phraseology, but we mean every word to its fullest extent."<sup>1</sup> "The fact is," says Dr. Frederick H. Hedge, "theism is also a tradition, and not, as is claimed, a universal intuition of the soul. . . . The idea of one only God, self-existent, almighty, wise, and good, Creator and Father of all, is a Hebrew tradition."<sup>2</sup>

But the most moving demonstration, perhaps, of the impotency of human nature to retain this its most precious possession of the knowledge of God, arises from a survey of the actual condition, not alone of Egypt and India where a blight seemed to have withered man's nature, but of Athens where the intellect of man reached its perfection and its crown, and of Rome where practical sense and worldly sagacity had their widest field in the world's imperial sway. At Athens alone, it was the boast of Pausanias,<sup>3</sup> was there an altar to Pity. Yet Athens, with unrelenting rigor, hushed in death the only voice, that of Socrates, that could teach his countrymen a worthy doctrine concerning God;<sup>4</sup> and Aristotle, when,

religion are not the comparatively late result of a process of development, or elimination, from the grosser. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient."—Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 91.

<sup>1</sup> *Chips from a German Workshop*. Vol. I., pp. 367, 368. N. Y., 1881.

<sup>2</sup> *Christian Examiner*, Sept., 1864, pp. 150, 151.

<sup>3</sup> *Descript. of Greece*, I., 17.

<sup>4</sup> "To the gods Socrates simply prayed that they would give him good things, as believing that the gods knew best what things are good. . . . He said that it

according to a tradition preserved by Origen, compelled to flee from the threatening of a like fate, said: "Let us depart from Athens, that we may not give the Athenians a handle for incurring guilt a second time, as formerly in the case of Socrates."<sup>1</sup> The people who turned into deities every power of nature, and every passion in man, good and bad, and erected altars to "unknown gods" lest any should be neglected, were intolerant alone of the true God, and of earnest belief in Him. But the degradation of man's religious sense seems to touch the lowest depth in the appalling climax at Rome, when the worship of the emperor was required as the one only real God.<sup>2</sup> It is very difficult to realize this fact, yet the proof of it is unmistakable. Our very Christian enlightenment tends to make us view this monstrous portent as an exaggeration or a mistake. Did the Roman, with his masculine sense, who spake the tongue of Cicero, of Horace, of Virgil, worship as gods not the first two Cæsars alone, but Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, Commodus? Alas! there is no room to doubt of it. "In the confused multiplicity of mythologies, the worship of the emperor was the only worship common to the whole Roman world, and was therefore that usually proposed to the Christians on their trial."<sup>3</sup> There is a passage in the *Anthology*, written in the age of Augustus, perhaps by Alpheus of Mitylene, in which the Hellenic mind seems to have anticipated this strange worship: "Shut, god, the unsubdued gates of Olympus; guard, Jupiter, the holy citadel of the sky: for already is the sea brought

would not become the gods to delight in large rather than in small sacrifices; since, if such were the case, the offerings of the bad would often be more acceptable to them than those of the good, . . . but he thought that the gods had the most pleasure in the offerings of the most pious." — Xenophon, *Mem.*, I., 3; II., 3.

<sup>1</sup> Origen, *Adv. Cels.*, I., 65.

<sup>2</sup> Les Romains étaient éclairés; cependant ces mêmes Romains ne furent pas choqués de voir réunir dans la personne de César un Dieu, un prêtre, et un Athée.—Gibbon, *Misc. Works*, II., 476. Lond., 1796.

<sup>3</sup> Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, pp. 22, 23. Lond., 1876.

by the spear under the yoke of Rome, and the land also; only the road to heaven remains untrodden."<sup>1</sup> "Rome," says Ozanam, "began to crave a more concrete god than the Capitolian Jove, and found a living and most terrible deity in the person of her emperor. Earth could offer nothing more divine in the sense of a majesty at once recognized and obeyed, and paganism did but push its principles to their consequence in deifying the Cæsars; but reason fell to the lowest depth of degradation, and the Egyptians grovelling before the beasts of the Nile outraged humanity less than the age of the Antonines, with its philosophers and jurisconsults rendering divine honors to the Emperor Commodus."<sup>2</sup>

(b) Christianity has rescued the conception of man himself from almost as great a perversion as that which deformed the nature of God. It is very common now throughout the world, in literature among poets and dreamers, in politics among socialists and agitators, to hear and read of the inherent dignity of man, of his rights and of his great destiny. But this conception has no solid foundation whatever in anything that the religions, the sages, the poetry, or the philosophy of this world have ever produced. The spiritual dignity and rights of man as an individual are utterly foreign to the best wisdom of the ancient world. India was fettered in the cruel prison of caste, which doomed the larger portion of mankind to hopeless degradation. Aristotle taught that slavery was the normal and necessary condition of certain classes. Poetry<sup>3</sup> lent itself to the revelry of passion, and philosophy summed its teachings finally in

<sup>1</sup> *Greek Anthology*, Burges's tr., p. 98. Lond., 1876.

<sup>2</sup> Fred. Ozanam, *Civiliz. in Fifth Cent.*, V. I., p. 80. Lond., 1867.

<sup>3</sup> . . . . . 'Oh, would  
That long before within the grave I lay,  
Or long hereafter could behold the day!"

Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 227-234.

"Happiest beyond compare  
Never to taste of life;

Happiest in order next,  
Being born, with quickest speed  
Thither again to turn  
From whence we came."

Sophocles, *Aed. in Col.*, 1225-1229.

"Do not then consider life a thing of any  
value."

Marcus Aurelius, *Med.*, IV., 50.

"The aim of philosophy is to despise life."  
Stoic.

calm despair. What has emancipated the minds of men, even of unbelievers, from these depressing conceptions? Where did Shelley, for instance, in his *Queen Mab*, obtain his ideal of man as the "king of life," though now discrowned in poverty and obscurity, "with pure desire and universal love," "of cloudless brain, untainted passion, elevated will," and fearless in the presence of death? Whence do metaphysicians derive the hardihood to affirm that "there is nothing on earth great but man, and in man nothing great but mind"?<sup>1</sup> Nay, how should even Pascal's statement find general applause and reception? "All the bodies, the stars, the firmament, the earth and all its kingdoms, are not worth one soul; for that soul knows both itself and them, and they know nothing."<sup>2</sup> The answer is that this conception of man came from revelation alone, from the Holy Scriptures. Out of the Bible did Shelley derive those ideas of God and man which he employs in the midst of his blasphemies against both. Man, as we know by the Book of Inspiration, was created in God's image, and is therefore the natural sovereign of all creatures on earth, the heir of eternity, to redeem whom his Maker came down from highest heaven, and shared human life, and said to His creature, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" And S. Paul said to Christians: "All things are yours, whether . . . the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come: all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."<sup>3</sup> But from this we know that the Apostle to the Gentiles derived a lesson in strong contrast to the world's boasting: "*Therefore*, let no man glory in men." And immediately he points out that the charity which is a supernatural grace in man is as far above the highest flight of mind and thought, as mind itself is above matter.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Hamilton. 5-11. S. Matt. xvi. 26. 1 Cor. iii.

<sup>2</sup> *Pensées*. 21-23.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. i. 26. Rom. iv. 13. Phil. ii. <sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, 8-10.

"The infinite distance," says Pascal, "of body from mind is a figure of the still greater infinitude between mind and charity."<sup>1</sup> And, again, the very miseries of man wandering in vice and estranged from his Maker are a most expressive testimony to the inherent nobleness of his nature.

It is as easy to prove the Christian origin of every exalted conception of man by a negative method as we have just done positively. We have only to look into modern writers who consciously and deliberately seek to cast away every shred of respect for revelation. They immediately revert to the heathen view of man, and sometimes, in their cool and intentional pitilessness, seem to get below it. "Man," says Moleschott, "is produced from wind and ashes. . . . His will . . . is governed by the laws of nature, just as the planet in its orbit, as the vegetable in its soil."<sup>2</sup> "All that is elevated, all that is lovely," says Winwood Reade, "in human nature has its origin in the lower kingdom. The philosophic spirit of inquiry may be traced to brute curiosity, and that to the habit of examining all things in search of food. Artistic genius is an expansion of monkey imitativeness."<sup>3</sup> When the positivists of modern days seriously proposed human beings as objects of worship, and humanity as the highest god, they were answered by an unbeliever of another cast, with great abundance of detail and superfluity of scorn, that there was nothing worshipful in man, either individually or collectively, as private citizen, statesman, or as scholar. And herein the agnostic Spencer undoubtedly made a sound, though partial, answer to the positivist Harrison. Finally, John Stuart Mill, whom some people find very attractive, as of old his disciples thought of Epicurus, has not hesitated to say that "man is naturally a lover of dirt, a sort of wild

<sup>1</sup> La distance infinie des corps aux esprits, figure la distance infiniment plus infinie des esprits à la charité. — *Pensées*, II., 90, 330, ed. Faugère.

<sup>2</sup> Christlieb, *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, pp. 146, 158. N. Y. ed.

<sup>3</sup> *Martyrdom of Man*, pp. 394, 395. Cf. 243, 244. N. Y. ed.

animal craftier than the other beasts, to whom the most criminal actions are not more unnatural than most of the virtues, and to whom the imaginative hope of futurity may be more a burden than a blessing." <sup>1</sup>

(c) The fruits of Christianity in government and society are not to be sought in the disappearance of tyranny, the extinction of war, the removal of the causes of rebellion and discontent, or in the prevention of crimes of cruelty and lust, fraud and treachery. There were happy homes and domestic charities upon the earth even before Christ was born. So were there also strong and wise governments, and an even administration of justice. It is something, surely, to say that cruelty, injustice, and misery would entirely disappear from the world if men would listen to Christ's counsels, and that then happy homes would be universal, and all governments just and strong in the virtue of their citizens. Nevertheless, a mighty and very real change has passed upon government and society since the apostles of the Son of God went forth from Judæa to preach His Gospel to the nations. It has been compared to the change from winter to spring. We know what takes place after the solstice. The ice breaks up, the streams begin to flow, the verdure looks forth in sheltered nooks ; but summer, though surely coming, comes only by degrees. There are long delays ; many an unsightly and barren deformity remains to mar even the summer landscape. And something like this is true of human society, even after the Sun of Righteousness has turned upon our earth His healing beams. Yet sure evidences of His mighty and genial approach, though His coming be not with observation, are not wanting in the laws and customs of nations, and even in the new development of international law, testifying the oneness of the family of man. There are three departments of human life in which the divine touch of the religion of Christ cannot be mistaken—the condition of childhood, of woman, and of the slave.

<sup>1</sup> *Essays on Religion*, pp. 46, 48, 62, 122. Ed. N. Y., 1874.

Even prophecy predicted the peculiar glory of childhood in the kingdom of Him who should come upon earth as a babe at Bethlehem. Fierce and untamable things would forget their nature in that gentle presence. Of the wolf and the bear, the serpent and the lion, it was said: "A little child shall lead them."<sup>1</sup> Christ made children members of His kingdom, and constituted their innocence and simplicity the enduring types of highest spiritual perfection. He uttered solemn warnings against the slight or injury of them.<sup>2</sup> The words of the Christian's Lord have had a wonderful fulfilment in a world which everywhere held the murder of children to be no crime, and still in heathen lands exposes and kills these innocents without mercy. "The exposition of children," says Gibbon,<sup>3</sup> "was the prevailing and stubborn vice of antiquity." This hateful thing was done not only in China, in India, in Egypt, but in the forests of Mt. Taygetus, and before Diana's altar in Sparta;<sup>4</sup> nay, Plato and Aristotle coldly justify the enormity. "The offspring of the inferior," says Plato in the *Republic*, "or of the better when they chance to be deformed, the proper officers will conceal in some mysterious, unknown place."<sup>5</sup> "With respect to the exposing or bringing up of children," says Aristotle in his *Politics*,<sup>6</sup> "let it be a law that nothing imperfect or maimed shall be brought up." The law of the Twelve Tables permitted the Roman father thus to destroy his offspring.<sup>7</sup> The son "in his father's house," says Gibbon, "was a mere thing [not a person]; confounded by the laws with the movables, the cattle, and the slaves, whom the capricious master might alienate or destroy without being responsible to any earthly tribunal."<sup>8</sup> It is memorable that the barbarous treat-

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, xi. 6-9.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matt. xviii.; xix. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. XLIV.

<sup>4</sup> "I myself," says Plutarch, "have seen youths endure whipping to death at the foot of the altar of Diana, surnamed Orthia."—*Lives*, Vol. I., pp. 105, 108. Boston, 1859.

<sup>5</sup> V., 460.

<sup>6</sup> VII., 16.

<sup>7</sup> Table IV., Prov. I, II. Cicero, *De Leg.*, III., 8. Dionysius, *Archæologia*, 2, 26, 27. Ortolan, *Hist. of Roman Law*, pp. 106, 107.

<sup>8</sup> Ch. XLIV.

ment of children found no rebuke in the highest heathen literature.<sup>1</sup> But it is wonderful to note, in the second century, when the new light and warmth from the cradle at Bethlehem began to be felt over the earth, how a reaction set in, and the Emperor Trajan gave freedom to those children deserted but preserved, and established a fund for their maintenance—a fact commemorated on coins and monuments. Pliny followed the imperial example.<sup>2</sup> Hadrian and Antoninus Pius enlarged the bounty; while Marcus Aurelius put the endowments under the charge of consular officers, appointed a prætor to watch over orphans expressly, and required a registration of births.

The Christian sentiment may be read as early as the second century in the well-known passage in S. Irenæus, proclaiming how the Lord “came to save all through means of Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again to God—infants, and children, and boys, and young men, and old men.”<sup>3</sup> The Church made childhood honorable and safe, as well as holy. She performed on earth, amid evil laws and cruel customs, the task assigned to the most powerful angels by their Master in heaven. Her success is witnessed by whatever is noblest in literature and art.<sup>4</sup>

Inseparably associated with the protection of children is Christ’s exaltation of woman. Himself the virgin-born, He found in women the truest penitents, the most faithful disciples, the bravest and most self-sacrificing champions of the Cross. A woman drew from Him His first miracle, and the first Gentile that obtained His blessing on earth was a woman; women ministered to Him when He was weary and forsaken; they were the last at His cross, when the shadows of death were im-

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *Tusc. Quest.*, I., 39. *Terence, Heaut.*, IV., I., 634-640. Seneca, *De Ira*, I., 15. Plato, *Theat.*, 151.

<sup>2</sup> Trajan to Pliny, Ep. X., 72; VII., 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Adv. Hæres.*, II., 22, § 4. Cf. *Ep. of Barnabas*, XIX. Justin Martyr, *Ap. I.*, 27, 29. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, VI., 20.

<sup>4</sup> *E. g.*, Wordsworth’s poetry and Raphael’s Sistine Madonna.

pending, and first at His tomb to hear the tidings of His resurrection. The will of Christ thus expressed by Him while upon earth toward one-half of the human race was not disclosed in vain. If His religion has accomplished anything, it has been in the transformation of the place and condition of woman in human society. Through all ages and in every part of Christendom, women have been the missionaries, the defenders, the support, of this religion; they have adorned it with virtues never before seen in the world, under any religion, or in any members of their sex; the Christian women were ever a glory apart, the astonishment and envy of the cultivated heathen, the mothers of saints, the promoters of learning, the founders of religious houses, the inspiration of true chivalry, the finer soul and the choicest product of all that was admirable and peculiar in Christian civilization.

This great fact cannot be properly appreciated without recalling woman's actual condition in heathenism. "Woman," said Confucius, "can determine nothing of herself, and is subject to the rule of the three obediences: when young, she must obey her father and elder brother; when married, she must obey her husband; when her husband is dead, she must obey her son."<sup>1</sup> This is simply a repetition of one of the Laws of Manu, which adds: "By a girl, or by a young woman, or by a woman advanced in years, nothing must be done, even in her own dwelling-place, according to her mere pleasure. . . . A woman must never seek independence."<sup>2</sup> "The law of Solon declares," says Demosthenes, "that all acts shall be null and void which are done by any one under the influence of a woman." And upon this the orator pronounces: "Wisely has the legislator provided."<sup>3</sup> Plato, in the *Republic*, condemned the equality of the sexes, and deliberately proposed a community of wives for his ideal state.<sup>4</sup> By Aristotle women are ranked with slaves: "A

<sup>1</sup> Legge, *Chinese Classics*, Proleg., Ch. V., II, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Demosthenes, *Orat. adv. Olymp.*, 1183.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. V. Sir Wm. Jones's *Works*, Vol. VII., p. 269. Lond., 1807.

<sup>4</sup> *Repub.*, VIII., 563; V., 457. *Timæus*, 18, 19.

woman and a slave," he says, " may be good, though perhaps of these the one is less good, and the other is wholly bad."<sup>1</sup> At Rome women were long under a kind of perpetual guardianship (to the time of Claudius); they were not permitted to be sureties for any one; and it was only under the later emperors that they were allowed to be guardians to their own children or grandchildren."<sup>2</sup> By the law of Quintus Voconius, passed between the second and third Punic wars, no woman except a vestal virgin could inherit property. Cicero denounces the injustice of this law. " Why," he asks, " should not a woman possess property? Why may a vestal virgin become an heir, while her own mother cannot?"<sup>3</sup> The effect of this law is thus explained by Hadley: " If an only child, who by his father's death had just come into a large property, died himself without a will, the nearest *agnate* [male relative], though he were only a fourth or fifth cousin, could shut out the widowed mother from all share in the estate which had belonged to her husband and child. So if a woman died intestate, leaving infant children, her *agnate* ten degrees removed, if there were none nearer, could prevent her children from obtaining the least share in any property she might have left."<sup>4</sup> It is very evident that both in Greece and Rome the marriage relation from comparative purity in early times went down continually toward corruption and dissolution. In the typical Homeric household monogamy and domestic fidelity are honored. In the time of Pericles the *hetæraæ* were the only educated and influential women; one of these, Plato says, composed the celebrated funeral oration ascribed to Pericles, where occurs the sentence: " Great is the excellence of the woman who is least talked of among the men, whether for good or evil."<sup>5</sup> At Rome unlimited divorce was fol-

<sup>1</sup> *Poetica*, XV.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Mackenzie's *Studies in Roman Law*, p. 79. Edin., 1880.

<sup>3</sup> Cic., *De Rep.*, III., 7.

<sup>4</sup> Hadley's *Introd. to Roman Law*,

ustine's indignant comments on the injustice of this law, *De Civ. Dei*, B. III., Ch. XXI.

<sup>5</sup> Thucydides, II., 45. Plato's *Me-*

*nexenus*, 236.

p. 284. N. Y., 1880. Cf. S. Aug-

lowed in the reign of Augustus by the formal and legal establishment of concubinage.<sup>1</sup> Even among the Jews, after their rejection of the Son of God, there sprang up, with other signs of degradation, a peculiar contempt for women. In their morning service, after thanking God that they are neither heathen nor slaves, the Jewish men now say: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hath not made me a woman!" And the women say: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hath made me according to His will."<sup>2</sup> This is a falling away from the teaching of the Talmud: "Love your wife like yourself, honor her more than yourself. . . . It is woman alone through whom God's blessings are vouchsafed to a house. She teaches the children, speeds the husband to the place of worship and instruction, welcomes him when he returns, keeps the house godly and pure, and God's blessings rest upon all these things."<sup>3</sup> The noble picture of a virtuous woman, in the ancient Scriptures, taught to King Lemuel by his mother, has never been realized except in Christian days, whose triumph and lustre were exhibited by Dante in figure, when he marked the successive heights of Paradise not by material measurements, but by a new beauty in the face of Beatrice, his guide.

When the Son of God was born into this world, slavery was universal; it prevailed, though with modified rigor, amid the Jewish people. Cruelty to children and contempt of women received a kind of license as they reached a sort of climax in this frightful institution. In less than fifteen centuries, by the influence of Christianity alone, slavery had disappeared everywhere in Europe.<sup>4</sup> This great fact is unmistakable and certain, and reveals God's presence among men with an emphasis difficult to

<sup>1</sup> Troplong, *De l'Influence du Christianisme*, pp. 238-244. Paris, 1868. <sup>3</sup> *Emmanuel Deutsch's Remains*, p. 56. N. Y., 1874.

<sup>2</sup> *Prayers of Israel*, p. 11. N. Y., 1870. <sup>4</sup> Hallam's *Middle Ages*, Ch. II., Pt. II., p. 91. N. Y., 1854.

measure because of the very magnitude of the achievement and of the power it manifests. Let us remember first the universality of slavery. The remote East had hardened it into the iron fixity of caste. But, in whatever shape, slavery was everywhere—in Asia, in Egypt, in Africa, in Europe, amid Copts and Huns, Persians and Scythians, Greeks and Romans, Germans and Franks, Dacians and Celts. In the Roman Empire, when in the reign of Claudius Gibbon estimates the entire population at 120,000,000, he puts the number of slaves at one-half, viz., 60,000,000.<sup>1</sup> There existed in the wide earth, outside the circle of revealed religion, neither law nor sentiment that tended to abolish slavery. “Property,” says Aristotle,<sup>2</sup> “is as an instrument to living, and an estate is a multitude of instruments: so a slave is a living instrument, and every servant is an instrument more valuable than other instruments. . . . That being who by nature is not his own, but totally another’s, and yet is a man, is a slave by nature; and that man is the property of another who is his mere chattel, though he is still a man; but a chattel is an instrument for use, separate from the body. . . . It is clear that some men are free by nature, and that others are slaves, and that in the case of the latter the lot of slavery is both advantageous and just.” Plato equally recognizes slavery, only recommending that Hellenes should not enslave Hellenes.<sup>3</sup> He quotes Homer’s line. Plutarch says that Cato would buy only stout and serviceable slaves, and then turned them out to die when unable to work, giving less thought to them than is sometimes granted to worn-out horses and dogs.<sup>4</sup> In Attica, B.C. 309, there were estimated to be 84,000 citizens, 40,000 aliens, and 400,000 slaves. As the result of the sacking of Tarentum by Fabius, 30,000 slaves were brought into market; Paulus sold 150,000 after the conquest of Epirus. A good slave at Athens in the time of

<sup>1</sup>Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Ch. II., V. I., pp. 52, 53. N. Y., 1852.

<sup>2</sup>*Politics*, I., 4. 5.

<sup>3</sup>*Republic*, V., 469. *Laws*, VI., 777.

<sup>4</sup>*Lives*, Vol. II., pp. 321–344.

Demosthenes cost about thirty dollars of our money; at Rome in the time of Horace, about ninety dollars. A man could be purchased in the camp of Lucullus in Pontus for less than eighty cents. After Pindenissus was taken by Cicero, the inhabitants were sold for over half a million dollars.<sup>1</sup> The wealthy owned large numbers, among whom were those skilled in every trade. Crassus had five hundred masons and architects. Men of the best race and of the highest accomplishments were liable by war or piracy to be reduced to slavery. According to Diodorus, Plutarch, and others, Plato himself was thus once captured and sold in the slave market of Ægina. Suetonius mentions, as having met a similar fate, Gniphos, a man of genius, learned in Greek and Latin, who had Cicero for a pupil. Terence had been a slave. Staberius Eros and Daphnus, eminent grammarians, and Manilius Antiochus, founder of astronomy, were all slaves. L. Octacilius Pilitus, a liberated slave, a professor of rhetoric and a historian, was also a teacher of Pompey. The Athenians, sent to the Syracusan quarries and sold as slaves after the defeat of Nicias, strove to soften the hearts of their captors by teaching them the verses of their great poets. The Syracusans branded them in their foreheads with the figure of a horse, as after another defeat the Samians put on them in derision the figure of an owl. The slave had no rights. The Spartans murdered them, when their numbers grew excessive, in cold blood, from policy. The rich Romans put them to death in passion or wantonness. Vedius Pollio ordered a slave to be thrown to the lampreys in a fish-pond, because he had broken a crystal vase. This cruelty is said to have been prevented by Augustus. But emperor and senate united to execute the cruel law which condemned to death all the innocent slaves of Pedanius Secundus for the crime of one. The words of Horace<sup>2</sup> show that a master in his time had the power to crucify a slave for eating

<sup>1</sup> 12,000 sestertia = \$530,000. Cicero, *Ep. ad Attic.*, V., 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Satires*, I., III., 80-84.

without permission the remains of a fish he had removed from the table.

In contrast with this horrible system, the Church of Christ taught the equality of all souls before their Maker and Redeemer, the sanctity of life. The baptized slave became a brother beloved, capable of the highest place in the kingdom of heaven. She enfranchised the enslaved; she adopted them as her own children; she forbade any one to reënslave them; she invested them with her highest offices. She counted the redemption of slaves a suitable cause for the expenditure of her most sacred treasures. Council after council restricted, and at length abolished, the traffic in slaves. Her voice at length became potent amid human laws and over the most powerful kingdoms. The laws of Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian move steadily in the direction of freedom. Gregory the Great manumitted his slaves with the declaration that, since Christ took man's nature to free him from the bondage of sin, it was suitable to free those in bondage by the law of nations.<sup>1</sup> Pope Calixtus I. had been a slave; Adrian IV., the only English Pope, had been an illiterate servant in a monastery at Avignon; Sixtus V. was son of a vine-dresser. The father of Adrian VI. was a mechanic, and the fathers of John XXII. and Urban IV. had mended shoes. These, in their high place, disciplined and sometimes deposed kings. Thus practically they taught what Pope Alexander III. sought to have declared in a council of the twelfth century—"that nature has made no man a slave"—and so to abolish slavery. This mighty result was not brought about without a long and passionate struggle. No one not wishing to be deceived can fail to see that it was due alone to the religion of Christ, not to statesmanship, to self-interest, to the commercial spirit, nor to any system of philosophy. Multitudes, in old times as well as new, have been ready to rush back, if allowed, into their old heathenism. They had not always the excuse pretended

<sup>1</sup> Robertson's *Charles V.*, Vol. I., pp. 297, 298. Boston, 1857.

in modern days, of an alien race and color. William of Malmesbury<sup>1</sup> accuses the Anglo-Saxon nobility of selling their own flesh and blood. The Venetians had to be forbidden to sell Christians to Saracens<sup>2</sup> in exchange for Asiatic luxuries. Such is the commercial spirit. The American President Lincoln, just before his death, said of the war that arose out of slavery: "If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offences which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, . . . as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.'"<sup>3</sup>

II. The practical results of Christianity, at which we are now to look, have indeed many of them been anticipated by what we have just said of the nobler conceptions of God and man introduced into the world by this religion. There can be no more fair and reasonable way of estimating its fruits than by looking at its personal influence, and the efforts it prompted to enlighten the souls and remove the miseries of mankind.

(a) The faith of Christ, honestly received by any human being, invariably wrought a wonderful transformation and elevation. Commonplace people became interesting; life received a new value and purpose; the vicious were permanently reformed, and freed from the chain of evil habit; the careless and frivolous became earnest. It was found that even children, taught their catechism, could answer understandingly and consistently questions before which Plato and Aristotle had hesitated and wavered. Nay, when persecution broke like a storm upon the Christian communities, young persons, even women

<sup>1</sup> *Chronicle*, p. 102. See Hallam, p. 473.

<sup>2</sup> See a law of Carloman, brother to Charlemagne: "Ut mancipia

Christiana paganis non vendantur." —Baluze, *Capitularia*, T. I., pp. 150, 361.

<sup>3</sup> Second Inaugural Address, 1865.

and maidens, as well as plain, average people, never suspected of the heroic, were known to stand forth and brave the threatenings and endure the tortures, often keen and lasting, inflicted by the authorities, with a courage and a calmness that neither Socrates nor Zeno ever surpassed, often with a kind of joy and triumph that would have seemed strange to philosopher or Stoic. In every land, in every city, in almost every town and village and country district of the great empire, a little community could be found which produced these unworldly philosophers, these humble champions and heroes, performing the greatest actions without ostentation, making wicked souls holy and clean, obtaining divine wisdom in place of doubt, changing coward hearts into brave.

(*b*) Then, in the next place, the Church of Christ exhibited the fruit of missionary exertion in attestation of the divine treasure she had received, going forth, at her Lord's command, to impart the good tidings of His religion to human beings in every land, of every race, sex, and condition, by persuasion and moral instruments alone, by holiness and charity, by instruction, by patience, by exhortation and encouragement. No religion has ever before or since been disseminated<sup>1</sup> thus in any branch of the family of man, by its own merits alone, without mixture of self-interest or worldly politics. Pass in review the long line of apostles and missionaries, from S. Peter and S. Paul, S. Matthew and S. Thomas, down through the ages to Pantænus and Bardesanes, Pothinus and Irænaeus, Dionysius and Ulphilas, Eucharis and S. Martin, Augustine and Theodore, Columban and Gall, Methodius and Cyril, Boniface and Willibrord, Francis of Assisi and Raymond Lulli; and in more modern days, S. Francis Xavier, Henry Martyn, Reginald Heber, John Eliot,

<sup>1</sup>“ Missionary enterprise is almost peculiar to Christianity. . . . century and a half later, carried the new religion to Iceland; when Adalbert of Prague ministered to the savage Hungarians, or when, at a later time, he died under pagan violence, when Friedrich and Thorwald, a while seeking to carry the Gospel to

Marsden, Williams, and Gardiner ;<sup>1</sup> and in our own days and memory, Bishops Pattison and Mackenzie. What courage, what patience, what faith, what high intelligence, united with unselfish labor, do these very names, and a multitude of others, their companions and followers, that crowd upon our thoughts as soon as they are mentioned, bring before us, writing the divine evidence of the religion for which they lived and died in lines of light through all the pathways of the world ! These missionaries addressed the souls of men with a power never before perceived in human words, because they copied the spirit and echoed the message of Him who "knew what was in man," and yet "spake as never man spake." They could not be content to possess the truth and cherish the hope of eternal life for themselves alone, but, by a divine necessity, were constrained to make other men sharers in it.

(c) A similar impulse led them also to give an enduring and practical expression to the charity and mercy of their religion, forming thus another of its peculiar and most glorious fruits. "It has covered the globe," says Lecky, "with countless institutions of mercy, absolutely unknown to the pagan world." These may be distributed under three classes: 1. Those for the sick and hurt; infirmaries. 2. For the board and education of children. 3. For poor old persons of both sexes.<sup>3</sup>

The word "hospital"—whence in English the terms "Spital," "Spitalfields"—it is well known, comes from *hospitium*, the name of the institution established in the Christian ages for the reception and relief of lepers. Thus did the Church renew her Lord's miracle upon those

the Prussians; when Otto, at Stettin, in the twelfth century, assailed by a furious heathen mob, walked forth to meet them, in the midst of his clergy, calmly chanting psalms and hymns—always was seen the motive force of faith in the religion which they honored and taught as apt for mankind."—R. S. Storrs's *Origin of*

*Chy.*, Lect. IX., p. 306. See Neander.

<sup>1</sup> See Miss Yonge's *Pioneers and Founders*. Macmillan, 1872.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. of European Morals*, Vol. II., pp. 89-91, 95. N. Y., 1876.

<sup>3</sup> See the mention of the *Gerontokomion* (γεροντοκομειον) in Justinian's *Code*, I, 2, 19, 22, 23.

forsaken of human aid. We hear of this heroic charity as early as the time of S. Basil, who, besides a hospital of general character, created an immense hospital for lepers at Cæsarea, for which S. Gregory Nazianzen declared that it deserved the title of "the City of Charity," and to be placed above the seven wonders of the ancient world.<sup>1</sup> When the dread disease invaded Europe in the middle ages, these *Hospitia* for lepers, or lazar-houses, were found everywhere, and were usually served by monks. Thousands of persons of both sexes, and from every rank in life, were moved by their religion to devote their lives to the relief of this and other forms of suffering. "A Roman lady, named Fabiola, in the fourth century, founded at Rome, as an act of penance, the first public hospital, and the charity planted by that woman's hand overspread the world, and will alleviate to the end of time the darkest anguish of humanity."<sup>2</sup> The oldest existing hospital in Europe, the *Hôtel Dieu* in Paris—long known as the *Maison Dieu*—was founded in the seventh century, and received the benefactions of successive sovereigns. It was served and aided by the Sisters of Mercy. The great hospital at Lyons was gratuitously conducted by the same charitable Order, in all the departments, cooking, nursing, dispensing medicine, etc.

It is notable how in this department of Christian effort there is, first, in general, the only sound solution of the problem how to advance toward moral perfection by turning excited and sympathetic feeling to a religious use; and, secondly, how science and charity were made to advance hand in hand, when the means of relief became also schools of medicine, and the work was classified into departments, as lying-in hospitals, ophthalmic hospitals, consumptive hospitals, children's hospitals, dispensaries, *maisons de santé*, *sanatoria*, etc. The city of Copenhagen owes its origin to a monastery founded by Archbishop

<sup>1</sup> Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, Vol. VI., pp. 283, 285, 291. <sup>2</sup> Lecky's *European Morals*, II. 85, Ch. IV. Lond., 1879.

Absolon, on the Baltic coast, for the reception of the shipwrecked. The care of orphan and friendless children has been the occasion of many memorable charities, among which may be specified the Christ's Hospital in London, and Girard College in Philadelphia. The latter is sometimes signalized as illustrating the charity of unbelief, because the clergy are expressly excluded from its enclosures. Never was a more futile boast. The very conception of such a charity was never found save in Christian hearts; and the money by which Girard realized it was not his own, but intrusted to his hands by those whom Christian charity had preserved from the West India revolution.

The treatment of the insane among the ancient Egyptians was said to have been accompanied by music and other agreeable impressions upon the senses. But fear prompted cruelty even in many Christian lands. It seems incredible that a word with the terrible associations of "*Bedlam*"<sup>1</sup> should be derived from "Bethlehem," where the star of hope first shone out upon sick and suffering man. The name "Bethlehem"<sup>2</sup> was again given in modern days to the institutions where sounder views of psychology prompted a more beneficent treatment of the insane. "The Knights of Malta were famous as the one order who admitted lunatics into their hospitals, but no Christian asylum expressly for their benefit existed till 1409. The honor of instituting this form of charity in Christendom belongs to Spain. A monk named Juan Gilberto Joffre, filled with compassion at the sight of the maniacs who were hooted by crowds through the streets of Valencia, founded an asylum in that city, and his example was speedily followed in other provinces. In A.D. 1425 an asylum was erected at Saragossa. In A.D. 1436 both Seville and Valladolid followed the example, as did also Toledo in A.D. 1483."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is a dreadful description in Pinel, *Traité medico-philosophique sur Aliénation mentale*, pp. 200-202 (2d ed.).

<sup>2</sup> Lecky's *European Morals*, Ch. IV., II., 94, 95. He derives these facts from Desmaisons, *Des Asiles d'Aliénés en Espagne*. Paris,

<sup>3</sup> See Sydney Smith's review entitled "Mad Quakers."

1859.

It is worth while to recall a brief outline of one of the important hospitals of the largest and best kind, say for example, to take an English one, Middlesex Hospital, in the parish of Marylebone. To secure thorough ventilation, it is built in the form of the letter H. There are 310 beds—120 for medical, 190 for surgical cases. Upon the staff are three physicians, a physician *accoucheur*, four surgeons, assistants for outdoor patients, a chaplain, and a secretary. The physicians and surgeons who give their service gratuitously act as professors in the medical college. There are 2,100 cases, on the average, annually admitted; 1,800 receive attendance at their own homes. This great establishment is conducted at an annual expense of £11,000—or \$55,000—one-half from endowment, the rest from subscriptions, donations, legacies, and miscellaneous collections. The work of the hospital, therefore, represents not merely a past impulse of Christian charity, but equally the present, living feeling of Christian hearts, that still see in the poor and afflicted the representatives of their suffering Lord. Hospitals, moreover, we should observe, are organized not merely in great towns like London, Edinburgh, and Paris—and the best are near universities—but also in connection with other great branches of public service, like the Military Hospitals at Netley, Fort Pitt (for lunatics), and Yarmouth; and naval hospitals, like those at Haslar, Plymouth, Malta, Bermuda, etc.

The rules which prevail in all of them are substantially identical, and are worthy to be recalled—good order and cleanliness; that they be open night and day; have resident surgeon and assistants; quiet, decorous conduct; exclusion of intoxicants and miscellaneous visitors.

The benevolence which peculiarly marks these products of Christianity is hardly less characteristic of them than the union they exhibit of the purest charity with high intelligence, the most exalted feeling with the calm efficiency of science.

It has been admirably said, that widely as the Epicurean

and the Stoic differed on most points, they seem to have quite agreed in their contempt for pursuits so vulgar as to be useful. The Stoic was perpetually going over the questions, "What is the highest good, whether pain be an evil, whether all things be fated, whether we can be certain of anything, whether we can be certain that we are certain of nothing, whether all departures from right be equally reprehensible." The Epicurean who referred all happiness to bodily pleasure, and all evil to bodily pain, might have been expected to exert himself for the purpose of bettering his own physical condition and that of his neighbors. But while one talked only of virtue and the other of pleasure, in the end it appeared, as Macaulay said, that "the Epicurean had added as little to the quantity of pleasure, as the Stoic to the quantity of virtue." It remained for Christianity to produce a philosophy that "tended to assuage suffering, to multiply the conveniences of life, and to extend the empire of man over the material world."

It has been sometimes alleged that nowhere in the history of morals can more revolting developments of certain peculiar vices—such as cruelty, hypocrisy, blasphemy—be found than in Christian lands. Without disputing the comparative turpitude of the pagan and Christian examples of these vices, it may be granted that the sin against light has always a deeper intensity than the sin of indifference or ignorance. A Christian who turns cruel, makes prayer and religious forms instruments of deceit and gain, or lets loose his tongue in wanton riot amid sacred persons and things, does the devil's work on earth. He is the servant who knows his lord's will, and yet determines not to do it. But his very misery and loss are a measure of the treasure he casts away.

One of the earliest and most expressive forms of the hospital was seen in the *Xenodochia*, or refuges for strangers, found in early days at Ostia, at Rome, at Jerusalem, and ordered by the Council of Nice to be erected in every city. Charity in these, receiving the stranger and pilgrim,

amid the coldness of the world, journeying toward the holy city, was a most significant type of the Church taking into its hospitable fold humanity, bruised and wounded with injuries bodily and spiritual. In her was the heart, and with her was the skill, to administer prompt and effective relief. She alone possessed the exact knowledge which was the key to the treatment of the spiritual diseases of men. The ignorant sneers sometimes directed by able men (as, for instance, Macaulay) against her solicitude over the distinctions marked by the words Homoousion and Homoiousion, Nestorian and Monothelite, are really as stupid as would be a sneer directed against the care of a physician to discriminate between sulphate of zinc (white vitriol) and sulphate of magnesia (epsom salts), or the similar looking preparations of morphine and quinine. Yet it has not been thought beneath the dignity of a State legislature to pass a law requiring that morphine be put in bottles of red labels and white letters. Exact distinctions are a sign both in religion and science of the possession of real truth, and of a due sense of the dignity of the office of physician, whether of soul or body. The Church does not confound revealed truth with the old speculations of philosophy. She knows what she has received, and she has faith in the remedies of her Lord, the Good Physician, who comes near to man in the hour of gloom and sickness, and "touches" heart and soul and conscience, as well as the suffering body, with healing powers.<sup>1</sup> Life has no malady, and death no terror, for which she has no medicine, and over which she has not at some time triumphed.

<sup>1</sup> "There is one only Physician of true life in death, Son of Mary and flesh and spirit (*εἰς ἄρτος ἐστὶν* Son of God, first passible and then *σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός*), impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord." generate and ingenerate, God in man, —Ignatii, *Ep. ad Ephes.*, VII.



THIRD COURSE.  
APOLOGETICS.



## INTRODUCTION.

---

AFTER viewing the internal and external evidences of Christianity—its essential glory and strength, which fit it to take captive every human soul, and its outward title-deeds to its great possessions in the world's homage—we seek now to give some answer to the various objections raised by the wit or the passion or the learning of man, to excuse his rejection of the truths and his violation of the laws revealed by the religion of Christ. This branch of our subject is appropriately styled Apologetics, a name often extended both in ancient and modern times over the whole theme. I have distributed its treatment in the present course into twelve lectures, as follows :

- I. Metaphysical Objections : <sup>1</sup> to Religion in general, and to Miracles in particular.
- II. and III. Scientific : Law, Miracle, Evolution.
- IV. and V. Moral: take the offensive. Biblical Morality. Immoral Animus of Infidelity. Gibbon's bias.
- VI. Critical and Pedantic Objections.
- VII. Pagan and Heathen Rivals to the Christian Religion.
- VIII. Schisms.
- IX. Faults of Christians.
- X. Scepticism as a Habit.
- XI. Indifference.
- XII. Faith and Reason compared.

<sup>1</sup>“ Newton cannot dispense with the metaphysician, nor the metaphysician with us.”—Cardinal Newman.



## LECTURE I.

---

### METAPHYSICAL OBJECTIONS: TO RELIGION IN GENERAL, AND TO MIRACLES IN PARTICULAR.

IT is part of the divine evidence of Christianity that this religion can give a reasonable answer to every honest doubt. This does not mean that it can solve every riddle or clear every objection that has puzzled the wit of man. To lay claim to any such power, would be the way to raise suspicion rather than to procure confidence. No branch of science is free from speculative difficulties that are unanswerable, and most branches encounter at some time or other practical obstacles that are inexplicable. Now, the claim which the Catholic Church makes for revealed religion is simply that she possesses important truths concerning the nature of God and the nature of man, and the relations of each to the other, and laws for the regulation of human life, that man may not miss the felicity for which he was made. This view of religion it is the more necessary should be clearly considered, because the neglect of it is the source of continual mistakes, and often of wilful misapprehension. Religion is not a disclosure of all truth upon every subject. Scripture gives no details of any human science, astronomy, geography, geology, chemistry. Nay, it uses upon the subjects of many of them the popular language common to human beings still quite ignorant of them. This is, in

fact, no more than was necessary if it would speak to man an intelligible language at all. This religion proposes to man certain important truths to regulate his belief and his life—truths whose evidence and reality depend not upon their beauty and high consistency, though they may have both, nor upon any human attestation, but simply on the authority of the Divine Being who discloses them. The only logical objection to these religious truths must be made either against the evidence that they come from God, or against the belief itself in God. We say simply, that, if there be God, He can disclose himself by a miracle to his creature, man. And the certainty of the disclosure is not at all affected by the lapse of time since it took place, unless new evidence has meantime come to light affecting the reality of the disclosure. It is very common, though in the view of logic very senseless, to declaim against dogma and tradition, as if, under these invidious names, religion could be overthrown. Every class of truths rests upon its own peculiar evidence. Each human science rests upon discovery, observation, orderly statement, logical consistency. The distinctive truths of revealed religion rest upon the authority of the Almighty speaking directly to human beings. The queen of the sciences, theology, makes use oftentimes of the methods of human science, applied, for instance, to the varied disclosures in Holy Scripture, for the purposes of teaching, of exposition, of defence; but her foundation is wholly different from theirs. That foundation is exclusively the direct word of Him who can neither deceive nor be deceived. It is quite legitimate for theology, in the service of religion, to point out how the doctrine revealed is in harmony with reason, and consistent with the noblest utterances of human sages upon the same or kindred themes. But its certainty, after all, is to be sought merely in the authority of its Revealer. It would be becoming in the human objector to criticise the proof that there has been a revelation; but, without doing this, to criticise the revelation itself is simply folly and im-

piety. To place the divine dogma on a level with arbitrary statements of human leaders in science, or in false religions, is merely confusion of mind; or to stigmatize as "a tradition" some revealed doctrine that has been for many generations in the possession of the Kingdom of God, looks like a designed jugglery between proved revelations and the shadows of legend.

The most important illustration of those axioms in religious philosophy to which I would now call your attention is to be found in the revealed doctrine concerning God Himself. Revelation declares that He is One. It also says that He is a Trinity, Three in One. It proclaims Him to be independent of His works, and that evil is no part of His work, though absolutely subject to His sway. Now, these truths are certainly part of revealed religion. They are contained in Scripture; the Church attests them. It is not permitted to any person to deny any one of them and still claim to be a believer in revelation. For what the Church believes on these points is the revelation, or there is none. The private interpretation of any person or any sect, apart from the Church, to the contrary, is a sheer delusion. Now, these dogmas concerning God, it is plain, condemn the errors both of polytheism and pantheism. They assert that God is one; and with equal certainty they assert that He is a Trinity, not the God worshipped by Muhammedans and Unitarians. They also assure us that He is holy, and hates and will punish sin.

What ought to be said to a mind that feels a difficulty, or thinks that it feels a difficulty, in receiving any or all of these first truths? This inquiry is a fair introduction to the principal subject of the present lecture, the metaphysical objections to religion and to miracles. And it is fair in the outset to insist that no objection should be allowed to prevent the reception of a truth of religion, when the same objection is not admitted to be valid against other truths. They who receive without hesitation a multitude of scientific facts and doctrines in spite of unsolvable difficulties and objections connected with

them, cannot with consistency reject religion because of difficulties precisely similar. He who rejects the Trinity because he cannot conceive of three persons in one Godhead is not permitted to retain belief in one God, who is infinite and a person, unless he can conceive how infinity can be reconciled with personality. Nor may he who puts aside his trust in God's goodness because of the evil in the universe continue to retain confidence in the goodness of any person, or of himself, after his experience of human weakness and the power of temptation. The truth is that facts and principles adequately proved are and must be received by all healthful minds, in spite of speculative puzzles that may be raised upon them.

We are now prepared to look in the face the metaphysical objections to the arguments for God. The majority of those who have worshipped God, and without doubt worshipped Him acceptably, have done so simply because they have been taught so to do, and have found in the very act the approval of their innermost consciousness. Their certainty of their Maker's being and presence has outrun and transcended every formal argument. To worship Him, to obey Him, and to love Him, has seemed to them undoubtedly the most fit and right, rather than the most reasonable thing to be done. Reasons, we are well aware, for our most familiar and instinctive actions come to us in the order of time usually after our own beliefs have received a shock, or when we seek to remove from some other person the obstacles that hinder him from entering on a path familiar to us. The most obvious proof of God comes from the necessity we feel of assigning a cause for whatever exists. A cause is that which efficiently precedes any known result.<sup>1</sup> Two things are necessary to the conception of cause: first, that it be adequate to the production of the effect; and second, that it end, after however long a succession, in a First Cause, or something which has no antecedent. These

<sup>1</sup> Quod cuique efficienter antecedit, id ei causa est.—Cicero, *Fab.*, XV.,

conceptions are not confined to the religious; they are as plainly expressed by the free-thinking Hobbes,<sup>1</sup> for instance, as by any orthodox theologian. The world, with the creatures in it, intelligent and inanimate, did not make itself; it had a Maker with powers sufficient to produce and to control its vastness, its splendors, its regular movements, its hidden machinery. The creation of the world is in no sort explained by saying that the changes recorded in its constitution have been going on without limit through an indefinite past. Seriously to propose such a statement as an explanation is merely an abnegation of reason. A law of our reason compels us to think that all causes end in a First Cause, itself uncaused. To deny this is really to deny the existence of cause altogether, and to admit that there can be an infinite series of effects without any cause.

Next comes the question, Is the first cause to be received as equivalent to God? Philosophy will say that the attributes of this cause can be known only from its effects. The movements of the vast universe, under the law of gravitation, suggest that their cause is one; and reason confirms this judgment. But can we say that the power, the skill, displayed in the creation, great as they are, in strictness prove that the Creator is infinite? Can we even affirm that the sublimity, the beauty, the happiness, blended as they are in nature with deformities and anomalies and abundant evils and miseries, leave the goodness and mercy of God an obvious conclusion, without mystery? The answer to such questions, which spring up in the mind of man, can in part be found by considering the very nature of that being of whom the mind is a principal part. Man recognizes in himself, as in the universe, a blending of mind and matter. He instinctively believes in the difference of the two: mind thinks and moves, matter cannot think or move itself. No logical jugglery can persuade a really healthy mind that matter can think, or produce mind. The producing

<sup>1</sup> *Leviathan*, Pt. I., Ch. XII.

cause of all things must be intelligent.<sup>1</sup> Let any one who hesitates at this conclusion reflect that an inadequate cause is in truth the same as no cause at all. To say, then, that matter, by gradual steps, through a long development, has produced mind, is nothing else but the old absurdity of an endless series of effects without any cause. Again, to say that matter perhaps may think and move itself, is the same as denying the existence of matter as all the world has hitherto understood that term, namely, as denoting something that cannot think, and is moved only from without. The consciousness of every man, who considers his nature carefully and without prejudice, assures him that the thinking principle within him, call it mind or spirit or soul, is his very self, that it is distinct from the surrounding world amid which he lives, and that the very body which he inhabits, and which is part of himself, is, in the strictness of truth, an organism serving the intelligence which it enshrines, and which that intelligence uses as an instrument, and can do without. Now, the cause which framed the world is the cause also of the mind or spirit which anywhere in matter, animate or inanimate, produces or regulates motion. The matter that does not think could never produce the thinking spirit. This is as certain as that whatever exists must have a cause, except the First Cause. That First Cause must have intelligence, because we His creatures have intelligence. It must be a Person, because we whom He

<sup>1</sup> This has never been expressed with more admirable perspicuity than by Socrates in Plato: "Having once heard a person reading from a book written, as he said, by Anaxagoras, and which said that it is intelligence (*νοῦς*) that sets in order and is the cause of all things, I was delighted with this cause, and it appeared to me in a manner to be well that intelligence should be the cause of all things, and I considered with myself if this be so, that the regulating in-

telligence orders all things, and disposes each in such a way as will be best for it. . . . From this wonderful hope, however, my friend [addressing Cebes], I was speedily thrown down, when, as I advanced and read over his works, I meet with a man who makes no use of intelligence, nor assigns any causes for the ordering of all things, but makes the causes to consist of air, ether, and water, and many other things equally absurd."—Plato's *Phædo*, 107, 108.

has made are persons, and He sympathizes with our needs as such. His nature must be the rule of right and wrong, because in our nature the recognition of those distinctions is at once the most ineradicable of instincts, and the surest affirmation of reason. If the world does not everywhere manifest the clearest triumph of right and good over wrong and evil, is this after all a darker mystery than, or very different in kind from, the same conflict in individual man, in families, and in society? It does not hinder us from knowing that our own nature, in spite of its weakness and aberrations, was formed for virtue and goodness, and that the strength of individuals and of governments lies in upholding right and justice; and that these, in spite of temporary obstacles and defeats, tend to conquer and to triumph in the end. Nothing can support human nature in suffering, or in exertion, like the sense of having with it this holy law; nothing can stimulate human beings, singly or in masses, to such indignation as a sense of violated justice. Their Creator, therefore, is on the side of right and of holiness; His government tends to the triumph of justice, which shall finally assign to every creature its exact due. This inference is direct and irresistible, and seems contained in the very conception of cause. And when we further consider, that, while we see in the vast universe intelligence and wisdom enough to make us sure that it was formed and is ruled by an intelligent Spirit, still vast departments therein remain of unfathomable mystery and greatness, the conviction is forced upon us, that what we do not understand and conceive of the Creator is immeasurably more wonderful than what we do understand and conceive. There is, besides, an inherent excellence that belongs to the very nature of the First Cause. That which exists from eternity, and is itself the cause of whatever else exists, great or small, we cannot but think has every possible power and perfection.<sup>1</sup> Endeavoring to view Nature as a whole, she suggests to

<sup>1</sup> "Eternity," says Boethius, "is at session of interminable life."—*De once the entire and the perfect pos- Conso. Philos. L.V., p. 6.*

us infinitude rather than limits in the attributes of the Creator. Mathematical and even mechanical science imagines and takes for granted, as axiomatic foundations, forms of matter and laws of motion, that are never, and can never be, exactly realized in gross, actual matter. The artist looking upon Nature sees in her beauty the suggestion of an ideal that no created loveliness has ever fulfilled. And so in the depths of the conscience and the moral nature there is a glorious image of duty and self-sacrifice, an ideal of virtue, compared with which the utmost labors of heroes and saints ever seem to themselves as poor and inadequate. Whence comes to the human soul the ideal perfection of truth, of beauty, or of goodness, if it be not in some sort an image of the Creator placed therein by His own hands to charm His creature to Himself?

The language which men of science habitually use concerning the uniformity of nature shows that they find no difficulty in drawing an inference precisely analogous to, and certainly no more logical than, the inference we have just been considering. The uniformity of nature—that is to say, the unfailing recurrence of the like phenomena under like conditions, in small matters as well as in great—is assumed by multitudes to be a truth as certain as any mathematical axiom. And yet this uniformity rests upon no other foundation than a long repeated succession of phenomena. The sun has arisen and set, the tides have ebbed and flowed, since immemorial ages: therefore these phenomena will continue forever. This is the whole of the argument on which the belief is grounded. And yet scientific men consider it a kind of profanation, or a token of mental confusion, even to doubt of its truth. And we do not here doubt of its truth: we only say that the argument on which it rests has no logical validity. The sun may rise a million times, and then fail to rise forever, without breaking any rule of logic. Even in supposing the law of gravitation to cease to act, there is nothing contrary

to reason; such as there is, for instance, in supposing an effect to take place without a cause. Each of us knows that his mind has not existed from eternity; that he did not make his own mind; that he could not make another. He is certain therefore that his Maker is external to himself, and has existed from eternity. And since nature presents to him ascending and descending ranks of beings, the inference is natural, nay, irresistible, that the Author of all is higher than the highest, and greater than the greatest, next to Him, and that, too, by an infinite degree. What might be called the instinct of our reason teaches us to believe that outside of our mind there exists a Being greater in knowledge, power, and goodness than the very greatest of whom we can form any intellectual idea, however boundless. That we cannot in thought reconcile personality, love, disapprobation, justice, sympathy, with this infinitude, is no more obstacle to our thorough belief in their union, than our knowledge of the several infinities in lines, planes, and solids prevents our belief in the reality of geometrical extension. It is not too much to say that a law of our being compels us to think that our own best thoughts concerning truth or beauty or goodness are but images (like the reflection of a star in water) of the same qualities in Him who formed us thus, and, as a Person, sympathizes with our own personalities. We might even say that the non-existence of such an infinite Person is simply inconceivable. The heart demands Him, the intellect beholds Him, the will alone can check the confession of Him on the tongue, or paralyze the limbs that would worship Him with appropriate homage. To say that there is no God, is to say that truth and falsehood are one, that beauty is the same as ugliness, that right and wrong are but a vain jangle of words: and these are possible to a human being only when he puts on idiocy as a mask of his true self.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Vainest of all, the student's theme  
Ends in some metaphysic dream."

—*Vidal* in Scott's *Betrothed*, Ch. XIX., V., I.

To give a little further definiteness to the outline of a great subject, we will here add a few words upon two points—the nature of what are termed necessary truths, and the argument from design.

The laws which govern all thought are said to be necessary, because if we think at all we must think in conformity with them, and it is impossible to conceive the contrary of them to be true. Of this nature are the laws known in logic and metaphysics as the laws of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle. In mathematics, in like manner, the axioms bring before us necessary laws whenever we think of lines, of parallels, or of triangles. No effort of the imagination, for instance, will enable us to think that two straight lines can enclose space. But it should be observed that in scientific and popular speech the laws which govern the uniformities of nature, the movements under gravitation and chemical affinity, for instance, are also constantly spoken of as necessary; and they have without doubt a necessity of their own. Matter is actually under their sway. And all experience, speaking generally, confirms the uniformity of their operation. Practically we feel quite as certain that the sun will rise to-morrow, as that contradictories cannot be true. And yet these two kinds of necessity are generically different. Laws of thought govern every intelligent being whenever he thinks at all. Laws of nature govern substances which are external to the thinking spirit. The mind can without self-contradiction imagine the laws governing this outward nature to cease<sup>1</sup> in their operation, or even to be reversed, so that all visible forms and movements should be dissolved. But the mind cannot imagine a reversal of the law of identity, or of that of two straight lines so that they might enclose space. It is very

<sup>1</sup> Thus, *e. g.*, Bentley says: "Without gravity the whole universe, *if we suppose an undetermined power of motion infused into matter*, would have been a confused chaos, without beauty or order, and never stable and permanent in any condition."—Fourth Sermon of the Boyle Lectures, *Works*, III., p. 75. London, 1838.

important, then, that we observe, if we choose to apply the terms *necessity* and *necessary* to the laws of outward nature, and to the mental laws which govern all thought, that they bear in each application a very different sense: so that of the one class we say, *they must be*; but of the other, they are in fact thus, but might conceivably be otherwise. Even if we adopt the fatalist's language, according to which everything great or small is equally of necessity, we should remark that this necessity<sup>1</sup> is in no sort an explanation of how things came to be as they actually are, nor excludes choice, contrivance, responsibility, but merely affirms the necessity of the choice or contrivance finally preferred.

Now, it is well known that there is a law, called sometimes the law of sufficient reason, sometimes the law of reason and consequent, which has perplexed the most eminent metaphysicians and logicians, not as to whether it be true, for of that there can be no doubt, but as to the character of the necessity which it affirms. The law was thus stated by Leibnitz: "Nothing happens without a reason why it should be so rather than otherwise." This law so far as it is logical is expressed by the precept, Infer nothing without a ground or reason. But it contains, also, the metaphysical law, No event or being, but the First One, in the universe is without a cause. Sir William Hamilton, after teaching that the law of sufficient reason was the fourth of the fundamental laws of thought, at length maintained that so far as it was logical it was derived from the other three, and so far as it was material it was the same as the principle of causality, and extra logical. This distinction may be thus illustrated. The increase of light proves to me that the sun is rising. Here the growing light is the logical ground or reason of my inference concerning sunrise. But under the law of causality it happens that this order must be precisely reversed: for the sunrise is really the cause of the growing illumination. We see, then, why we are cautioned in logic that

<sup>1</sup> See Butler's *Analogy*, I., 6.

reason and consequent are not always identical with cause and effect. We must distinguish between a synthesis of thoughts and a real connection of existences. That which in the real connection of nature was an effect, viz., the growing light, becomes in the order of thought the actual cause of my knowledge of the sunrise. In some such way every real cause and effect in the universe may become to minds contemplating them actual reasons and consequents, though in a reversed order. In minds illuminated by experience the knowledge of causes becomes a summary of every possible knowledge.

And here it is fit to glance at what is called the argument from design. All the world,<sup>1</sup> heathen as well as Christian, have believed that an intelligent Creator is disclosed in the laws which govern nature by number, measure, and weight, in the myriad adaptations of means to ends, the wise contrivances, the skilful instruments by which certain works and definite results are wrought accurately, securely, constantly. Our minds perceive in every department of nature, in the air, on the earth, in plants, in the bodies of animals, a certain end or working contemplated, and then accomplished by suitable mechanism, with the same certainty because upon the same principles as in some human workshop we observe the details of delicate and elaborate machinery. The design or contrivance proves the designer; the glorious work reveals the artist. Many of the most successful human instruments, optical, mechanical, etc., have been produced by intelligent imitation of the works of nature. This argument was perceived quite as plainly by heathen sages as by Christian divines; it is expressed by Socrates in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* with a perspicuity worthy of being compared with the lucid opening of Paley's *Natural*

<sup>1</sup> The sceptic Hume admits the validity of this argument. "The whole frame of Nature," he says, "bespeaks an intelligent Author; and no rational inquirer can, after serious reflection, suspend his belief a moment with regard to the primary principles of genuine theism and religion."—*Natural History of Religion*.

*Theology.* The argument is enforced in Holy Scripture by an appeal to the native sagacity of all thinking men, while they who are insensible to it are stigmatized as "brutish" and "fools." "He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see? . . . He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not He know?"<sup>1</sup> Out of many statements of the argument, ancient and modern, I will select the following from the great classical scholar, Richard Bentley: "The bodies of men and other animals are excellently well fitted for life, and motion, and sensation. . . . The eye is very proper and meet for seeing, the tongue for tasting and speaking, the hand for holding and lifting and ten thousand operations besides; and so for the inward parts: the lungs are suitable for respiration, the stomach for concoction, the lacteous vessels for the reception of the chyle, the heart for the distribution of the blood to all the parts of the body. This is matter of fact, and beyond all dispute. . . . When we consider so many constituent parts in the bodies of men, all admirably compacted into so noble an engine; in each of the very fingers, for example, there are bones, and gristles, and ligaments, and membranes, and muscles, and tendons, and nerves, and arteries, and veins, and skin, and cuticle, and nail, together with marrow, and fat, and blood, and other nutritious juices, and all those solid parts of a determinate size, and figure, and texture, and situation, and each of them made up of myriads of little fibres and filaments not discoverable by the naked eye: I say, when we consider how innumerable parts must constitute so small a member as the finger, we cannot look upon it or the whole body, wherein appears so much fitness, and use, and subserviency to infinite functions, any otherwise than as the effect of contrivance and skill, and consequently the workmanship of a most intelligent and beneficent Being."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psalm xciv. 9, 10. Cf. v. 8. 2d May, 1692. Bentley's *Works*,

<sup>2</sup> Sermon III. Boyle Lectures "In III., 55. *Confutation of Atheism*," preached

This argument has in it neither subtlety nor uncertainty. The adaptation of the eye for seeing and of the ear for hearing are plain matters of fact, as Bentley says, and admit not of dispute. The conclusion that their Maker intended them for the ends they fulfil is equally unavoidable. To dispute or to ignore either is not a mark of subtlety or of philosophy, but rather deserves the stigma of Scripture as "brutish" and "foolish." For these classes the wise man provided a whip, a bridle, and a rod, not arguments—at least exclusively; for his first counsel is: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him."<sup>1</sup> If there be any logical certainty binding premise to conclusion, if there be any such relation as cause and effect, then assuredly all over nature there are effects that could proceed only from an intelligent Cause, instruments made by a skilful Hand, and working results that are correctly termed the final causes of the instruments themselves. The design, the contrivance are facts, they cleave to the very constructions, and the inference as to the Designer and Contriver is equally sure and inevitable.

What answer is made to this clear and simple argument? One philosopher says, Why there are rudimentary organs found in animals, beginnings of eyes, wings, paws, hands, which never develop to any use. And so, in order to contemplate this strange fact exclusively, this philosopher shuts his eyes to all the wisdom and skill in other things around, and even in the eyes and hands that are of use. Another philosopher says, A great many feeble beings and multitudes of imperfect, inefficient instruments appear in Nature's workshop; she cannot, therefore, be directed by high intelligence. In reference to the famous illustration of Paley, he says that a watchmaker who turned out so many poor timekeepers<sup>2</sup> would be neglected and discredited. But the skill of the poorest mechanic is

<sup>1</sup> Prov. xxvi. 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Pope has given a celebrated answer to the question why the senses of man have not greater acuteness than they actually possess:

"Why has not man a microscopic eye?  
For this plain reason, man is not a fly.  
Say what the use, were finer optics given,  
To inspect a mite, not comprehend the  
heaven?  
Or touch, if tremblingly alive all o'er,  
To smart and agonize at every pore?"

the perfection of wisdom compared with the stupidity that denies contrivance even in a bad watch or in an eye of imperfect sight. A third philosopher, and we are told that this type is often found in Eastern sages, cannot believe in design or contrivance in anything which, like human bodies or the parts of plants, grows or is put forth by insensible degrees. Design or contrivance for such minds, in other words, exists only in the artificial and is excluded from whatever is natural. Had no such objection ever been put forward in good faith, we might be tempted to dismiss it at once as senseless and contemptible. But lest any one should suspect that it contains a real difficulty, it may be worth while to say that design or contrivance is precisely the same conception in whatever material it be shown; that it can be seen as plainly in bones and skin and sinews, as in glass, metals, and wood; that the contriving mind and skilful hand of a human being are themselves a part of nature, and what they do is hence really though indirectly nature's work. The point of the difficulty, if it deserved to be called such, may perhaps be illustrated by remembering how a skilful performer on a musical instrument began by slow, painful, and deliberate production of the several notes, the labor of which is scarcely conceivable when we compare it with the rapid, easy, instinctive touch of the accomplished player. No one could regard it as wisdom to deny the identity of a tune when performed by the scholar and when performed by the adept in music. The atheist's objection to design—namely, that it is an accidental collocation of atoms out of myriads of other possible collocations<sup>1</sup>—is clearly and fairly met by the mathematical

Or, quick effluvia darting through the  
brain,  
Die of a rose in aromatic pain?  
If nature thundered in his opening ears,  
And stunned him with the music of the  
spheres,  
How would he wish that heaven had  
left him still  
The whispering zephyr and the purling  
rill!"

*Essay on Man*, Ep. I., 193.

<sup>1</sup> It is worth perhaps to recall Bentley's energetic exposure of this doctrine as an account of the formation of man. "What can be said more [he means than a threat of coercion] to such persons, that are either so disingenuous or so stupid as to profess to believe that all the natural powers and acquired habits

doctrine of chances, by which it is shown, that while the collocation in a given organ is vastly improbable, the exact combination of a large number of organs in a single body involves improbabilities, which, though expressed in figures, transcend the imagination. To believe in such a chance would argue the wildest credulity. Here perhaps it may be suitable to quote a sentence from Mr. Darwin. "To suppose that the eye," says Mr. Darwin, "with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree."<sup>1</sup> So far, then, as this philosopher is concerned, we have his admission that the only possible alternative to an intelligent Creator that his system can offer is itself "absurd in the highest possible degree"—a form of speech held in geometry to be a full admission of the opposite hypothesis. There remains finally the modern scientific man, of whom we may take Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire as a type, who, when confronted with the argument from design, thinks that he may, in polite parlance, give it the cut direct. He simply declines to see any design in nature. The eye is an instrument which sees, and the ear another which hears; they grew by an inexplicable evolution to be what they are, and they perform their work, and that is all. There

of the mind, that penetrating understanding and accurate judgment, that strength of memory and readiness of wit, that liberality and justice and prudence and magnanimity, that charity and beneficence to mankind, that ingenuous fear and awful love of God, that comprehensive knowledge of the histories and languages of so many nations, that experienced insight into the works and wonders of nature, that rich vein of poetry and inexhausted fountain of eloquence, those lofty flights of thought and

almost intuitive perceptions of abstruse notions, those exalted discoveries of mathematical theorems and divine contemplations, all the admirable endowments and capacities of human nature, which we sometimes see actually existent in one and the same person, can proceed from the blind shuffling and casual clashing of atoms?" *Second Boyle Sermon, 1792, Bentley's Works, III., pp. 43, 44.*

<sup>1</sup>Quoted in Mozley's *Essays*, Vol. II., p. 404.

is no contrivance in their construction, no agreement or correspondence with a foreseen work: the work proceeds from the instrument because it happens to be able to do that and nothing else. Saint-Hilaire ridicules design by this illustration: "You might as well say that a man who uses crutches was originally designed to the misfortune of having one of his legs paralyzed or amputated."<sup>1</sup> Saint-Hilaire has here certainly drawn a most lame conclusion from what are very like lame premises. If the professors of science habitually reasoned thus, it is safe to say that little credit would come through their temper or sagacity to their favorite pursuits. To draw such a lesson in design from the sight of a lame man, is as if one should meet an explanation of the benevolent purposes of a lighthouse, with the sneer that it was far more likely designed for shipwrecks. People of ordinary sense and feeling are at no loss to draw a lesson, and a sound one, on the subject of design from the crutches of a man who has lost a limb. They would say, for instance, that the crutches were *designed* to supply the place of the missing limb. No scientific oracle could persuade them that there was any absurdity in that. But men would say with equal certainty that the legs of man *were designed* by his Maker to promote the movements of this creature over the earth's surface with head erect. The design is just as certain in the construction of the legs as in the construction of the crutches, although there is an infinite disparity between the skill displayed in the one case and in the other. The science that cannot see this is a science that has greater skill in closing its eyes to a truth it does not like than in keeping them open to all truth.

The proofs, then, of the existence of God, and that striking proof especially that comes from the argument from design, can never be overthrown by metaphysical

<sup>1</sup>À raisonner de la sorte, vous diriez d'un homme qui fait usage de béquilles, qu'il était originai-  
 res jambes paralysée ou amputée." — *Principes de Philosophie Zoologique*, p. 66.  
 destiné au malheur d'avoir l'une de

objections. This last great proof brings into special prominence the personality of the Creator. This being established, there is so far from being any *à priori* objection to miracles, that, on the contrary, a strong probability seems to arise for their occurrence. The uniformity of nature, and, to take an example from its most conspicuous law, gravitation itself seem finally to depend only upon the Maker's will. He, then, who made man,—who still loves His creatures amid their errors and miseries—it seems certain will in some way interfere, in answer to their prayers, to guide them, and to save them, that they miss not the great end for which they were made. And the miracle is the sole conceivable proof of the reality of this merciful interposition.

## LECTURE II.

---

### SCIENTIFIC OBJECTIONS.

THE consideration we have just given to metaphysical objections to religion we believe to be the best introduction to the review upon which we now propose to enter, of such objections to the doctrines of revelation as have lately seemed to take new vitality from the developments of science in many directions. We propose to devote two lectures to this subject—one to the grounds or fundamental principles of the sciences in general, and one to some of the leading and favorite doctrines of the present time, *e. g.*, the question involved in evolution. The battle-ground where the conflict will have to be fought out between religion and such science as has become irreligious will be found at length, I believe, in the region of metaphysics. Some preparation therefore in the technical details of this abstract science I earnestly recommend as of very great importance to the champion of faith. What I recommend is not any exclusive or protracted devotion to the teaching of any one school, though I have my own opinion as to the soundest school of metaphysics, but that you acquire sufficient knowledge of the subject to be able to state briefly, and with precision, the nature of the controversies raised concerning substance, cause, the primary laws of thought, the nature of law, the differences between mathematical, logical, and physical necessity, and some of the more celebrated doctrines on these and kindred topics. Even a very elementary

acquaintance with these matters will enable you, I believe, to detect, for instance, the fact that the strength of the irreligious objections derived from some of the sciences lies solely in the tacit assumption of the truth of the abstract doctrine known as materialism. This is the doctrine that teaches that there is but one substance in the universe, viz., matter, not two, *i. e.*, spirit and matter; that spirit, in which inhere intelligence, thought, feelings, conscience, is not different in essence from matter which has extension, resistance, taste, form, color, and cannot move itself. It is enough for the refutation of this doctrine, with many minds, merely to state it thus simply, fairly, and without exaggeration. And the reason is because it is thus perceived to contradict a primary intuition of mankind, who believe that the mind that has intelligence, thinks, reasons, and can originate motion is a different substance from the matter that is simply extended, hard or soft, is inert, and has no power to move itself. It requires no very great proficiency in metaphysics, I affirm, to attain reasonable and perfect certainty on such a point as this, and to estimate at their just value all sophistical attempts to undermine this intuitive conviction.

Moreover, I have no doubt that a truth much akin to this is in fact a part of divine revelation; I mean the truth uttered by S. Paul when he said:<sup>1</sup> "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." The inspired apostle points to an important distinction between the gross matter (the psychic body), which is the instrument of the intelligent soul in this life, and the same organ (the spiritual body) when it shall serve the immortal spirit after the resurrection. And the difference doubtless depends upon its more or less intimate relation and subservience to the spiritual principle. The radical difference between matter and spirit is emphasized by their contrast even when matter is most highly exalted.

<sup>1</sup> Ἔστι σῶμα ψυχικὸν καὶ ἔστι σῶμα πνευματικόν.—I Cor. xv.

The soundness of our answers to scientific objections to religion will obviously depend upon the soundness of our conceptions of both science and religion. The sciences consist, in the great kingdom of knowledge, of distinct groups of facts and doctrines, having a measure of logical coherence and completeness, so that they can be clearly taught and conveniently apprehended. Each science is the aggregate result in its department of the patient and continued researches and experiments of different laborers, few or many. Religion, on the other hand, as we here conceive it, consists of certain truths and principles revealed directly to man by his Maker, and not discovered originally by man, nor discoverable by the powers of his reason, nor capable of being enlarged by that reason, though susceptible of being, in a certain measure, systematized by human intellect, and indefinitely illustrated and even recommended in the various phases of human experience.

The sciences are improved, their errors corrected, their defects supplied, by new experiments and careful observations in the respective fields to which they belong. "We do not enlarge the sciences," says Kant, "but disfigure them, when we suffer their boundaries to run into one another." This is true of the whole of what are called the experimental sciences, which, though resting on a common principle, still have each their proper province and peculiar methods. But Kant's remark is even more emphatically true of the relation between the natural sciences and religion. To attempt to apply the method of these sciences to religion is, in fact, simply to assume that there is no such thing as religion in the sense we have given to this term. That religion is a disclosure from the Maker of man to His creature of certain truths and principles for the regulation of man's faith and duty; they receive confirmation, they even receive new evidence, from the experience of a faithful and dutiful obedience. But religious truths and laws can neither be enlarged nor corrected nor abrogated save

by the same Authority that originally revealed them. They stand distinctly upon that Authority for whatever claim they have upon our faith and obedience. A fair adversary of religion cannot logically ignore this fact. The only legitimate attack is either to deny the proofs, historical, literary, or otherwise, that there has been a supernatural revelation, or else to assert that the matter of the religion revealed is intrinsically absurd or self-contradictory, so that it may not be conceived as proceeding from an all-wise and perfect Being. The first alternative in this attack we have considered at length in last year's course. The most typical instances in the prosecution of the assault under the second alternative form we now propose to review.

I call your attention in the outset to this principle, as plain and fair. An unbeliever cannot logically reject religion on account of speculative difficulties and objections of precisely the same kind as beset scientific doctrines which nevertheless he receives along with the rest of the learned world. If any one doubts whether this parallel can be sustained, we commend to his attention the following sentence from Hume. "No priestly dogmas," says this famous sceptic, "ever shocked common-sense more than the infinite divisibility of extension with its consequences."<sup>1</sup> And yet the mathematical development of the whole mechanical philosophy depends on this doctrine. The "shock to common-sense" contained in it lies in the contradiction of saying that a limited portion of matter comprises an infinity of parts, or that there may be several infinities in the same portion of matter. Still, though this dogma has no authority but that of certain fallible teachers of science, it has been patiently accepted by many generations of the learned.

A still more striking illustration may be found in the beautiful and attractive science of optics. It is well known that the wonderful mathematical results reached in this science have now for a long time been based on the

<sup>1</sup>"Academic Philosophy," Hume's *Works*, IV., 182.

truth of the undulatory theory of light. What is very memorable in this matter is that the undulatory theory, after a sharp struggle, displaced the rival theory of emanation, which had the sanction of the great name of Sir Isaac Newton, himself an optician of the first rank. And now what do we hear, in our own day, from men of science concerning this same undulatory theory? "The multitude of fictitious assumptions embodied in this hypothesis," says Stallo, "in conjunction with the failure of the consiliences by which it appeared at first to be distinguished, can hardly be looked upon otherwise than as a standing impeachment of its validity in its present form." The following are some of the things which the undulatory theory of light requires us to believe: "That all space is pervaded and all sensible matter is penetrated by an adamantine solid exerting at each point in space an elastic force 1,148,000,000,000 times that of the air at the earth's surface, and a pressure upon the square inch of 17,000,000,000,000 pounds." And still this solid eludes our senses, "is utterly impalpable, and offers no appreciable resistance to the motion of ordinary bodies!"<sup>1</sup> These statements, however, wonderful and "shocking to common-sense" as they seem, are not, after all, it should be observed, the things which cause the scientific authorities to waver in their adhesion to the undulatory theory. What influences them is the failure of certain consiliences which they consider necessary experimental confirmations of the theory. If these consiliences were forthcoming, the speculative and imaginative difficulties would be thrust aside and neglected.<sup>2</sup> They who approve this proceeding are very inconsistent when they criticise and reject the contents of revelation on speculative grounds or because they are not what the critics imagine

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Stallo's *Concepts of Science*, into two parts and then brought by Internat. Sci. Series, London, 1882. different paths to fall on a screen will exhibit dark places." — *Ency. Brit.*, art. "Ether," viii., 569. (Prof. J. Clerk Maxwell, Prof. of Elemental Physics, Cambridge, England.)

<sup>2</sup> "That light is not itself a substance may be proved from the phenomenon of interference, *i. e.*, a beam separated by optical methods

they should be. As science stands or falls according as it is confirmed or not by experiment and observation, so the truth of religion depends solely upon the fact whether it is a real revelation from the Almighty. The light and confirmation it receives from the experience of good men, beautiful and consolatory as this becomes, is not, after all, the original or actual ground of its reception or its evidence. Religion, therefore, standing upon the independent ground of the authority of its Author, is no more destroyed by the absence of human experience than it was established by the attestation of such experience. But observation and experiment are the very foundation and framework of the sciences. Even when they are shaken to the centre and their symmetry threatened by calling in question, as in an instance to which we have just referred, some fundamental doctrine essential to their whole orderly or mathematical presentation, this is held to be an impeachment not of the substantial truth of the science, but rather of the intellectual grasp or capacity of its previous teachers. "Inert matter," says Mr. Stallo, "in the sense of the mechanical theory, is as unknown to experience as it is inconceivable in thought." "The question," he says in another place, "to what extent the atomic theory is still indispensable to the chemist as 'a working hypothesis,' is at this moment under vigorous discussion among men of the highest scientific authority" (Cournot, Tyndall, Sir Benjamin Brodie, etc.). Mr. Stallo also informs us that the kinetic theory of gases is now exploded. He makes this significant complaint against the class among whom we believe he is counted an able member: "Even the intellects of men of science are haunted by . . . the inveterate fancy that the mystery by which a fact is surrounded may be got rid of by minimizing the fact, and banishing it to the regions of the extra-sensible. The delusion that the elasticity of a solid atom is in less need of explanation than that of a bulky gaseous body, is closely related to the conceit that the chasm between the world of matter and that of mind may

be narrowed, if not bridged, by a rarefaction of matter, or by the resolution into 'forces.' The scientific literature of the day teems with theories in the nature of attempts to convert facts into ideas by a process of dwindling or subtilization. All such attempts are nugatory; the intangible spectre proves more troublesome in the end than the tangible presence."<sup>1</sup>

These confessions of vacillation and uncertainty in the fundamental doctrines of the sciences are not brought forward to disparage science; far from it. They should serve but to spur ardent minds to grasp a deeper and truer conception of the wonderful facts of nature; and they should serve also certainly to teach modesty to those who have ventured to reject the mysterious truths of religion on grounds not a whit more solid than these now-discarded theories of science. These theories, we should observe, represent merely the efforts of different minds to give an intelligent account of what are, after all, open and material facts, patent to mankind since immemorial time. It is no discredit to the most gifted intellects that their conceptions of these mysterious facts are in process of time shown by the discoveries of their successors to be imperfect, or even erroneous. The very ablest men, with scarcely an exception, have anticipated such a result, and humbly accepted it in advance. It is only the noisy and mischief-making sophist who proclaims the reigning doctrine of science to be a finality. The most successful searcher into natural truth feels that he is in the midst of works of immeasurable complexity; that when a gleam of light illumines his path in one direction, the same gleam discloses numerous other paths, which he has neither time nor ability to explore; that thus while it is granted to very few to cultivate more than one or two of the sciences with eminent success, still all the sciences have a real and intimate connection; that he must, therefore, rely for much even of his scientific knowledge upon the industry and veracity of others. He learns

<sup>1</sup> *Concepts of Science.*

by degrees to be cautious how he rejects or admits a fact in any department solely on abstract or speculative grounds; *i. e.*, because it is either different from what he thinks it ought to be, or seems to be condemned by some reigning doctrine. This is quite different from the restless hankering after novelty, and habitual rejection of accepted doctrines simply because they are received—a disorder that has attacked science, of which I will presently give an instance, as it has attacked religion.

When the science of astronomy in modern days started out upon its great career, the imaginations of thoughtful and religious men received a severe shock as they realized by degrees the magnitude of the material universe, and the comparative insignificance of the earth to which they had hitherto assigned so very different a part. The chief difficulty was not, I believe, in reconciling particular texts of Scripture with the Copernican theory—which the author of that theory believed could be done—but rather in conceiving how the Maker of so vast a universe could have had such regard to the puny race of man, in a remote corner, as it seemed, of His creation, that He actually took their nature upon Him, and suffered and died for them upon the earth. The temptation, however, which from science here assaulted the heart of man was met by the thoughtful assertion of the superiority of spirit compared with matter. “The universe,” says Pascal, “by its space comprehends and swallows me up as a mere point; but by my thought I comprehend the universe. Man is but a reed, the feeblest in nature; still it is a reed that thinks. There is no need for the entire universe to arm itself to crush him. A mist, a drop of water, is enough to kill him. But, though the universe should crush him, man would still be nobler than that which kills him, because he knows that he dies; while of the advantage which the universe has over him, the universe itself knows nothing. Our true dignity, then, lies in our thoughts. It is thence we should seek to elevate ourselves, not by space and extension, which

we could never fill. Let us labor, then, to think rightly: this is the first principle of morals."<sup>1</sup>

Out of geology, and later still biology, arose objections, some of them analogous to the one just considered, others in strong contrast to it. Geology seemed to bring to creation an extension in time parallel to that which astronomy had revealed in space. The beginnings of life were traced back through myriads of ages, and behind even these stretched uncounted periods when the solid earth with its rocks and minerals assumed its present form from a fluid. But the insight which science has afforded us into the essence of matter and the development of life has neither slackened the tie that binds healthful and rightly thinking minds to their Creator, nor has it diminished but rather enlarged their conceptions of His wisdom and power. When chemistry, for instance, points out how the great masses of inert matter are compounded of a few simple substances—the strange element oxygen forming nearly one-half of the whole—it unveils to us design reigning throughout these huge and formless realms. When zoölogy and botany, aided finally by biology, have arranged and counted all living things, animal and vegetable, marked their relations and described their development through the circle of their career—considering, on the one hand, their vastness, the ten thousand kinds of birds, the four thousand kinds of lizards, the sixteen hundred kinds of snakes, the fishes equal in number to all three; the worms, the star-fishes; then the insects more than all the rest put together, some of whom, like the coral, have built up a large part of the earth's crust: or turning our thoughts, on the other hand, to what the microscope reveals concerning this life, that there is a minute animal or plant (often more than one) associated with the life of every other animal and plant: I affirm that the result of such an examination is not unfavorable to the first doctrine of

<sup>1</sup> *Pensées*, Art. XVIII., "Grandeur de l'Homme," pp. 228, 229. Paris, 1874.

religion, but that, on the contrary, the instinctive and the irresistible conclusion of a glance at all this life is that expressed by the man who in this generation, by general consent, knew the most about it, Louis Agassiz, who said: "All these facts in their natural connection proclaim aloud the one God, whom we may know, adore, and love."<sup>1</sup> If we turn our thoughts to the fundamental points, or doctrines of leading interest, in this great study, we shall see how they rather teach humility than any suggestion that can exclude a Creator. The distinctions, for instance, that separate the four great classes, vertebrates, articulates, mollusks, radiates, and also the distinctions among the members of each, seemed to the great naturalist just mentioned to demand for their explanation something generically different from mechanical or self-adjusting forces. It is well known that Agassiz had devoted especial attention to fishes. "Have fishes," he asks, "descended from a primitive type? So far am I from thinking this possible, that I do not believe there is a single specimen of fossil or living fish, whether marine or fresh-water, that has not been created with reference to a special intention and a definite aim, even though we may not be able to detect but a portion of these numerous relations of the essential purpose. Are the present fishes superior to the older ones? As a general proposition, I would say *No.*"<sup>2</sup> "The coincidences between the geological succession and the embryonic development, the zoölogical gradation and the geographical distribution of animals, in the past and present, rested, according to his belief, upon an intellectual coherence, and not upon a material connection. So also the variability as well as the constancy of organized beings at once so plastic and so inflexible, seemed to him controlled by something more than the mechanism of self-

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Classification.*

<sup>2</sup> *Louis Agassiz: his Life and Correspondence.* By Eliz. Cary Agassiz. 2 vols., Boston, 1885.

Milne-Edwards, with his school in France, is worthy of being joined to that of Agassiz, in discrediting "natural selection" and evolution.

adjusting forces. In this conviction he remained unshaken all his life, although the development theory came up for discussion under so many various aspects during this time. . . . Belief in a Creator was the key-note of his study of nature."<sup>1</sup>

Or if we consider the discovery on which biology now so much vaunts itself—viz., that in every animal and plant the four elements, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen, unite to form a special substance known as protoplasm, of which every living organism is at first entirely composed, while the whole inorganic world is destitute of such material—a thoughtful mind will acknowledge that, though this may seem to put animals and plants in *one great group*,<sup>2</sup> still it will not remove mystery from the path of the mechanical philosophy. Protoplasm is found both alive and dead. It is only living protoplasm that has the six remarkable properties: 1. Of an internal circulation; 2. Of contraction and expansion; 3. Of causing chemical changes and *gently* evolving heat; 4. Of appropriating external matter for food and growth; 5. Of forming new substances; 6. Of exchanging gases, *e. g.*, throwing out carbonic acid and absorbing oxygen.<sup>3</sup> But science as yet can give no analysis of life. The only things it can say with certainty are that there is no spontaneous generation of it in the inorganic world,<sup>4</sup> and that no instance of any kind of life exists that is not descended from some previous form of life. These facts, the latest and the most

<sup>1</sup> *Idem.*

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Stirling, in a paper read before the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, says that the researches of the most eminent German physiologists show that *not* "one and the same protoplasm is the matter of all organisms; that all protoplasm is *not* chemically identical; that the protoplasm differs in different tissues, in the bone, in the muscle, in the nerves and brain; and, again, that the protoplasm differs in different plants

and animals, each having its own kind, not interchangeable with that of the rest."—See McCosh's *Chr. and Positivism*, Lect. I., p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> St. George Mivart in *Am. Cath. Quart. Review*, Jan., 1886, p. 58.

<sup>4</sup> "I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life."—Prof. Tyndall in *Nineteenth Century*, 1878, p. 507.

certain in this department, it is almost needless to say, are in entire harmony with religion.

Or once more, if we glance at the controversy connected with the account of creation in the opening of Scripture, we venture to affirm that no well-established facts (and we here distinguish facts from hypotheses) of the sciences just mentioned contradict, but, on the contrary, are, on the whole, in harmony with the scriptural account.<sup>1</sup> We refer especially to the order in which life appeared. And we undertake to make good our statement out of the mouth of the most determined denier of the possible agreement between Scripture and science on this point. Now, we state our case thus: Scripture describes vegetable life as among the works of the third day, while all animal life belongs to the fifth and sixth days!<sup>2</sup> The mention of fowl is put at the close of the fifth day's work. We may say, then, that the general outline of the appearance of life on the earth, as it appears in Scripture, represents the vegetable kingdom as coming first by a long period, then animal life in succession in the water, in the air, and on the land.<sup>3</sup> Now, Mr. Huxley himself, who in his late controversy with Mr. Gladstone has emphasized the contrariety of Scripture to science with great vehemence, nevertheless admits that the above outline is correct, save that *probably* (it is no more than this, though a high probability) the land animals should precede those of the air. But to make this exception an objection to the accuracy of Scripture is peculiarly incon-

<sup>1</sup> The nebular hypothesis, supported by Mr. Gladstone, is also defended in the following able work by a Roman Catholic, who has the approbation of the reigning Pope, Leo XIII.—Canon Duilké de Saint-Projet, Professor of Apologetics in the higher school of theology, at Toulouse: *Apologie Scientifique de la Foi Chrétienne*. M. de Saint-Projet is well acquainted with modern science, and his remarks are intelligent and deserve careful attention.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. i. 11-13, 20-28.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Gladstone quotes the following standard works of the present time as sustaining this statement: Phillips' *Manual of Geology* (Vol. II.), p. ii, by R. Etheridge, 1885; Prof. Prestwick's *Geology*, pp. 80, 81. "A substantial accordance—an accordance in principal relevant particulars—is to be accepted as shown by probable evidence."—*Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1886, p. 15.

sistent in Mr. Huxley. His great point, which in his eyes renders science perfectly irreconcilable with Holy Writ, is that in reality there was no succession at all in the appearance of the water, land, and air varieties of the animal kingdom. His words are: "During the greater part of the time recorded by the fossiliferous rocks the 'creation' of the members of the water, land, and air populations must have gone on contemporaneously." "It is not true," he adds, "that the species composing any one of the three populations originated during any one of the three successive periods of time, and not at any other of these." Here, first, it should be noted that this rash but determined sceptic boldly ignores the fact that none of the sciences he professes to represent has a word to say, but are all as dumb as death, about the origination of the species in question, as he may read in Darwin. Moreover, incredible as it may seem, Huxley has in this same article categorically contradicted himself, as follows: "Undoubtedly it is in the highest degree probable that animal life appeared first under aquatic conditions, that terrestrial forms appeared later, and flying animals *only* after land animals." There is here a kind of emphasized contradiction of the position we have just seen him taking. He not only asserts as "in the highest degree probable" the very succession in the animal populations which he has just pronounced to be "not true," but in particular insists that "flying animals *only* came after land animals." Professor Huxley describes his own treatment of this subject as "impulsive advocacy;" and he has certainly afforded us a curious instance of the logical confusion to which it can bring a clear mind even in its own department. When he wishes to give a flat denial to what is said of the fowl in Gen. i. 20-22, he becomes sure that there was a well-marked succession of aquatic, land, and flying animals, and that "flying animals appeared *only* after land animals." But when he wishes to cut off by anticipation all future attempts to follow Mr. Gladstone's

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that the first scientific man to defy this anathema is the able and learned Professor Dana, of Yale, who, in a letter published in

in reconciling the account of Moses with science, Professor Huxley magisterially declares: "*It is not true*" that there was ever any such succession at all. Perhaps the Professor can now see what appears to have been hidden from him when, in this same article,<sup>1</sup> he penned the sentence: "I do not understand how a hostile criticism can under any circumstances tend to confirm that which it attacks."

It may not be without interest to illustrate a little further, from the Professor himself, this particular kind of confirmation upon a single point. When making good his statement about flying animals, he says: "Every beginner in the study of animal morphology is aware that the organization of a bat, of a bird, or of a pterodactyle, presupposes that of a terrestrial quadruped." Now, since the monstrous flying reptile, the pterodactyle, belonged with the ichthyosaurus, plesiosaurus, megalosaurus, and iguanodon, to the oolitic period, long before mammals appeared, it certainly preceded man by an immense interval, and was a most striking specimen, though far from the only specimen, of the flying creatures of that remote time. The earth must have been as uninhabitable for man when these huge reptiles darted through the air, and still greater ones crept on the ground, as in the carboniferous age before, when the atmosphere was saturated with the principle that is at once food to vegetation, and a deadly poison to animals. We say that the existence of flying creatures, proved by fossil remains to have existed long before men or cattle, the most characteristic of the mammals, could have lived on the earth—pertaining, therefore, in the Scripture representation to the fifth rather than to the sixth day of creation—ought to be placed among the confirmations that science gives to Holy Writ. It removes the most obtrusive exception

the *Nineteenth Century* for Dec., 1886, says: "I agree in all essential points with Mr. Gladstone, and believe that the first chapters of Genesis and science are in accord."

<sup>1</sup> "The Interpreters of Genesis and the Interpreters of Nature," by T. H. Huxley, *Nineteenth Century*, Dec., 1885.

Huxley has been able to bring forward to the accuracy of the outline as a whole.

I promised an instance of that restless craving for novelty, and habitual rejection of accepted doctrines simply because they are received, which has attacked science as well as religion in these later days. The instance I take is from the history of vaccination—a history that has lessons of peculiar interest for men of science. Dr. Jenner's valuable discovery was the result of thoughtful observation, and it was verified by careful experiment. Against vulgar prejudice and against theoretical objections alike, it made its way to triumphant recognition in the London hospitals, in the British army and navy, on the Continent, even as far as Russia, from whence as well as in England the doctor received substantial tokens of approval and honor.<sup>1</sup> Count Platoff, the Copack general, said to him: "You have extinguished the most pestilential disorder that ever appeared on the banks of the Don." The results point to the conclusion, that, if vaccination were carefully and thoroughly extended, this disease might be removed even from the world. Now, the efficacy of vaccination, when practised carefully in accordance with certain well-ascertained rules, as a preventive against one of the most terrible diseases that has afflicted the human race, is, beyond doubt, one of the best-established facts in the science of medicine. Yet doubts have been raised even of this clear fact in the minds of some not unintelligent people by highly colored reports of the results of employing impure vaccine matter. In England, at this moment, is an Anti-vaccination League, composed not wholly of the uneducated, and prepared to resist, even with violence, the enforcement of this salutary practice. There are large sections of Canada and many people in the United States who have even resorted to riot and disorder when vaccination

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jenner received a Parliamentary grant of £20,000, and an offer from the Emperor of a Russian order of nobility. The physicians and surgeons of the fleet gave him a gold medal.

has been attempted in their midst by the benevolent, striving in purest kindness to shield them from a horrible calamity. Hence, in many places, salutary laws requiring vaccination have been left unenforced merely from reluctance to do what was displeasing to a number of people, forming a small minority of the community, though considerable in themselves. The pleas in defence of this minority were lately considered by one of the ablest and most experienced physicians of the metropolis. He calls them "the credulous class, who believe that views conflicting with those held by the medical faculty express new truths, which the latter, from professional bias or jealousy, refuse to acknowledge. Modern opponents of vaccination, who give any thought to the subject, are chiefly among those who suppose that the minds of medical men are held in a kind of bondage to traditional doctrines and authoritative opinions, which constitute an insurmountable barrier against a liberal and untrammelled exercise of judgment. There are persons, and their number is not small, who are ready to adopt, without either opportunity or desire for investigation, heterodox principles in medicine, for the reason that they are so, assuming that they who make it the business of their lives to endeavor to ascertain the truth in this department of knowledge are the least likely to find it."<sup>1</sup> If we substitute the word *religion* for medicine in this passage, we might imagine we were reading the complaint of a theologian, so precisely does it represent the kind of treatment in fashion against religion. The clear-sighted physician resents the injustice and the folly of putting aside the best-attested facts on such shallow pretences. But many scientific men have failed to recognize the equal folly of rejecting plain external proof of a revelation because of some speculative obscurity concerning the nature of God or in the truths made known by Him.

We have now touched upon instances enough to show that science, in its fundamental and most material doctrines, is beset with insoluble abstract difficulties, like those

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Austin Flint, sen., in *North American Review*, June, 1881.

of infinite divisibility and the atomic theory; that it has accepted in inert matter a conception not verifiable by experience, that (as in the undulatory theory of light and the kinetic theory of gases) it either wavers in its grasp of or abandons altogether a long-received explanation of some of the most striking facts; that, while the first aspect of astronomy, geology, botany, seemed to threaten faith, further insight discovered in them the strongest confirmations; that the great outline of creation on the first page of Scripture is indisputably and wonderfully true; that, finally, the declamation against authority and prescription in religion is curiously paralleled by an assault upon some of the most certain and beneficial facts of medical science. All this, it may be replied, does not prove religion. Granting this, we can still, however, insist that it clearly shows how illogical and immodest are some favorite excuses for its rejection. We learn from the examples given what arguments are precluded in opposing a doctrine that stands on its own independent basis of proof. We see the weakness of the human intellect in its failure to grasp the true theory of the most obtrusive and ever-present facts. We see, on the other hand, its capacity for faith in its willingness to accept the most astounding and inconceivable facts and figures (like those concerning light) on the mere authority of the few who can make the delicate experiments and calculations on which they rest.

All that we ask, then, as the result of this review is, that no one when neglecting religion<sup>1</sup> shall affect to understand the nature of life and of the Author of life better than he understands the nature of matter and of the

<sup>1</sup> The following severe judgment upon a class of whom he had some right to speak is put forth by Mr. Marsh, late U. S. minister to Rome. "The devotees of the experimental sciences," says Mr. Marsh, "or sciences of observation, the knowledge of which may be, and often is, carried very far with an incredibly small amount of general culture, and a mere infinitesimal degree of large intellectual discipline, . . . out of their sphere, . . . are inferior to average jurymen in the practical exercise of the logical faculties in general reasoning."—*Mediæval and Modern Saints*, etc., p. 192. N. Y., 1876.

light; moreover, that he shall not despise the religious consiliences analogous to those which in secular science are held to warrant the putting aside of any number of speculative objections; such facts, for instance, as meeting the needs of the human soul, transforming character, quelling doubt, securing the allegiance of the ablest, the most acute, the most learned of human beings. For these and the like effects—the production of the most heroic, the most steadfast, and at the same time the most tender and delicate types of character—are the incommunicable glory of the religion that subdued also the learning and power of the world.

## LECTURE III.

---

### “EVOLUTION,” “NATURAL SELECTION,” ETC.

“EVOLUTION” has been made to cover up, under a single word, as much unsound science as irreligious speculation. A frightful spectre has been made to dance before the eyes of the world, like the figures from a magician’s mirror, shocking the religious, astounding the simple, with the announcement that a *consensus* of the learned was going to compel us to believe that all the varied forms of animal life have grown by degrees out of a single one, and that the simplest and lowest. This wild imagination, however, has no scientific basis: the most important facts, like those concerning fishes obtained by the sagacious Agassiz, give it the lie direct; and it has no inherent charms except for the pantheistic and materialistic philosopher. Every well-informed biologist will tell you, without hesitation, as a fact on which no evidence throws the slightest doubt, that man is *not* descended from the monkey.<sup>1</sup> Lamarck’s idea that organs

<sup>1</sup>See Quatrefages, *Man*, p. 78. He gives the following names of distinguished anatomists as confirming his views: Richard Owen, M. Duvernoy (col. with Cuvier), Gratiolet, Alex, and especially the zealous Darwinian, M. Charles Vogt. The brilliant Voltaire is now as effectually pilloried by science for his declaration that “none but a blind man can doubt that the whites, negroes,

Albinos, Hottentots, Laplanders, Chinese, Americans, *are entirely distinct races*,”—as the most benighted mediæval scholar who believed the earth immovable, while sun, moon, and stars revolved about it. For the latter had, “to give him pause,” if he would but think upon them, deep passages of Holy Writ, like “He hangeth the earth upon nothing.” (Job, xxvi. 7.)

assumed a special form under the pressure of an internal effort to secure some coveted good outside—an explanation wholly inapplicable to plants, and ridiculously inadequate to account for the peculiar figures of animals—has been long abandoned amid a storm of raillery. The argument from rudimentary organs, so loftily asserted by Lewes as conclusive against design, and alleged to have been more effective than any other in popularizing materialism, is now deliberately set aside by Professor Huxley as “double edged,” and dangerous to his cause. Of “natural selection,” the dogma of Darwin and Wallace, which not a generation ago seemed to put new life into an expiring hypothesis, two things are to be said :

(1) That there is an important difference between Mr. Darwin’s application of it and Mr. Wallace’s—Mr. Darwin giving it a much wider extension. Yet this should be noted of Mr. Darwin’s doctrine : that it is not strictly an attempt to explain “The Origin of Species” (though that is the title of one of his books), but how each variation when it appeared (in whatever way) maintained itself. Mr. Wallace stoutly insists that there is in man something generically unlike anything in other terrestrial creatures, viz., “the faculty of making abstractions,” as, for example, space and time.

(2) The second remark on Darwin and Wallace I will give in the words of Professor Huxley, because he appears in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* as the leading champion at present of evolution. Speaking of Mr. Darwin’s “natural selection,” Professor Huxley says: “If the explanation would apply to species, it would not only solve the problem of their evolution, but it would account for” this, that, and the other thing. But he concludes, “How far ‘natural selection’ suffices for the production of species, *remains to be seen.*”<sup>1</sup>

One good end the variations in this celebrated theory may be said to have subserved: it has furnished a new instance of the readiness of sceptics, who base their

<sup>1</sup> *Ency. Brit.*, VIII., 750, 751.

objections to particular statements in Scripture on what they suppose to be science, to lay down a long-cherished and favorite objection, simply because they believed that the new theory put in their hands a more deadly weapon against revelation. The inconsistencies involved in this proceeding seem to trouble them very little. When the wonders of geology, and especially of fossil geology, were breaking on the modern world, and marine shells had been observed on some of the high Alps, it was said hastily by certain defenders of religion, that here was a confirmation of the Scripture account of the deluge. Hereupon Voltaire, who in such a case had as real a contempt for science as for religion, stoutly insisted that the shells were not marine at all, but had been *dropped there by the pilgrims of the middle ages!* So it is in the memory of persons now living, how, before evolution came into fashion, demonstrations were put forth with much pomp of science, to show the impossibility of all human beings now on the earth having descended from a single pair. Differences of complexion, the difficulties of travelling such immense distances, especially by sea without suitable vessels, the radical divergences of speech—these and many other matters were magnified and declared to be insuperable. Yet they all vanished as at the touch of a sorcerer's wand, when evolution asserted this very unity as part of a theory still more hostile to religion. It is curious to note in Professor Huxley, championing the theory in its present stage, a disposition to return to some of these old objections attending dispersion. He calls the brief historical statement in Gen. ix. 19, "These are the three sons of Noah, and of them was the whole earth overspread," "one of the dogmas"—using that word with a looseness very little creditable to a scientific man—which theology has obtruded into the domain of science. He then suggests that there is the same difficulty in supposing that all men have come from those then at Ararat, as that the South American sloth or the Australian ornithorynchus came from the same quarter. *À priori*

difficulties about migration, however, will have to be set aside before such facts as, *e. g.*, that wonderful movement of the Calmucks in 1771 from the banks of the Volga to the frontier of China—over two thousand miles; and upon the sea the still more marvellous colonization of Polynesia, which occupies a good part of the great Pacific Ocean. The migration which resulted in the peopling of these islands began in the first century of the Christian era, out of Asia, at the Marquesas Islands, in the Indian Archipelago, and was completed by the peopling of the Isles of Chatham from New Zealand about a century ago.<sup>1</sup> Man alone is cosmopolitan: not a single species of vegetable or of animal is found at the same time all over the globe. There are several of each which could not have been where they are had they not been brought thither by man. Hence a law, derived from geography and physiology combined, points to the conclusion that man originated in a single spot on the earth's surface. The monkey-type, in which some have seen an animal brother, if not father, of man, is, on the other hand, one of the least widely distributed animals. It is neither in cold countries, nor in hardly any part of the temperate zone, but only in the warmest lands, while still in a great part of Oceanica there is not a single monkey.

It is now time to look in the face the doctrine of evolution as formulated carefully and deliberately by its present champion, Professor Huxley. "Evolution, or development," he says, at the beginning of his article in the last *Encyclopædia*, "is in fact at present employed in biology as a general name for the history of the steps by which any living being has acquired the morphological and physiological characters which distinguish it." Huxley ends his article thus: "On the evidence of palæontology, the evolution of many existing forms of animal life from their predecessors is no longer an hypothesis, but an historical fact: *it is only* the nature of the physiological factors to which that evolution is due which is still open to

<sup>1</sup>A. de Quatrefages's *Natural History of Man*. N. Y., 1875. Lect. II.

discussion."² What a very curious fact (so loudly distinguished from an hypothesis) is this, which is the history of a process, whose factors are unknown, and whose extent, *i. e.*, whether it can account for species, is also unknown. One form of the evolution doctrine, for instance, the "arrested development" theory, was once very popular with able men. Of this Mr. Huxley emphatically pronounces: "*It is not true* that a fish is a reptile arrested in its development, or that a reptile was ever a fish; but it is true that a reptile embryo, at one stage of its development, is an organism which, if it had an independent existence, must be classified among fishes; and all the organs of the reptiles pass, in the course of their development, through conditions which are closely analogous to those which are permanent in some fishes." What security has Mr. Huxley that in a few years a form of evolution will not be accepted, as divergent from his own as is at present the doctrine he defends from that one he has just repudiated? Nay, there are signs of this coming event in the words of Professor Huxley's colleague, Mr. James Sully, a few pages after, in this same article. "The final form of evolution," says Mr. Sully, "*cannot yet be said to be fixed.*"³ Where is now the wonderful fact over which Mr. Huxley is so confident? Can it be that it refers only to such changes as in a particular species are produced by cross breeding? that, for example, the present numerous varieties of the horse—Arabian, Norman, mustang, etc.—are descendants of the fossil *equus caballus*? This, if not precisely like the Horatian mountain and mouse, is certainly a frightful collapse of a magnificent theory. It is hardly needful to point out that to claim for such a changeful theory the honors of a fact is to violate one of the first canons of induction, which warns us that "no imperfect induction can give a certain conclusion."³

There can be no doubt that with less profound and

¹ *Ency. Brit.*, VIII., 746, 751.

² *Jevons's Logic*, Less. XXV., p.

³ *E. B.*, VIII., 763.

accurate thinkers, who want to rid themselves of religion by one comprehensive stroke, and who are even less scientific than irreligious, the principal recommendation of evolution has been that it has seemed to offer them a complete mechanical explanation of the world and the life upon it. This explanation takes at times the form of materialism, and again the shape of pantheism. In this latter it has special charms for Mr. Sully, who frankly says: "This doctrine favors that pantheistic sentiment which reposes on a sense of ultimate identity between ourselves and the external world."<sup>1</sup>

Our war against the theory, it is pretty plain, therefore, is destined to be rather a metaphysical than a scientific contest. We must firmly resist all attempts to speak of theories as facts—an inaccuracy constantly emerging in the followers of Mr. Darwin. We may then take either the philosophic ground that the world and ourselves are not of one substance only—mere matter; because this contradicts a primary fact of consciousness which affirms that that which thinks and reasons is different in kind from that which has extension, is heavy or light, seen and touched, etc. Matter is not the same substance as mind, nor mind the same as matter. Mr. Stallo, in connection with this subject, rightly exhorts his brethren to become metaphysicians. He warns them against "the conceit that the chasm between the world of matter and that of mind may be narrowed if not bridged by a rarefaction of matter, or by the resolution into forces."<sup>2</sup>

Or, if we turn from this metaphysical view and look directly at any most familiar organism, we shall see, I believe, that the attempt to explain it as the result merely of mechanical or self-adjusting forces (design, or the comprehensive control of one superintending mind, being excluded) leads into inextricable difficulties, revolting to common-sense. It seems impossible for a sound mind, not besotted by theory, to believe that a

<sup>1</sup> *Ency. Brit.*, VIII., 772.

<sup>2</sup> *Concepts of Science*, Internat. Science Series. Lond., 1882.

plant is the product of the unconscious play of unintelligent forces. This has been admirably stated in a late English review: "Before a plant can assume the symmetry of perfect beauty, each molecule must follow a definite path, must fall into a fitness with its neighbor, and rest, as compared with the others, in a final limitation; otherwise there can be no individuality of leaf, or flower, or plant, or tree. This is not implied in the fact that the molecules are mutually attractive, or primary forces capable of passing into motion in any direction whatever. The effect is clearly produced by force working in subordination to an end, the possible varying in space tending steadily to a definite purpose; and, if it be incapable in itself of accomplishing it, there must be some power, animated by intelligence, dominating and regulating the process. After the reality and properties of atoms have been admitted, there remains the difficulty of constructing the world, because scientists cannot explain their modes of action, or account for their mutually adjusted movements in a given place and time."<sup>1</sup>

Sir William Hamilton used to say that even if metaphysics could not give positive truths, it could teach an intelligent mind how to avoid self-contradiction. The noble science, it is plain, has not yet conferred this important benefit on Mr. James Sully. The exquisite absurdity of the following statement may be taken as a proof: "In some of these systems, notably in the Aristotelian, the *genesis of conscious mind* is explained along with that of organic life by means of the supposition that mind *is but the formative principle* of the individual organism."<sup>2</sup> That is to say, the genesis of conscious mind is explained by the supposition that it is itself the origin, not the result, of the genesis of organic life! This is like saying the genesis of free-trade ideas in the minds of Cobden and Bright, and of the Anti-Corn-Law League, of which they were the active promoters, is explained by the supposition

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quart. Review*, April, 1886, p. 75. Lond.

<sup>2</sup> *Ency. Brit.*, VIII., 754.

that the League was formed to give effect to the ideas of Cobden and Bright!

Now, what thought should naturally come to a healthy mind contemplating the great animal and vegetable kingdoms, and enlightened by present science so as to realize, as no one in the past centuries could realize, their wonderful unity, the analogies that run through the most dissimilar shapes of being, the typical forms reigning everywhere deftly modified by a thousand methods to special ends? The theory we have been considering testifies most emphatically, whether of good will or not, to the unity that reigns in this great department of nature. To the most sagacious mind of this generation, the man of largest information, and who was nearest being a genius of all that have engaged in these studies, Louis Agassiz, the marvels of the world of organisms suggested no materialistic or mechanical hypothesis, but, as we have already<sup>1</sup> heard him say, "in their natural connection proclaim aloud the one God, whom we may know, adore, and love." "Belief in a Creator," his biographer says, "was the keynote of his study of nature." It is impossible for a candid mind to despise such testimony as this.

But looking in the face once more the metaphysics of the mechanical and material explanation of organisms, we are met with the most crying and insufferable contradictions. There is in the beginning of every life a gentle and regulated motion. Heat is evolved. Chemical operations are performed in delicate cells which can be imitated mechanically only by a great application of power. Do the mighty forces in light, in electricity, in steam, in gravitation, meet, and, though without intelligence, act with regulated harmony to produce through indefinite ages the same diversely wonderful results? The supposition sins against both common-sense and every canon of sound philosophy. It requires us to believe that a thing can make itself.<sup>2</sup> It asks us to think that there can be

<sup>1</sup> Lect. II., p. 500.

foolish who supposes the main shaft

<sup>2</sup> "If the man is thought to be of a cotton mill to turn of itself, be-

effects without a cause. To assign an inadequate cause, we should not forget, is virtually to assign no cause; and to assign the wrong cause comes to the same thing. The effort to make an endless chain of causes and effects a substitute for a First Cause is, to use Whewell's comparison, like seeking to suspend a chain upon "a link painted on a wall."<sup>1</sup> It is very likely in vain to *argue* with persons who gravely put forward such absurdities; they are rather fit objects of compassion, as those who

"have eaten of the insane root  
That takes the reason prisoner."

I think I may venture to say that a very wide-spread impression, for which the much talking of the evolutionists is responsible, is that all living forms are undergoing constant change, approximating to or receding from the forms of kindred species, so that an impression has gotten hold of some minds that any living form whatever may have come out of any other living form whatever, though quite different in seeming, and may again pass into something quite as foreign. Now, this notion, whatever prevalence it may happen to have, is in glaring contradiction to the plainest facts of science as at present known. And I give for my authority the last president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, which held its latest meeting in Birmingham last September. The president, Sir William Dawson, took fossil geology, his favorite study, for the subject of his inaugural address. "I have collected fossil oysters," says

cause he sees it apparently to end in a wall, which conceals from him the engine that moves it, are not the scientists chargeable with equal folly when they attribute self-motion to the ultimate molecules of matter, because the power that moves them is concealed from view? They confound law and force, and then attribute the latter to the phenomena

of matter, because they are unable to go behind the wall and to find out the source from whence it comes."—Dr. Carpenter in *Eng. Ch. Qu.*, April, 1886, p. 84.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of the Inductive Sciences*, Vol. I., p. 16. Another illustration is the French definition of a major as "a man of three decorations," etc.

Sir William, "in the cretaceous clays of the *coulées* of Western Canada, in the lias shales of England, in the eocene and cretaceous beds of the Alps, of Egypt, of the Red Sea coast, of Judæa, and the heights of Lebanon. Everywhere and in all formations they present forms which are so variable, and yet so similar, that one might suppose all the so-called species to be mere varieties. Did the oyster originate separately on the two sides of the Atlantic? or did it cross over so promptly that its appearance seems to be identical on the two sides? Are all the oysters of a common ancestry, or did the causes, whatever they were, which introduced the oyster in the carboniferous, act over again in the later periods? Who can tell? This," adds Sir William, "is one of the cases where causation and development—the two scientific factors which constitute the basis of *what is vaguely called evolution*—cannot easily be isolated. I would recommend to those biologists who discuss these questions to addict themselves to the oyster. This familiar mollusk has successfully pursued its course, and has overcome all its enemies, from the flat-toothed selachians of the carboniferous to the oyster dredges of the present day. . . . In these respects the oyster is merely an example of many forms. Similar considerations apply to all those pliocene and pleistocene mollusks which are found in the raised sea-bottoms of Norway and Scotland, on the top of Moel Tryfaen in Wales, and at similar great heights on the hills of America, many of which can be traced back to early tertiary times. They apply in like manner to the ferns, the conifers, and the angiosperms, many of which we can now follow, without even specific change, to the eocene and the cretaceous. *They all show that the forms of living things are more stable than the lands and seas in which they live.*"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sir Wm. Dawson, "Inaug. Address, Brit. Asso. for A. of S.," Birmingham, Sept., 1886. Reported in *English Guardian*. Mr. Ruskin made

this remark in 1869 upon the relation of species to one another: "Species are not innumerable; neither are they now connected by consistent

These facts certainly give the death-blow to a popular conception of evolution. Combine them with Agassiz's belief that fishes have not descended from one primitive type, that the present fishes are not superior to the older ones, that a special intention and aim (though these may never be fully known) controlled the creation of each variety—and what has become of the impious theory that boasted it had excluded the Creator from His works by the explanation of mechanical and self-adjusting forces? The beautiful and interesting discoveries in modern days, in biology, in geological fossils, and in every part of natural history, have added great wealth to the store of knowledge, but not a single fact that should shake our faith in a Creator, all-wise and all-powerful, and at the same time merciful and true, the object of boundless confidence, love, and worship. The simple beginning to which living things can be traced, the analogies that can be discerned in the development of the most diverse creatures, both the plasticity and the inflexibility of the various species, these all should suggest, assuredly, not blind force, or forces, combining without intelligence to produce results written all over with intelligence, but a powerful and present Ruler, whose Word unnumbered ages ago uttered the decree which His power, present everywhere and in everything, now and evermore brings to pass.

Such a belief we affirm to be natural and wholesome to the human mind. When presented to plain and honest souls, furnished or not with human science, it has an irresistible charm, which derives none of its power from pomp of argument or laborious investigation, and, on the

gradation. They touch at certain points only, and even then are connected, when we examine them deeply, in a kind of reticulated way, not in chains, but in checkers; also, however connected, it is but by a touch of the extremities, as it were, and the characteristic form of the species is entirely individual. . . . It has always seemed to me, in what little work I have done upon organic forms, as if the species mocked us by their deliberate imitation of each other when they met, yet did not pass one into another."—*Queen of the Air*, § 63, Note to § 62, p. 54.

other hand, can be withstood only by the pride of theory and the blandishments of passion. These, it is not too much to say, can make their votaries assert or deny anything, with or against reason, in conformity with or in the teeth of the plainest facts. There are certain metaphysical conceptions which have always had a strange attraction for particular races and, as it would seem, districts of the world, and individuals at times in every land manifest the same tendency. One striking example of this is the doctrine of fatalism. Another is the distrust of our own senses, and of the reality of the material world. The Sikhs of India, strenuous warriors as well as philosophers, habitually speak of the world of matter as without substance, a shadow, a vanishing bank of clouds. In every age, among speculative men, this doubt has arisen like a spectre. Do my senses give me the truth? Is this we call matter a real thing, or only a mask, some delusion put upon me? The very fact that any one can seriously put such inquiries will seem to many persons evidence of a pathological condition. Perhaps it is. But not less certainly is there mental unsoundness in the opposite doctrine of Epicurus's herd—matter is everything; mind is but its product; to think is but the rattling of atoms. Science reproves this, it is true, as an audacious substitution of theory for fact; but it cannot correct the disposition that gives it plausibility to certain souls. Neither can it help the idealist out of his dreams. A leader in science of the present day, and one not much given to dreaming, has permitted himself to say: "It is conceivable that some powerful and malicious being may find his pleasure in deluding us, and in making us believe the thing which is not, every moment of our lives."<sup>1</sup> We are afraid that a logician could not cure such a dark imagination by merely insisting, "We cannot suppose, and there is no reason to suppose, that, by the constitution of the mind, we are obliged to think of things differently from the manner in which they are."<sup>2</sup> The only thought that

<sup>1</sup> Huxley.

<sup>2</sup> W. Stanley Jevons's *Lessons in Logic*, Less. II., p. 11.

can give rest and healing to the mind distempered by speculation, or that can check passion and appetite with a firm control, is the thought of God, our Father as well as Ruler, the ever-present object of our highest trust and love. Whatever real knowledge He gives us, whether it be little or much, we receive thankfully, because it comes from Him, and in its measure discloses to us some view of Him. Our first step in knowledge must of necessity be an act of faith; we trust our senses, which are God's gifts to us. We should scorn, when in health, the notion that any alien power could enslave us, without the permission of Him whose children and image we are. The unity of the realm of living things, realized by this generation as by none in the past, has emphasized with a new force the truth that He reigns alone in heaven and on earth, alike over the immeasurable fields of space and the uncounted lapses of time. What our senses tell us we know to be true, because He made both our senses and the objects in which they find their development and delight. We know that matter furnishes a real home for our spirits. To learn what we can of each, to accept the mysteries that surround their connection, to study the outward world, to lay aside pride and arrogance, as if we fully understood any living thing or its manifold connections, or were able to assume the office of critic—these are habits both becoming to us and promotive of mental and spiritual health.

Providence has set before the eyes of all men a fact that may reprove the brutishness of that idea of evolution that has had such charms for a certain class of minds. The only evolution that is sure, when left to itself—that is, when human care is withdrawn—is the degeneracy of plants and animals, and especially of the noblest and most valuable kinds. The apple, the peach, the plum, the grape, part with their rare and generous qualities; <sup>1</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> "The *Brassica oleracea*, in its native habitat on the shore of the sea, is a bitter plant with wavy sea-green leaves; in the cultivated garden it is the cauliflower." "Plants which in a cold climate are annuals become perennial when transported to the torrid zone."—B. F. Cocker,

gentle cow becomes a wild and dangerous creature, whose chief value is in her hide; the house-dog turns into a wolf; the horse parts with both his beauty of form and his noble disposition. There is neither plant nor animal on the face of the earth that will improve without man's assistance, and every rare and choicest specimen will sink into wildness and worthlessness if that help be withdrawn. Now, here is an agency, practically of the very highest importance, but of which the mechanical theory takes no account. Can any one doubt, who views creation as a whole, that since life first appeared after the azoic time, there have been interferences of a controlling Intelligence, to rectify and to improve, at various periods, the rich varieties of life? The agency of man is but a feeble image of this process in the Divine Hand; but both show that there is nothing in living things themselves, no inherent power or sagacity, that can bring them even to their natural perfection without this external assistance.

It is obviously quite needless to enter upon any polemic defending the words of Holy Scripture anywhere concerning creation against the assumptions of evolutionists. Their threatening but lubricious theory<sup>1</sup> can array no well-settled fact in science against the plain narrative of Holy Writ. But what has just been said suggests a fitting answer to the audacious sophistry that would derive man's highest powers, by which he discerns abstract truths, his morality, and his religion, out of the filthy *débris* of beastly ancestors. First, remember that man did not come out of any animal—monkey, seal, or any other: this point

*Christ. and Gr. Phil.*, Ch. I., p. 19. N. Y., 1870. He refers for authorities to Carpenter's *Comp. Phys.*, p. 623, and Lyell's *Princip. of Geology*, pp. 588, 589.

<sup>1</sup>I justify this language by the authority of ex-President Porter of Yale College: "The evolution that we criticise," he says, "is a composite of scientific theories—some true,

others doubtful, and others false—which are held together and wrought into a fanciful philosophy by the very slenderest threads of analogy, and elevated into a negative theology by a daring flight of professedly modest or agnostic reserve."—Lecture on "Evolution," read before the Nineteenth Century Club, New York, May 25, 1886.

is perfectly agreed upon by intelligent anthropologists. Next, in the vast majority of cases, communities of men have not advanced but deteriorated. China and India are no less striking instances in proof than the Bushmen of Africa. Next, even among barbarous tribes, the surprising discovery is made, that whatever the nature of the development they have undergone, they still possess certain traits that mark a high civilization, in a higher degree than many, for instance, of the civilized communities of Europe. A striking example may be seen in the politeness, the modesty, the sense of honor, in some of the Polynesian tribes.<sup>1</sup> The most striking examples of the advance of human beings out of barbarism into civilization, which are perhaps furnished by Europe during the last twelve hundred years, are very far from being cases of unassisted development, but always start with some vigorous impulse from without—the introduction of Christianity; the decree of some powerful ruler who, like Peter the Great, brought in by force the arts and mechanical inventions of the West; or the enforcement, as under the Fredericks of Prussia, of discipline, of industry, of economy, and subsequently of education. These were distasteful to the respective peoples, who, however, having received them, obtained their benefits. The wisdom to which we are sometimes invited now to listen is something like the profundity that would evolve the diffused popular intelligence of Prussia out of the cane with which the irascible father of Frederick the Great tyrannized over schools and schoolmasters as over most other persons and things in his kingdom.

And here we naturally recur to that illustration with which two years ago we began these lectures. The Jews are an eternal witness against any merely mechanical or materialistic explanation of the peculiarities of the races of man. The Jew is a physiological paradox. He has survived unchanged the most powerful disintegrating in-

<sup>1</sup> See De Quatrefages's *Nat. Hist.* also Miss Yonge's *Life of Bp. Paterson*, Lect. V., pp. 133, 134. See *teson*.

fluences—war, captivity, dispersion, relentless and persistent persecution—before which every other variety of the human species has vanished. Here is a physiological fact, the most remarkable in the world, yet having no physiological factors that can account for it. The persistency of the Jew, it is certain, is connected in some mysterious way with his religion. The Jews now scattered over the earth are mainly from two tribes. The ten who threw away their religion in captivity lost also the physical differences that separated them from the heathen. Moreover, while the Jew remained faithful to his God, his nation was graced with a fair line of prophets and heroes; and books were produced there, which, though not strictly literature, because divine oracles, yet surpass all the literature of the world in sublimity, in eloquence, in pathos, in religious depth. But since the Jews rejected the true Messiah, though their physical endurance continues, their power to produce literature has departed from them as from a withered stem. To seek to account for such results by any theory of self-development is too violent an absurdity. We might as well seek to ascribe the firmness with which during more than three thousand years, amid every form of surrounding heathenism, they have asserted the unity of God, to some one of the pagan corruptions in which that unity is denied. Their history exhibits the usual weaknesses and corruptions of human nature—a tendency to forget their high vocation, a willingness at times even to throw away their chief treasure, the religion that had been revealed to them. They are at various times rescued from extreme peril by a mighty hand put forth to draw them out of the pit of their own degeneracy. “He made a covenant with Jacob, and gave Israel a law, which He commanded our forefathers to teach their children. . . . But they kept not the covenant of God, and would not walk in His law, but forgot what He had done, and the wonderful works that He had showed for them.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psalm lxxviii.

There is this analogy between the supernatural life of God's Church on earth and the appearance of living forms in the natural history of creation: the origin of neither can in any way be accounted for, but by the immediate agency of an Almighty Creator; the tendency of plant and animal life, left to itself, is to degenerate and to perish; thousands of species appear to have thus utterly passed away: in the Church, in like manner, individuals, parties, factions, passing into schisms and heresies, have testified to the downward trend of human nature when not upheld and restored by divine grace. At long intervals in the natural world a creative word is uttered, and new and more attractive forms of life appear. This is the image of that renewal, at fit and appointed times, of the call to faith, the return to duty, the restoration of religion, amid busy, worldly, sensual, ambitious populations, who for a time seem to dwell amid a new creation. In the natural and in the supernatural realm, it is God's Word alone that can give life, that can preserve it, or that can make any form of it blossom and bring forth its choicest fruit.

## LECTURE IV.

---

### “MORALITY.”

“IT is a law of revelation,” says Neander the historian, “that the heart of man should be tested in receiving it.” “In God’s word, as in His works, we find contradictions whose higher harmony is hidden, except from him who gives up His whole mind to reverence.”<sup>1</sup>

This converted Jew, when he gave up to the Christian religion his great heart, his extraordinary attainments, his devout spirit, was unfortunate only in embracing a shadowy mysticism instead of the substance of the Catholic Church. He resolutely devoted himself, however, to the defence of Scripture against the cavils of the rationalists, with a learning quite equal to, and with a gentle and religious spirit infinitely beyond, theirs. In such a contest the world deems the unworldly champion feeble and ineffective; nevertheless, we believe that in God’s good time his triumph is sure.

Confining ourselves to a single branch of a large subject, we propose to devote two lectures to the objections made against Scripture morality. In this lecture I will review some leading instances. In the next I propose to suggest some general answers to this class of objections, and to speak if possible to the spirit that prompts them.

There is a singular monotony in the matter and manner of these objections. From Celsus and Porphyry of old down to Tindal in his *Christianity as Old as Crea-*

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Christ*, Preface.

tion (answered by Waterland), and then by a still lower descent to the Bradlaughs and Ingersolls of our own day, these writers uniformly exhibit a carping and ungenerous spirit, tearing shreds and texts out of the sacred pages, and holding them up with scorn and ribaldry, but never acknowledging merits in the Scriptures collectively, or in any one of the sacred books; blind and deaf to the great qualities that have won so many testimonies from candid souls. An infidel lawyer, for instance, will roughly call the patriarchs liars for conduct which a teacher so sensitive as S. Augustine on the *mendacium* pronounces justifiable; while the same lawyer will proceed into our courts of law, and account himself to have won a great triumph in his profession, if by legal devices and artful appeals he can procure the escape from condign punishment of unfaithful officers who have defrauded the government by deliberate plans, involving forgery and false returns.<sup>1</sup> Similar and coarser attacks have been made upon Moses and David by assailants with the same brazen contempt for consistency.

The antagonists themselves of this sort do not expect and do not deserve a serious answer. The *argumentum ad hominem* can expose their inconsistency and unfairness. But less hardened hearts and perhaps unaccustomed to such discussions, being disturbed by these bold misstatements, we must endeavor to assist by laying before them the simple truth.

A book,<sup>2</sup> published a few years ago, treats of all the instances, some nine hundred, where the Bible has been charged with inconsistency with itself and its great ethical laws. This, after you have studied Waterland's<sup>3</sup> “Review of Tindal,” will furnish you with a complete list of the

<sup>1</sup> One of the most telling books (though not free from coarseness) written against the shameless Ingersoll is by a Roman Catholic priest, the Rev. L. A. Lambert. *Notes on*

*Ingersoll*, p. 200. Buffalo, 1884. Seventieth Thousand (6th ed.).

<sup>2</sup> *Discrepancies of the Bible*, by J. W. Haley, Boston, 1874.

<sup>3</sup> *Works*, IV., 149-370.

class of objections, of which I now proceed to give you a few examples.

Gen. xii. 10-13; xx. 2-12 (cf. Gen. xxvi. 6-9). The ribaldry of Tindal upon the act of Abraham and Isaac, in declaring their wives respectively to be their sisters, is even less virulent than that which S. Augustine answers after it flowed from the mouth of Faustus the Manichæan. The saint, who knew his adversary well, and by many fearful experiences the utter immorality of his system, calmly answers point after point with dialectic precision, applying the lash on occasion to this immoral champion of morality, and when he comes to the charge of falsehood, after exposing its exaggerations, concludes with the judgment that Abraham kept back something of the truth, but uttered no falsehood.<sup>1</sup> It should be remembered that there is a fair probability that Sarah was the daughter of Haran, Abraham's half brother, and that Rebecca was Isaac's cousin—the relations of niece and cousin being often included in the simple language of early days (as indeed in the Greek) under the name of "sisters" (ἀδελφαί).<sup>2</sup> Mr. Bayle puts on a long face here, and insists that Pharaoh and Abimelech, as "kings of the country," had a right "to know the whole truth"! How would his sarcastic wit have played upon any one who in secular history ventured to put forth so absurd a claim for ravishers and murderers!

The celebrated case (Gen. xxii.) where Abraham shows a willingness to sacrifice his son Isaac, at God's command, has, you are well aware, been a prolific theme for the attacks of enemies, and for the defence of the champions of Scripture truth. Abraham has been reviled for it as here showing pagan cruelty and insensibility. Scripture, on the other hand, distinctly selects this action as entitling him to his singular preëminence as father of the faithful and the friend of God. To me, I confess, it has always

<sup>1</sup> Tacuit aliquid veri, non dixit aliquid falsi.—S. Aug., *Contra Faustum Manichæum*, L. XXII., Ch. XXXIV.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the usage of ἀδελφή in 1 Cor. vii. 15; ix. 5.

seemed a transaction that drives the thought of apology from one's head, because it stands before us the most marvellous and the most overpowering summary of our religion, as foreshadowed in the Old Testament, as realized in the New, ever presented to human hearts and minds. It is an acted parable upon a hill of Palestine, believed to be Calvary itself, eighteen hundred years before the great event it pictures of the surrender by Almighty God of His only begotten Son as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. The narrative <sup>1</sup> that sets this before us we believe to be “without parallel in either the religious oracles or literature of the world; a simple, human narrative, truthful, unartificial, pathetic, which no human father ever read without tears, yet a sublime parable of faith, conveying the loftiest lesson ever taught a human soul, through a trial the most thrilling of which the heart of man is capable. Who that has ever followed the steps of Abraham and his son on Mount Moriah;—that has heard the guileless lad's words, ‘My father, . . . behold the fire and the wood; but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?’ that has felt the agony of the reply ‘My son, God will provide Himself a lamb;’—that has marked that sorely tried heart, striving to be faithful to the Divine Voice, lifting, amid blinding tears, the knife against the life dearer than his own heart's blood, then stayed by the angel out of heaven, and rewarded by the eternal benediction of the Almighty, who in after ages on the same spot was to sacrifice His own Son for the sins of men: <sup>2</sup>—who, we ask, that has grasped the significance of this marvellous lesson of faith in God, can believe that it proceeded from the devil, or from the devil's mask which men call chance? All faithful souls reflect in some sort the image of him who by this trial became the Father of the Faithful

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxii.

*ιδίου υιοῦ οὐκ ἐφείδατο*, we shall

<sup>2</sup> If we compare the Greek of the LXX. in Gen. xxii. 12, 16, *οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υιοῦ σου* with the Greek of Romans viii. 32, *τοῦ*

perceive that the very words of the ancient narrative were in the mind of the apostle.

and the Friend of God. For the Almighty thus, in the dawn of history, and in the beginning of the Church, found a human soul capable of rendering back a reflection, through earthly sacrifice, of the unspeakable offering which divine love had contrived for the race of man."<sup>1</sup>

It should be observed that the criticisms made by men without faith upon the patriarch's conduct in this memorable transaction, return with singular force upon their own heads, as soon as they have expelled supernatural religion from the world. "Had the patriarch," Sir Walter Scott makes one of his Puritans say, "destined his son to death upon any less ground than faith and humble obedience to a divine commandment, he had meditated a murder and not a sacrifice."<sup>2</sup> Now, what is the position of those who, having rejected this and the rest of Scripture as disclosures of the supernatural, still for historical reasons and a general estimate of the great patriarch's character disdain to join in any vulgar vituperation of him? This is the position of Ewald, for instance, who boldly defends Abraham's conduct.<sup>3</sup> This, however, is really to forsake the cause one has apparently defended. It places the patriarch among the devotees or victims of false religions in every part of the world, who without cause, or with pretended cause, or following an evil custom, have yielded themselves to cruelty and stifled the holiest instincts of nature.

It is a curious fact that Tindal, who condemns in an early part of his book Rebecca's and Jacob's deceit practised upon Isaac, on the ground that it is a dangerous example, toward the latter part, with peculiar naïveté, actually justifies it by the law of nature. "Friendship," he says, "will sometimes oblige men to deceive people, when it manifestly tends to their good, and none are

<sup>1</sup> From my article on "Rationalism" in *Church Eclectic*, July, 1884, pp. 308, 309.

<sup>2</sup> Alice Bridgenorth in *Pevesil of the Peak*, Vol. I., Ch. XVIII., p. 234.

<sup>3</sup> See *History of Israel*, Vol. I., pp. 332, 333. Lond., 1869. Still Ewald (apparently from force of habit) cannot refrain from referring, a few pages afterward (p. 339), to the story of Phrixus and to the Hindu Cunahsêpa.

prejudiced by it; and all practise it with relation to children, sick people, and men in passion. And if men (as none scruple it) may bid their servants say, *they are not at home*, and do several other things of this nature, why may they not, when silence will be interpreted *to their prejudice*, deceive impertinent people in such matters where they have no concern?"<sup>1</sup> These principles would completely exonerate Jacob and his mother. But it should be noted that Scripture excuses their deceit on no such ground; in fact, offers no excuse for it. Facts are related in Scripture without approbation or censure, and we are left to apply the divine law (which is clear enough) to form a judgment of them. And "Divine Wisdom," says Waterland, "often makes use of the sins and follies of men to wise and excellent ends, bringing good out of evil."<sup>2</sup>

Exodus, ii. 11-15. The slaying of the Egyptian by Moses, commented upon by S. Stephen (Acts, vii. 22-29), the first champion of the new host of God to be led to deliverance not by inflicting but by patiently suffering death, is rudely converted into a murder and flung as a charge at the great lawgiver. The same persons, however, would never dream of hinting that a similar act could dim a single ray in the glory that encircles the brows of such heroes as Bruce and Wallace. Scripture, however, intimates by the consequences of this act, the long delay and the consequent discipline to which it subjected the chief agent in beginning his great work, that he had mistaken the spirit<sup>3</sup> and the means through which it was to prove successful. By patience, by trust in God, by active courage and energy, also, when the occasion came, were God's people to be led from Egypt to Canaan. Holy Scripture holds up none of its saints and heroes

<sup>1</sup> *Christianity as Old as Creation*, p. 347.

<sup>2</sup> IV., 206.

<sup>3</sup> Thus S. Augustine decides, after calmly weighing the probabilities of a divine impulse, that Moses cannot

be altogether justified: "quia nullam adhuc legitimam potestatem gerebat, nec acceptam divinitus, nec humana societate ordinatam." — *Quest. in Exod.*, § ii.

(save One alone, of whom the rest at their best are but shadows) as without fault. Of Moses in particular it emphatically records other instances of impatience and of its signal punishment, though to his most intimate friends he seemed at length "meek above all the men on the face of the earth."<sup>1</sup> So different are God's judgments from those of man. On the contrary, we are not to allow too readily that this act of Moses, and such as is ascribed to the prophet Elijah, for instance, in destroying by fire those sent to apprehend him, are in irreconcilable conflict with the spirit of the Gospel, when we remember the death of Ananias and Sapphira at S. Peter's word, and how S. Paul smote the sorcerer with blindness.<sup>2</sup>

The transaction referred to in Exod. xi. 2, 3; xii. 35, 36, has formed the ground of much sarcastic vituperation, which, however, will completely vanish upon a careful consideration of the passage. I am indebted for this criticism to Professor Fairbairn in his valuable work on typology.<sup>3</sup> The translation "borrow" rests upon a complete misapprehension of the meaning of the Hebrew word לָשַׁאֵף, which simply means "to ask" or "demand," and in the Hiphil form (in xii. 36), "to cause another to ask." The true meaning then is: "The Lord produced such an impression on the mind of the Egyptians in favor of the Israelites, that so far from needing to be cozened or constrained to part with the articles of gold (a more correct translation than 'jewels of gold'), silver, and apparel, they rather invited the Israelites to ask them." This was, in fact, the voice of an alarmed conscience, awakened often

<sup>1</sup> Numb. xii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Kings, i. 8-15. Acts, v. 1-11; xiii. 8-11.

<sup>3</sup> *Typology of Scripture*, by Patrick Fairbairn, D.D., Professor, etc., Vol. II., pp. 53-55, 3d ed. Phil., 1857. I have not, it will be perceived, followed the learned professor in his severe remarks on the Septuagint

translation, and on the Fathers, including S. Jerome, following it; because *αἰτέω*, *postulo*, *peto* (employed by them) fairly represent the meaning of the Hebrew. His severity should have been directed against the authorized version. The LXX. translate לָשַׁאֵף by *αἰτεῖται* in Deut. x. 12.

in the most insensible in moments of extreme terror, urging at length upon the acceptance of the slaves whom they had so long defrauded some compensation for much unrequited toil.

We come now to the celebrated case of David, who himself heard the prophecy that he would continue to be "a great occasion for the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme." The following texts bring before us the difficulty of which so much advantage has been taken: 1 Kings, xv. 3, 5; Acts, xiii. 22, compared with 2 Sam. xxiv. 10; 1 Chron. xxviii. 3. In their eagerness to make Holy Scripture sanction murder and adultery, unscrupulous propagandists of infidelity will sometimes quote 1 Kings, xiv. 8, where the important qualification found in 1 Kings, xv. 5, "save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite," is omitted. This was lately done by Bradlaugh himself in England, and he was put to confusion, and retired from his lecture, by the correction of a poor workingman who pointed out the important clause omitted.

First it must be said, though it is plain, that Scripture is not silent concerning other sins of David before and after this; for example, the sin of numbering the people, to which so conspicuous a punishment was attached.<sup>1</sup> Next, to a devout believer, familiar with the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, it can only seem wonderful and incredible that any one, professing to judge of the contents of the holy volume, can be ignorant of its awful and unmistakable, yet still merciful, judgment upon this great lapse in that royal soul. King David was not a Christian, and, though favored with divine gifts, he had not the grace which the Son of God brought to the soul. Yet he was a man (if we may use the world's language), who, while gifted with genius, a poet, "the sweet psalmist of Israel," a born leader of men, quick and ready in arms, brave to a fault, yet able to form plans requiring patience and delay for their execution—with all this, still cherished in his heart of hearts the truest faith in God, whom his

<sup>1</sup> 2 Sam. xxiv.

eye habitually contemplated as the very life of his soul, for whom he felt a burning loyalty that could not endure to see the worship of his God dishonored, and made him look on God's enemies as his own, and God's true servants as nearest unto himself. As we look upon this peerless champion, he suddenly falls, through self-confidence, through natural impulse, unrestrained by the highest grace; and in a moment we see him among the very transgressors whom he abhorred. The divine mercy leaves him not very long without the suitable medicine for his wound. A prophet is sent, who in the most touching of parables flashes conviction and self-knowledge into the soul blinded by sinful passion. The agony that ensued, and that wrought a kind of regeneration in the heart of the penitent,<sup>1</sup> expressed itself in strains so moving, so pathetic and heart-searching, so true to both nature and grace, that in every country of the world, among Christians even more than among Jews, they are the instinctive language of penitential sorrow, when souls would lift themselves out of the depths of guilt and despair to gather a ray of hope from the face of their merciful Creator and Saviour.

I will not repeat any of the ribaldry, shallow and unfair as it usually is, cast at the sin of David; nor shall I attempt to gather the learned and careful answers that have been returned. I prefer to give you a single judgment of a man accustomed to weigh the characters of history, a literary man of genius, who, though not a believer himself, scorned to countenance the narrowness and malignity that refuse to see any great qualities in one they have resolved to defame. I quote the following from Thomas Carlyle's *Heroes and Hero Worship*: "Who is called 'the man after God's own heart'? David, the Hebrew king, had fallen into sins enough—blackest crimes, there

<sup>1</sup> Quia licet secundum cor Dei non fecit.—S. August., *De Octo Dulcit.* esset, quod ille peccavit; tamen secundum cor Dei fuit, quod pro peccatis suis congrua pœnitentia satisfecit.—S. August., *De Octo Dulcit. Quæst.*, qu. v., VI., 168. Davidis virtutis et vitia peccata et delicta fidelis Scriptura non tacuit.

was no want of sin. And therefore unbelievers sneer and ask, 'Is this your man after God's own heart?' The sneer, I must say, seems to me but a shallow one. What are faults, what are the outward details of a life, if the inner secret of it, the remorse, temptations, the often baffled, the never ended struggle of it, be forgotten? David's life and history as written for us in those Psalms of his, I consider to be the truest emblem ever given us of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls will ever discover in it the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul toward what is good and best. Struggle often baffled—sore baffled—driven as into entire wreck; yet a struggle never ended, ever with tears, repentance, true, unconquerable purpose, begun anew."<sup>1</sup>

Look at 2 Samuel, xxiii., and compare its opening verses with the last, and you may see a most affecting proof how in that royal soul the desire to make some amends for his great wrong clung to his dying thoughts. The chapter begins: "Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God, . . . although my house be not so with God, . . . and although he make it not to grow." Then the chapter concludes with the list of thirty-seven favorite champions of David, interspersed with his affectionate comments. And the last verse is: "Uriah the Hittite, thirty and seven in all." So he gathered his injured friend again into his heart in death.

Judges, iv. 17-22. I wish to make a remark upon the celebrated story of Jael, celebrated by the prophetess Deborah with divine strains of approval, coarsely condemned by the unbelieving in every age as unwomanly, treacherous, and cruel. It need not be said that the

<sup>1</sup>p. 72.

Kenites were no part of the chosen race. But I base no vindication of the zealous friend and champion of Israel on that ground. Far from it. She struck the ruthless instrument of oppression, when he came into her power, with the zeal which burns in loyal hearts for their friends. She killed Sisera, doubtless, with as little compunction as she would have killed the most venomous of serpents. We know not how far she shared the faith of Israel; but there is no doubt she felt sure she was sweeping from the earth the cruel robber and tyrant who for twenty years had despoiled her hereditary friends. The impulse which had suddenly raised her woman's nature to attempt this act of masculine daring is the subject of Deborah's praise. It was nature's impulse, it is true, and an Oriental nature's in a marked manner; but at its root lay true loyalty to God and man. Another feature of the commendation should be noticed particularly. The prophetess makes it the occasion of a most stinging reproof to the lukewarm. "Curse ye, Meroz," said the Angel of the Lord, "curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, the help of the Lord against the mighty."<sup>1</sup> There is no character held up in Scripture to more thorough abomination and scorn than that of him who can never be trusted to adhere to any cause, good or bad, who, in other words, is indifferent or lukewarm. Their voices may at times be heard among the languid critics (themselves believing nothing) who attempt to weigh the character of this loyal-hearted woman. I do not hesitate to pray (*sit anima mea cum illa*), May my soul be with hers rather than with theirs, when God shall bring into judgment Christians and heathen before His throne.

Judges, xi. 30-40. The sacrifice of his daughter by Jephthah,<sup>2</sup> the ninth of the judges, has caused great perplexity and proved a scandal in the minds of those who have felt themselves bound to think that the Almighty

<sup>1</sup> Judges, v. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *i. e.*, "the opener" or "deliverer."

gave His sanction to this strange and cruel pagan custom. It is well known that the law forbade such sacrifices. But in those times of confusion the plainest laws were broken. Jephthah's education was not fitted to give him either clear knowledge or exact fulfilment of the law of God. The son of a concubine, he was driven by the jealousy of his legitimate brethren from his father's house to the land of Tob, where he became leader of a band of outlaws, more desperate, it would seem, than those who followed David when he fled from Saul. We could hardly expect from one under such circumstances accurate knowledge of the law. His vow, then, if fulfilled by the sacrifice of his daughter, as on the face of it seems to be the meaning of the narrative, was the act of a generous, blinded, half-pagan soul, whose intention, however, to serve God's people, as in the case of Jael, was undoubted, though little in conformity with God's law. This tragedy would then bring before us one of those strange and instructive contrasts of history, in that the Ammonites, whose beginning was in a daughter's unnatural sin, are finally punished by one, whose daughter made herself a willing sacrifice, that the expiation might be complete.

But the Jews themselves have never been willing to admit that this is the true meaning of the story, as it leaves too deep a stain upon the character of one of the most heroic of their judges. In the first place they point out how the law expressly provided for the redemption of one whose life had become forfeit. The *Targum* blames Jephthah for not consulting Phinehas, the high-priest; and a tradition was handed down that the priesthood was transferred from Phinehas (in punishment for not having prevented Jephthah's act) and given to the house of Ithamar.<sup>2</sup> Kimchi gives a wholly different interpretation to the words concerning Jephthah, "who did with her according to his vow."<sup>3</sup> "That is," says Kimchi, "he made her

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xxvii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Selden de Success. ad Pontif.*, L. I., Ch. II., fol. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Judges, xi. 39.

a house and brought her into it, and there left her secluded from the company of all men, and from all secular affairs.”<sup>1</sup> “The result whereof,” says Waterland, who adopts this view, “probably was that she was to continue a virgin all her days, and to serve in such a way as females might for the use of the sanctuary, as in spinning, weaving, making vestments for the priests and Levites; or in grinding wheat, kneading flour, baking bread, or the like. Such kind of services, probably, she was condemned to for life. And thus the vow was executed.”<sup>2</sup>

I have now brought before you some typical instances where the morality of the Old Testament has been condemned, and its Author has been blasphemed, because of certain actions recorded there of leading heroes and saints, but who are never held up as perfect. It is a curious fact, however, that in none of the books or discourses that contain these violent charges will you find recognition of the fact that some of the great men maligned—Abraham, Moses, and David, for instance—have a noble place in the world’s history, even apart from their mention in Scripture, and are recognized, where faith is not known, not only as leaders among the great, but as among the number of the great who have been benefactors. You will seldom find in the literature of unbelief any recognition of the peculiar merits of the Ancient Scriptures, compared with all literature; their simplicity, their directness, their pathos, combined with a peculiar sublimity. They see nothing wonderful in the majestic disclosure of the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth. They admit no help for morality in the implanting in human souls a steadfast faith in Him. They will allow as little in the disclosure that all men are of one parentage, one blood. We never hear, in the writings of these profane objectors, of the Ten Commandments, or of their place in every system of morals. No advantage appears to have come from the wonderful separation and preserva-

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Patrick, *in loc.*

those who have maintained this view

<sup>2</sup> Waterland, IV., 258. Among are Le Clerc, Bedford, and others.

tion of a nation that should witness to all that is most necessary for man to know, which still, humanly speaking, would have been irrecoverably lost without that nation's witness.

I desire finally to say a word upon what are sometimes called progressive standards of morality. The phrase, I believe, has been used so as to convey a sound meaning. But the perverse philosophy of the day tends continually to bring it in to the support of the false and baseless theory, that man by his own efforts is advancing toward more perfect morals, even as he has discovered without assistance whatever is known of religion. The Old Testament, the Book of Deuteronomy, for instance, contains the very highest conceptions of duty, the precept to love God supremely and our neighbor as ourselves, the golden rule, if not with the fulness of the Sermon on the Mount, yet with great plainness. "The law was our school-master to bring us to Christ." By the Law and the Prophets, and in the Jewish Church, our merciful Maker came among men to set up a school to teach the things of religion. All souls are invited, and allured to enter it. When those endowed with great natural gifts, with strength of intellect or strength of body, with generosity, courage, self-sacrifice, are brought to yield their necks to the yoke of this heavenly discipline, they are encouraged, their services are accepted, but they are never held up as perfect or nearly perfect. The Master grieves over the failure of his most promising scholar. He exposes to view no more of it than may be necessary for his pupil's good, or for the warning of beholders.

But the sins of the earnest and the loyal are no theme for the criticism of the half-hearted and indifferent. Such nerveless souls can measure the true man neither in his elevation nor in his fall. That half-heathen Jephthah, but whole-hearted soldier of God, taught the unreasonable Ephraimites a valuable though bitter lesson on this point. They fastened a quarrel upon him for vanquishing Ammon without their aid. With a fragment of his

victorious army he chastised these over-nice malcontents. Then, by a defect in the pronunciation of a word of their own language, he detected the fugitives as they came to the fords of Jordan. This was a bitter but not wholly unsuitable retort upon those who would have destroyed without scruple the brave champion and saviour of Israel, for a punctilio, a fine point of honor.

They will never pass Jordan who cannot lift their spiritual sight to behold the good that is in God's champions, though they be not perfect, and who cannot at the same time be brought to understand the danger of narrowness and half-heartedness. The Almighty loves all His creatures, and will love them always so long as they will let Him. He encourages, He reproveth, He lifts the fallen, He checks the overbold, He teaches the most valuable lessons at times by the innocent and the weak. His Word may seem full of contradictions to the irreverent and the stubborn: its deeper harmonies are revealed only to loving and reverent hearts. But for this character of it, thoughtful observers have been prepared by intelligent contemplation of His works. The wise shun those teachers of natural science who see no difficulties in their subject. In that great continent of truth, Lord Bacon said, "there may be veins and lines, but not sections or separations."<sup>1</sup>

Transferring this character of scientific truth by analogy to the science of human character, we shall find that the lines that separate the good man from the weak and sinful cannot be traced with mathematical precision. But the good man ever relies firmly upon his God: "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him," are his characteristic words. The repentant sinner cries: "Against Thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight. . . . Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." But it was the Devil's voice that said to the Maker of men: "Doth the good man serve God for nought? . . . Put forth Thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse Thee to Thy face."

<sup>1</sup> *De Aug. Scient.*

## LECTURE V.

---

### OBJECTIONS TO SCRIPTURE MORALITY.

IN the last and in the present lecture, in order to make our view more precise, we confine ourselves to the consideration of objections to the morality of Scripture (as distinguished from critical, scientific, historical objections), and the instances reviewed in the last lecture may be taken as specimens of these. Now, what impression do these cases, on the whole, leave upon us? Do they seem blots upon the holy page? Do they rise up as stumbling-blocks to sincere and believing souls? Are they of such a nature as to raise questions in thoughtful and candid minds honestly searching for the truth? We answer without hesitation, Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, both the graver charges and the light ribaldry, uttered so freely and copiously concerning these Scripture characters and events, suggest nothing so strongly as the presence of certain serious faults of mind and heart in those who uttered them. The malicious, flippant character of this hostile criticism; its want of candor; its blindness to what is excellent, while microscopically searching for defects; its lofty assumption of being in possession of some high standard of virtue, from which it can pass judgment on Holy Scripture and on every other standard; its evident insincerity even in this assumption—these obtrusive characters of infidel lectures and tracts show that the animus that sent them forth was not real difficulty or honest doubt, but license seeking to justify

itself by destroying the foundation of virtue, malice against some person or class, anger, vanity (either wounded or flattered), or, finally, pride of opinion that having once assumed a position is too stubborn to change. Le Clerc was neither unphilosophical nor uncharitable when he bluntly put down as the cause of unbelief the following: immorality, pride, prejudice, stupidity, laziness.<sup>1</sup> The conscience of the infidel will often respond to this serious charge. Nay, Tindal in his celebrated work, with cynic plainness, and with a restriction peculiar to himself, says: "Incontinence *in single persons* is one of the rights and liberties which God has allowed by the law of nature."<sup>2</sup> He is constrained, also, flatly to contradict the evangelic precept to "love those that hate us." Now, it must be confessed that lust and malice are serious charges (yet brought by this author against himself) in the case of one who sets himself up to judge and condemn leading characters in Scripture for immorality. It seems probable that Celsus<sup>3</sup> and Porphyry, the most celebrated antagonists of Scripture (and slanderers of Christians) in the ancient world, were impelled to their unhalloved efforts by their zeal for the philosophical sect to which they belonged, and which they found to be dwindling under the attraction of a resistless rival. We know how bitter and intense this feeling might become from the history of S. Justin Martyr, hounded to death by a brother philosopher. Celsus, moreover, is reported to have been detected in an effort to introduce himself to the Christian mysteries under the guise of a believer. The apostate emperor Julian, intoxicated by power, determined to crush by force the unworldly kingdom that had

<sup>1</sup> *Causes of Incredulity*, pp. 108, 110.

<sup>2</sup> *Christianity as Old as Creation*, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Neander makes this estimate of his character: "He is the original representative of a class of intellects which in the various attacks on

Christianity has over and over again presented itself to our notice: wit and acumen without earnestness of purpose or depth of research; a worldly understanding that looks at things merely on the surface, and delights in hunting up difficulties and contradictions."—*Ch. Hist.*, I., 227.

once owned his allegiance, by rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem, that prophecy might be shamed. In further execution of his purpose he tried to deprive Christians of the means of a liberal education; he systematically employed libellers to defame and misrepresent the sacred books, but in the end had to confess that both truth and moral strength were on the Christian side. Voltaire, the most brilliant and effective infidel of modern days, was a man without principle, without honor, cynically destitute of any pretence to morality; who committed perjury to save himself from the results of illegal pecuniary transaction while he was in Prussia. He was destitute, according to Gibbon, of any thorough knowledge even of the histories he attempted to write; he was, according to Carlyle,<sup>1</sup> a man of words, of jests, rather than of any solid acquaintance with any branch of knowledge. He was, indeed, the representative and the tempter of an evil age. But his own character was a striking summary of the peculiar vices of unbelief. Gibbon exhibits to us the infidelity, the deliberate unbelief, of a most able and learned man. His knowledge of literature, Christian and secular, was immense, wonderful. He hated all inaccuracy, and lazy, half researches. Now, how does it happen that a man like this became a determined unbeliever? The answer, I fear, must provoke some deep searchings of heart. He was doubtless the child of his age, to whose worst influences he at length yielded. You all remember that when, being then a youth of hardly fifteen, he went up to Oxford, he was by no means destitute of religious sensibility. While there he became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church, he himself tells us, from reading Bossuet's *Variations*. He seems to have been thoroughly sincere. He went to confession in London, and received the holy sacrament. On writing to his father the news of the step he had taken, he was banished to Lausanne, where he spent several years in the house of a learned Calvin-

<sup>1</sup> Who discloses a ghastly picture of Voltaire in his *Frederick the Great*.

istic divine,<sup>1</sup> who sedulously devoted himself (according to the elder Mr. Gibbon's wish) to eradicating the seeds of the new faith from the young man's mind. He succeeded, but with how melancholy a victory! All faith was found to be uprooted in that mind forever. The result was doubtless fostered by the fact that the youthful Gibbon during these years lived in a French rather than English atmosphere, not using his own language at all. But the serious fact remains, that he gave himself up, as it would seem, with the docility of boyhood, to the guidance of one,<sup>2</sup> who, though he might point out (what he deemed) the errors and absurdities of the Roman dogmas, and the sins and falls, corruptions and vices of popes, bishops, and priests in that communion, yet still had no substitute to offer (none that could win any real allegiance) for the faith which he had rooted out of that ardent young soul. The report went abroad that Mr. Gibbon had been reclaimed to Protestantism.<sup>3</sup> Few ever measured, as many now fail to measure, when we ought to know better, the full import of the miserable fact covered by that complacent phrase. In Gibbon's case it was simply an application to all the evidence for religion of a principle thus expressed in De Crousaz's *Logic*, where he is commenting on Descartes' precept, "Begin by doubting

<sup>1</sup> M. Pavilliard. Gibbon grew to love the little apartment he had here more than the three elegant rooms in Magdalen College, which he occupied (but where he did not study) at Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Sheffield, who edited Gibbon's *Autobiography*, says that M. Pavilliard had given him his recollections of some of his controversial labors with young Gibbon: "the astonishment with which he gazed on Mr. Gibbon standing before him; a thin little figure, with a large head, disputing and urging with the greatest ability all the best arguments that had ever been used in favor of

popery." Gibbon's *Life*, note, pp. 71, 72. Gibbon says he is willing to give to M. Pavilliard "a handsome share of the honor of his conversion; yet I must observe that it was principally effected by my private reflections."

<sup>3</sup> Bayle, whose career in certain respects resembled Gibbon's, was the son of a Calvinist minister; was converted to the Roman Catholic Church at the age of twenty-two, remained there seventeen months, then returned to his former sect. "I am most truly a Protestant," said Bayle; "for I protest indifferently against all systems and sects."

everything ;” “ that is, let him not rely more on the opinions in which he has been brought up, and in favor of which he and those around him are prejudiced, than on so many visions of the imagination, and let him examine them with the same circumspection as if he were assured that they contain some truth among much falsehood and many extravagances.”<sup>1</sup> Gibbon frequently speaks in the strongest terms of the influence of this work of De Crousaz upon him, at the formative period of his intellectual life ; upon it, he says, “ I formed my mind to a habit of thinking and reasoning I had no idea of before.”<sup>2</sup>

Gibbon, it is well known, has described the organization of the Catholic Church as it was when Constantine recognized it, with a fulness and force which can hardly be found in any English Christian writer before him. He even puts the virtues of Christians among the five celebrated causes of the triumph of Christianity. But in his own mind there reigned an incurable suspicion<sup>3</sup> as great nearly of all virtue as of all miracle.

For an able paper justifying the war of England against France, Gibbon received a seat in the Board of Trade under Lord North’s administration—a position which he held while his patron continued in power. “ He wore the yoke of ministerial servitude on the merest notions of interest and emolument, and never seems to have ascended to the dignity of a principle in reference to any portion of his parliamentary career.”<sup>4</sup> The profoundly read historian, for instance, never raised voice (as did Burke) against the unjust and unstatesmanlike measures which rent the American colonies from the British Empire. In this respect he contrasts unfavorably even with the coarse and ribald

<sup>1</sup> De Crousaz’s *Logique*, T. III., .P II., Ch. VI., p. 263.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon’s *Life*, by himself, pp. 32 (note), 77, 89.

<sup>3</sup> The distemper of his mind is manifest in a greediness for unclean details and filthy witticisms and a peculiar hardness toward Christian

martyrs. He often praises the stately ceremonials of paganism, while passing lightly over the unspeakable villainess and sensualism in which they were steeped.

<sup>4</sup> Gorton’s *Biog. Dict.*, s.v. This is said by one who on the whole admires him.

Paine (whose fellowship no doubt he would have scorned), who lifted a vigorous and effective protest against that oppression. Gibbon loved his native land because it offered a place of security amid that mighty tempest whose first fury he lived to see. Among his last words were, "I hate France." He wrung feeble hands of horror over the tragedy of the Archbishop of Arles. He died as if he had washed from those hands all stains of that great tragedy whose opening acts he beheld.

The names I have now mentioned may be taken as the names of typical unbelievers. There are no keener wits than Celsus of old and Voltaire of modern days. No greater learning was ever pressed into the service of a bad cause than in the case of Gibbon. Few writers could stir the popular heart more effectively than Paine, when he told men of their wrongs. Now, how ought a believer to answer the insults thrown at religion and Scripture by these men, whose merits we have acknowledged more freely than they ever acknowledge merit in the Scripture saints? First, doubtless, by a secret prayer that the merciful Saviour would keep our hearts from malice; next, that He would touch with His grace the souls who have been misled by such leaders. But ought we again to bring forward careful explanations of absurd mistakes? Shall we appeal to philology and criticism? Shall we point out the weakness and shallowness of certain philosophical assumptions? Shall we point out the self-contradictions, and often the plain insincerity, of those who assail the morality of Holy Scripture? Or, what is most tempting of all, shall we present to these hard, taunting, mocking spirits, that peerless vision of virtue, recognized by unmistakable gleams in every one of the holy books, from first to last, illustrated in parts by the heroes, kings, and saints of the sacred volume, yet fully realized but once? This answer also I fear we must deny ourselves. The Almighty did not convert Satan by the sufferings of the patient Job; but He brought to a sounder mind certain deluded beholders who either

secretly or openly had sided with Satan's view of human virtue.

*We* cannot touch the springs of Providence; but we can, if we will learn 'the secret from the merciful Saviour of men, do that which in its effects often seems as wonderful—speak with power to the consciences and wills of human souls. Practically, then, my advice to any priest or preacher in the Church, who finds, as he certainly will find, himself confronted by some reckless assault upon a text, a saint, or an holy book, is first to inform himself exactly as to the facts; it is better in these days to make a special study of the cases that are constantly perverted into scandals. I do not recommend any attempt to answer an infidel before a miscellaneous crowd. But the priest can before his own flock, in church or in a lecture-room, choose for a theme the errors that have been made; briefly and plainly (and the plainer and briefer the better) state where the mistake precisely lies; then, without permitting this to become a prominent part of his lecture, and without exulting over the discomfiture of the assailants, let him ask his hearers' charitable prayers for them, and raise the direct, practical question how it happens that persons in other matters intelligent, candid, honest, can, on coming near a matter of this kind, suffer a sudden transformation into the most narrow, the most unscrupulous, the most unfeeling, and join hands with the base and vile in sapping the foundations of virtue. This, we think, might prove a happy hortatory improvement of such a theme, if urged plainly and earnestly, yet without passion. He could point out how indulgence in the sins that peculiarly foster unbelief blind the understanding and fetter the powers. The case under review, for instance, might be one where a little careful exertion and research would have cleared up the whole difficulty. This exertion, however, is precisely that which a slothful man will not make. The result has been thus described by a careful writer on logic: "Sloth deserves the more attention as it is a cause of

error extremely frequent, and one of which we ourselves are less aware, and which is less notorious to others. We feel it fatiguing to continue an investigation, therefore we do not pursue it; but, as it is mortifying to think that we have labored in vain, we easily admit the flattering illusion that we have succeeded. By the influence of this disposition it often happens that, having rejected what first presented itself, after having rejected a second time and a third time what subsequently turned up, because not sufficiently applicable or certain, we get tired of the investigation, and at last put up with the fourth suggestion, which perhaps is not better, haply even worse, than the preceding; and this is simply because it has come into the mind when more exhausted and less scrupulous than it was at the commencement.”<sup>1</sup> From an analysis like this we learn the near relation of sloth to impatience and precipitancy.

The most implacable, apparently the most hopeless, enemies of religion, and the virtue which it fosters, are those who find in unbelief a shelter for their passions. Dr. Johnson in his allegory<sup>2</sup> of Truth and Falsehood says: “Truth had the awful aspect, though not the thunder of her father [Jove], and when the long continuance of the contest brought them near to one another, Falsehood let the arms of Sophistry fall from her grasp, and, holding up the shield of Impudence with both her hands, sheltered herself among the passions.”

Man is a being so wonderfully made up of rich, unfathomed capacities, of blended powers, amid which have operated the mysterious force of habit, and traditions that are in the blood and bone, that contradictions impossible to mere reason and speculation often rise before us, none the less in individuals than in nations. In the particular subject we are treating, the following anomaly may appear, as it has appeared: a person may deliberately surrender himself to an atheistic life, cast off religion and

<sup>1</sup> Crousaz, *Logique*, T. III., P. II., Ch. VII., p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> *Rambler*, 96.

even belief in God, live for the world and for its pleasures, without any scruple as to their character, and find his happiness in this through the sympathetic atmosphere around him; and yet through all firmly and obstinately refuse to lift his voice against the religion or the worship he once revered, or against those who still revere them. An able French writer has in a novel depicted such an one saying: "No word in ridicule of religious subjects has ever fallen from my lips. I am an unbeliever, but I am not impious. I have never insulted, and I will never insult, what I have once worshipped. I understand only too well how one can lose one's faith; but I do not understand how a man who in his childhood has knelt before the cross, at his mother's side, can ever fail to see in that emblem his childhood and his mother."<sup>1</sup> Here is a sensitiveness (true to the noblest nature) rarely found in the hardened children of unbelief, often lacking, also, in people not destitute of religion.

In history, it is a trite observation, those who occupy most of its pages and are remembered best are the bold figures that found states or lay them low, or the brilliant heroes whose fame is tarnished by conspicuous lapses under temptation. On the other hand, it is almost an equally trite observation, that some of the most valuable discoveries and gifts ever bestowed on man are from benefactors<sup>2</sup> utterly unknown or forgotten. Virgil's hero found in Elysium "those who advanced<sup>3</sup> civilization by skilful inventions, and who sought to make others mindful of them by deserving well."

Lord Bacon was wont to say that among the masses<sup>4</sup> there is always loud applause for the virtues of lowest grade, a gaping admiration for virtues of the average

<sup>1</sup> Octave Feuillet's *La Mort* (in English, *Aliette*), p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> See Newman's sermon on S. Andrew's Day in *Parochial Sermons*.

<sup>3</sup> *Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes,*

*Quique sui memores alios fecere merendo.*

Virgil, *Aeneid*, VI., 663, 664.

<sup>4</sup> *Infimarum virtutum apud vulgus laus est, mediarum admiratio, supremarum sensus nullus.*

kind ; while for virtues of the very highest rank there is no real appreciation whatever.

This may be allowed roughly and generally ; but it is not true of any soul, in any rank of human life, that has been touched by a real sense of religion, and it will have to be qualified by the instances of kindness,<sup>1</sup> delicacy, and honor (already mentioned) in those whom we call the barbarous islanders of the southern seas.

The conclusion we desire to draw from the desultory instances and remarks just made may be put into the form of a syllogism, as has actually been done : " If this infidel lecturer were wise, he would not speak irreverently of Scripture in jest ; and if he were good, he would not do so in earnest. But he does it either in jest or earnest : therefore he is either not wise or not good."<sup>3</sup> This destructive dilemma (as the books call it) is sound, because jest is wholly unsuitable in treating such a theme, and no man of the least degree of wisdom can really think the Kingdom of God (predicted in the Old Testament, unveiled and witnessed in the New) a matter for ridicule.

The class of assailants whom I have here had in mind are to be carefully distinguished from educated men, often youthful theorists, who in the present day, touched by the chilling breath of scepticism, have thrown themselves away with characteristic rashness, have yielded their minds to some abstract theory on the strength of whose paradoxes all virtue is pronounced impossible, and believers in religion dismissed with contempt. Such theories, though they may hold their victim in bondage, are without popular effect. The man whose tongue is free, who can influence if not mould his audience, can raise a laugh, boldly smirch

<sup>1</sup> " I'd like to see any one call my Bauro boys savages ! Why, the fellows on the reef that have never seen a white man will wade back to the boat and catch one's arms to prevent one falling into pits among the coral, just like an old nurse looking after

her child."—Miss Yonge's *Life of Bp. Patteson*, I., 301.

<sup>2</sup> " Honor is an essence that's not seen : They have it very oft, that have it not."

Shakespeare, *Othello*.

<sup>3</sup> Whately.

a great name, if he wander into sacred themes finds himself possessed of what may at first seem to him almost a new power. He can raise horror or call forth laughter—but of a different kind. He is in deeper waters. He delights to say to the simple and untrained, that he is biassed by no straitened opinions, that he can prove or disprove anything with equal ease. There is a curious tradition that Phavorinus the philosopher, to whom Plutarch dedicated one of his works, and who was the author of the saying that, “On earth there is nothing great but man, and in man nothing great but mind,” was fond of writing on whimsical subjects, and among these composed an eulogium on Thersites, “the ugliest man in the host before Troy,” yet not destitute of this demagogue’s gift of ready and mischievous speech. If we could infer anything from such an illustration of his great maxim, it would be that Phavorinus thought that the mind, after all, great as it is, was the servant, not the master, of the tongue. This was in fact the practical tenet of the sophists of Greece, who professed that they could give a finished discourse off-hand on any subject, and on either side of any question. The same temper appeared in Christian times in philosophical heretics, who treated the mysteries of the faith like the old theses of philosophy. The well-known story of Simon of Tournay is a memorable illustration, when he was struck dumb for saying to his admiring hearers that he could disprove with equal facility the sacred truth he had just demonstrated.<sup>1</sup> This might be viewed, if not as a miracle, as even a natural result, in a man with a remnant of a conscience, of the enormity into

<sup>1</sup>We fear that rhetoricians like Macaulay must be placed in this class. His rhetoric, which certainly has in a wonderful degree the element of popular power, was once likened in Whately’s presence to “champagne.” “Yes,” said Whately, “but it is champagne with a flavor of gin.” This gin was party spirit, which could impel or withhold Macaulay’s hand. He would have stabbed what he called Christianity itself as ruthlessly as he did the Church of England, if the Whig party would have let him, to show the skill of his pen. But now “the cause of Christianity is the cause of civilization.”

which a lawless tongue had betrayed him, as soon as he could at all realize it. He saw his sin, perhaps, in the horror of some honest young eyes before him, that were looking into his own.

One of the most active and able, seemingly the most malicious and least scrupulous, leaders in a propaganda of unbelief in France, lately smitten by compunction, suddenly became silent, broke off all relations with his companions in mischief, and, when they demanded reasons from him, declared himself a believer, but refused further to defend himself. A conversion like this is hardest of all to trust; yet nothing is impossible to God's mercy. One of its most hopeful signs was the determination to remain silent for a period. The evil had been fostered by an ungoverned tongue: its victim showed that he had a true glimpse of himself, by resolving first to regain mastery of that unruly member.

The champion of religion in the presence of the most determined adversaries may rely upon it that his chief strength lies (with God's blessing) in his own earnest confidence of both the truth and importance of what he defends. This confidence will make him calm. It will make him watchful, too, not to expose to peril what is dearest to his soul, both for his own sake and for that of others whom he would have sharers in that priceless treasure. The following description of a strong position was given by the late professor of modern history at Oxford:<sup>1</sup> "My own ideal of a strong position is that it consists far more in proved confidence of your own cause, in the vigilant maintenance of your own defences, in the thorough realization of your sources of strength and weakness, than in the most adroit use of weapons or the most energetic tactics of aggression."<sup>2</sup>

The highest proof of religion is not demonstrative, for then all men would be compelled to receive it, but is a

<sup>1</sup> Now Bishop of Chester, William Stubbs, D.D.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Prebendary Worl-

ledge's paper on "Christian Evidences" before a late Church Congress.

conviction we derive from the greatest probability, or from the accumulation of various probabilities. We may glance at three great classes of these probabilities: (1) Those which arise from comparing the truths of natural religion with those of revealed; (2) the correspondences of the Jewish with the Christian dispensation; (3) the commanding sway of Christianity in the world and over the nature of man. The truths of natural religion are founded on man's sense of sin, his need of atonement, his search to this end for some sacrifice. With his awakening conscience came to man his certainty of a God, of One whose law he had broken, of prayer lifted to Him in confidence or fear. Then dawned the anticipation of a future life, whether amid hope or fear. The proud savant, the product of our boasted civilization, who denies the truths of natural religion, who believes that sin is but a violation of a law of nature, and that there is neither God nor guilt, is, as to this department of knowledge, below the primitive savage whom he despises. But a soul true to itself, reflecting on the truths to which all mankind gave spontaneous testimony, is filled with a new and thrilling certainty as soon as he perceives how these truths are taken up and illuminated by Revelation. It can seem in no wise unreasonable that God should speak to His creature here, who is longing and praying to hear His voice from the eternal world. Then, as he studies and masters the methods of this Revelation in Scripture and in the history of the Church, perceives how the sacrificial worship, the symbolical rites, the great feasts (especially the Passover), and the peculiar history of the Jewish people, prefigured the more glorious Sacrifice, the more transporting worship, and the grander career of the Catholic Church, a stronger certainty still adds its force to what has gone before. But when finally he comes by experience to know, and to find in the knowledge the strength and sweetness of his life, that the one end and aim of the imperishable kingdom, in its varied activities and forces, is that he and sinners like him may have a path of return, by repentance and pardon,

to the hope of heaven; and that here meanwhile is opened direct access, by holy sacraments and by prayer, to that merciful Saviour who loves him and will receive him and cure his doubts—well may he cry that probabilities have yielded him what his soul craves, and that demonstration could not give him more.<sup>1</sup> The history of the outward world has something in correspondence with the experience of his own inmost life, and in the Maker that still guides them both, to whom he can look with the eye of faith, and say, “I know that Thou canst do everything, and that no thought can be withholden from Thee;” and again, “I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, . . . nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”<sup>2</sup>

It will be found on examination that many objections urged against Christianity by loud-voiced, pertinacious men are simply reproductions of old pagan opinions concerning God, or the gods, their government of the world, the relation of the human race to them, snatched up hastily in these days by the uninstructed, and repeated almost as axiomatic truths. Thus, for example, to some of these it seems wisdom to say, “The gods attend to great matters and neglect trifles.”<sup>3</sup> So S. Justin Martyr speaks of certain philosophers, who said that God cared for the universal, or species, but not for the individual.<sup>4</sup> Seneca says the Deity has determined all things by an inexorable law of destiny, which he has decreed, but which he himself obeys.<sup>5</sup> Lucretius proposed to remove the religious penalties threatened against sin (which he called illusions) by two scientific certainties—the world’s creation by a concurrence of atoms, and spontaneous generation, both of which science now knows to be illusions. And so men presumptuously think that

<sup>1</sup> Newman’s *Grammar of Assent*, p. 66. gunt.—Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.*, II., P. II., Ch. X., § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Job, xlii. 2. Romans, viii. 38, 39.

<sup>4</sup> *Tryph.*, I.

<sup>3</sup> *Magna dii curant, parva negli-*

<sup>5</sup> *De Prov.*, V.

they can pronounce on what is great and small, in the presence of the Highest; they assert, with a confidence the pagan did not assume, that though God created species there is no proof whatever of His providential care of individuals. The gloomy necessitarian,<sup>1</sup> finally, the most thorough-going foe to morals, binds the Deity in the inflexible chain in which he has first fettered his own mind and then all things else. With these old weapons the new assailants advance, trusting in the resources of a ready tongue to throw confusion into the Christian host. "Thersites was . . . wrangling; who knew in his mind expressions both unseemly and numerous, so as idly, and not according to discipline, to wrangle with the princes, and blurt out whatever seemed to him to be matter of laughter to the Greeks."<sup>2</sup> The prince who silenced this type of vulgar demagogues, by a stinging blow between the shoulders, was himself a wise and effective orator; but he disdained words then. Nestor, "the clear-toned speaker of the Pylions," could not have charmed that iron heart and brazen front. A typical Christian orator and popular speaker, S. Bernard of Clairvaux, in whose voice existed "a peculiar charm and power of moving men's minds," and in whose whole appearance an awe-inspiring effect testified that the theme which had seized and inspired governed the motions not only of his bodily frame, but of his whole being, once, in seeking to convert the obstinate Henricians at Alby, put forth the power with which he had been gifted, to the utmost. He urged

<sup>1</sup> "It extinguishes the personal agency in the world. Impatient of the injustice it sees around it, the mind falls back upon one summary antidote, and gets rid of the fact by converting it into fate; and fatalism has recommended itself by deadening the sense of wrong, and allaying the internal sore, like some stupefying medicine."—Mozley on the Book of Job, *Essays*, etc., Vol. II., p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Iliad*, II., 212-216.

"Thersites only clamored in the throng,  
Loquacious, loud, and turbulent of  
tongue;  
Awed by no shame, by no respect controlled,  
In scandal busy, in reproaches bold;  
With witty malice studious to defame;  
Scorn all his glory, laughter all his  
aim.  
But chief he gloried with licentious style,  
To lash the great, and monarchs to re-  
vile."

Pope's *Homer's Iliad*.

the heretics so effectively that at a signal they left the church in a body. The zealous saint sought to follow them, and to continue his address in the open air. The sectaries, however, silenced him by noisily shouting to him texts of Scripture. Here is a single instance of what was digested into a system and lauded as meritorious, at and since the Reformation; namely, the right of individual Christians to hold their own view of texts against the authority of the Church of God<sup>1</sup>—a principle whose fruit is endless division, and whose result unbelief. Still this rude rejection of the most persuasive orator that ever plead for authority was less deadly than the method of another adversary of the saint, the adroit and subtle and learned Abélard, who wrote a work *Sic et Non* (yes and no), in which he collected contradictory answers to a hundred and fifty questions upon religion out of the Fathers and early writers, and left these answers without comment. Some of these alleged contradictions were as baseless as the discrepancy that has been gravely cited between S. Matt. xxi. 31 and I Cor. vi. 9, 10, abusing the mercy that God shows to a particular class of sinners when they repent, by declaring it impossible that the same class of sinners, if remaining impenitent, can enter heaven.

S. Bernard invariably won those who were prepared to be won. This is the utmost the Christian advocate can expect. When he fails, he retires to his communion with God, to prayer, to the sympathy of his brethren, and his confidence is unshaken in her who has the promise: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn" (Is. liv. 17).

<sup>1</sup> "The Devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.

An evil soul producing holy witness

Is like a villain with a smiling cheek,

A goodly apple rotten at the heart;

Oh, what a goodly outside falsehood hath!"

Shakespeare, *Merch. of Ven.*, I., 3.

## LECTURE VI.

---

### CRITICAL AND PEDANTIC OBJECTIONS.

LET me remind you of a few axioms and elementary principles to which we have already more than once referred. God the Creator is not tied to any method of working in nature, or in the education of His creatures. He is absolutely free. There is no proof that He has never departed, much less that He never will depart, from what seems to us the uniformity of natural law. We do not deny that there is a revelation, a real revelation, of Himself and His attributes in the nature of man and in the works of creation. But we affirm that, besides this, there has been another revelation, distinct in conception and distinct in fact from the first. God has spoken directly to His creature man, in articulate words, in vision, in symbols, in Holy Scripture, in the sacrament.<sup>1</sup> This great fact has its own appropriate evidence, and we have endeavored to present an outline of it. No clear-headed reasoner should attempt to bring forward objections to this second revelation of which I speak before he has considered this proof. *À priori* objections to such a revelation are futile and based on a philosophy itself without foundation or substance. Neither should any candid man confound the natural with the supernatural

<sup>1</sup> The possibility of a direct revelation has often been admitted by unbelievers. Bolingbroke admits this. "No one will deny or dispute the power of the Almighty," said

Tom Paine, "to make such a communication if He pleases." Quoted from Hurst's *Rationalism*, Int., p. 18.

revelation. Both may be received and believed without contradiction, or rather in perfect harmony. But to confound their natures, or to say that both are in essence one, is to reject the second. And yet this is constantly done by people who believe themselves to be Christians. Still, logic will avenge itself. They will find themselves, when they comprehend the situation clearly, no longer Christians, but heathen once more. It may be their lot is with Socrates, Plato, Aristotle: it is not with S. Paul and S. John.

I am about to consider one of the most significant symptoms of this ill-omened return out of the light into darkness; from the merciful revelations and clear directions of the good God, seeking to recover souls from error and misery to happiness and to Himself, back to the stammering utterances and changing traditions, the despair and the uncertainty of the best pagan wisdom. And at first it seems strange and inexplicable that this deadly symptom should manifest itself in a careful, minute, laborious, and exhaustive study of the very text of Holy Scripture itself; bringing to bear upon it lights from every source—philology, history, archæology, and all heathen literatures. Still this curious and piteous spectacle has been now going on since the Reformation, in Germany at first and especially, but at length in every Christian country—the spectacle of earnest, plodding men of wonderful learning of various kinds, and of incredible labor, toiling over the Hebrew of the Old and the Greek of the New Testament, scanning every word, every text, every book, approving this, rejecting that, many at the end with a very small residue, and then even digesting what they have allowed to remain into catechisms and religious manuals, and yet calmly accepting as their final conclusion, that here is but another literature among the thousand that have been evolved from the genius and caprices of man. On examining the works thus produced, it is found that each generation has overthrown those of its predecessor, and left its own to a like fate at the hands

of that which is to follow. The labor seems pious enough, but a curse withers and pursues it. No critic, however great his genius or erudition, is of authority with the critics that follow him; if the truth must be told, not one but has changed his view on the most vital points many times during his own life. There cannot be a greater delusion than to speak of a union or consensus of the scholars, or Scripture critics, of Germany (and of those who follow them in every land), on the text of the Holy Scripture, save that for the most part they were *not* written by the authors whose names the Church has ever attached to them, and that they are in essence not different from other human compositions, contain no supernatural revelation, while possessing some peculiar merits.

What is it that has withered as with a curse, and brought to so pitiful a conclusion, labors that seemed religious in their inception, and were blessed and encouraged by religious men? The truth is, the Protestants of the Reformation, after rejecting Rome, threw away also all thought of the Kingdom of God as an external body having authority, and retained only the vague conception of an invisible mystic Church. They attempted to build their religion on the Scripture alone, pure and simple, a Book Divine, inspired, complete, possessing which they could neglect Church, ancient councils, fathers, doctors, the lessons of history, etc. Logic avenged itself on this absurd attempt. Scripture was given to the Jewish nation and to the Catholic Church—to the first, existing long before a line of the Old Testament was written, and to the latter, in like manner, before any book of the New Testament was written. The Church was ever the witness and keeper of Holy Writ. To attempt to take it from her and to interpret it independently, is as preposterous as if a German should go to England and announce to the judges at Westminster that he understood English laws much better than the natives, and meant, besides, to regulate his life there according to *his own* understanding of the laws. There is a good deal of this bumptiousness

in the learned German's treatment of the text and interpretation of Holy Scripture.

It will be observed how this perversion elevated critics and pedants out of a modest and useful position, and made them, for a time, oracles of religion and arbiters of faith. In no country, save perhaps in China, had so strange a phenomenon ever appeared. If we reflect upon it, we may perceive also the elements of a most affecting spiritual tragedy. The faith of a believing nation, trembling and palpitating after the last publication of Gesenius, Ewald, Baur, De Wette, Bleek, Von Bohlen, Strauss, waits to gather breath and strength again, as equally well-furnished champions—Neander, Olshausen, Stier, Hengstenberg, Kurtz, Auberlen—step forward in defence of their imperilled treasure. Still there is no end to the strife. A new adversary perchance arises, and a new defender. But the result is inevitable. Criticism cannot convert any book into an infallible oracle. Criticism is of much use in its place; but it is monstrous to substitute it for the Catholic Church, or to convert it into an infallible judge.

Scenes like this took place all over Germany: A young theologian came home from some leading university, and read to his father and mother his notes of the great Wegshneider's lectures, or, at another time, those of the learned Bretshneider. The simple-minded parents listen with amazement, not unmingled with horror: "The good and great doctors of our Reformation never taught such things as these." But the son airily answers: "Oh, the world has grown much wiser since their day."

One of the latest German apologists for rationalism<sup>1</sup> employed his learning to some purpose when he sought to account for the reproach invariably attached to the expression "to rationalize." Though the word comes from *ratio*, reason, it always seems to suggest a wrong employment of man's highest power. Dr. Rückert compares it to the class of Greek verbs in *ἰζειν*, as *μηδίζειν*, *λακωνίζειν*, *ῥωμαίζειν*, *ἄττικίζειν*, where the persons

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Rückert, *Der Rationalismus*.

meant are not the real persons whom the words seem to signify, but only act in their capacity. So it is never said of a true Mede, but only of some recreant Greek, that he Medises (*μηδίξει*). A real Spartan is never said to affect the ways of Sparta (*λακωνίζει*), but only some politic Alcibiades, who (perchance) hates them in his heart. So man endowed with this incomparable gift, when in the service of his Maker, loses his peculiar glory and really becomes irrational when he sets it above his Creator.

A being whose reason was given him to explore and understand the wonderful works of God around him, and himself among those works, certainly presents a poor, degraded caricature of himself in his best estate, when he begins to question the truth of everything he cannot quite understand, and to set limits to his Maker's power to communicate with His creatures. Because he can judge of things within a certain limit and range, he must needs set himself up for an universal judge.

It is curious to note how the very word "critic," of good significance at first, inevitably acquires an invidious, objectionable sense. A critic proper is "one skilled in judging of the merits of literary works and productions of art." The Greek word from which it comes was judicial in its application. While the *δυνασταί* were like the Roman *judices*, more like jurymen, the presiding judge was *ὁ κριτής*, "the decider" or "umpire." The next sense of critic we find in English is, "one who passes a rigorous or severe judgment," and a critical person is one "inclined to make nice distinctions," and at length one who is "nothing if not critical."

We may impeach Wegshneider<sup>1</sup> of this fault, when, after clearly stating the distinction between natural and super-

<sup>1</sup> *Institutiones Dogmaticæ*—a work not be confined to Luther. Luther that is said to have held its place for had attacked not only the Epistle of fifty years. It is dedicated "Pis S. James, but Kings and Chronicles, Manibus Lutheri," to show, says Job, Ecclesiastes, the Epistle to Sir William Hamilton, that the right the Hebrews, the Epistle of S. Jude, of attacking any sacred book could and the Apocalypse.

natural religion, and the necessary restriction of the sphere of criticism under the latter, he boldly denies the possibility of a direct revelation, on the grounds of a flimsy philosophy,<sup>1</sup> and then worse still, as if not perceiving that for him, in the eye of logic, the whole case is closed, and that he has simply rejected revealed religion, and the Bible as its exponent, he goes on endlessly re-asserting the dignity of reason, its right to examine and judge of everything, Scripture and the Almighty Himself. You would think from his language that the defenders of supernatural religion are always depreciating reason. The truth is, however, that he and such as he are the real culprits who bring it into disrepute.

A critic who does not care to hide his feeling of self-importance becomes a pedant, "one who puts on an air of learning; one who displays it habitually, awkwardly, or in an improper manner." An able critic, if he has this fault also, becomes a very trying personage, and is apt to bring into disrepute not only reason, but learning, and even the sound principles to which he appeals. But a dull, plodding, unimaginative man, who knows nothing but words and books, if arrogant and intrusive, is insufferable everywhere, but most intolerable as a religious oracle.<sup>2</sup>

We must remember that the Germans threw away an infallible Church, and put an infallible book in its place. They retained no conception, or they paid no heed to the authority, of the early undivided Catholic Church, which settled the canon of Scripture before Rome became what

<sup>1</sup> "It cannot be reconciled," says Wegshneider, "with the idea of God eternal. [why not, pray?]; it breaks up the perfect harmony of the world." (Many thoughtful men say the very opposite.)

<sup>2</sup> The following is a very fair specimen of an objection at once critical and pedantic. It is contained in the remark on the proverbial expression in S. Matt. xxiv. 28: "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be

gathered together," that "this is not scientific, because the eagle does not eat dead flesh." The Greeks, who on æsthetic grounds rejected the vulture as the symbol of cleansing, "took the eagle instead for their hieroglyph of supreme spiritual energy." Ruskin, *Queen of the Air*, § 72, p. 61. To have reversed this again would have been to speak unintelligibly to Greeks.

she now is; this was all as if not existing. Then the Germans took their infallible book and put it into a retort amid strong dissolvents, and when it came not forth again, they were without any religion at all, save the old religion of nature.

The early Church said to her children: Receive these sacred books as assuredly coming from one Author, God, though the names of the writers inspired by Him to compose their several parts are attached to most of them. Be not irreverent toward any one of them, nor any part of them; for they are not thine, but mine. This obedience thou owest to the Mother that bore thee, and made thee a child and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven. Bring thy stores of learning, of whatever kind, concerning language, history, geography, philosophy—all that may illustrate the sacred text. But presume not to usurp my place, or claim my authority: otherwise thou must return to the nature and the pollutions from which thou wast drawn.

We affirm that these commands were reasonable even upon natural grounds. The canon of the Hebrew Scriptures, differing in hardly a letter from what we at this day possess, was agreed upon by a Jewish assembly at Jamnia, at the close of the first Christian century.<sup>2</sup> What new light has since streamed upon critical minds, with all that philology has done, to enable them to know better than the Jewish nation and the Catholic Church, who wrote the different books and in what age? to embolden them to decide, from style alone, that seven authors, among whom was not Moses, wrote the Pentateuch? to separate chapter from chapter, and to rearrange the contents of the same book? finally to reject whole books? We pronounce this to be the madness of criticism, and the carnival of religious conceit.

Hermann, who had the temper and the will to do it, was not allowed to perpetrate such violence against the classics of Greece and Rome. Though these are much

<sup>1</sup> C. A. Briggs, *Biblical Study*, Ch. V., p. 105. N. Y., 1833.

less strongly supported by MS. authority than the text of Scripture, he never ventured, even with his boundless temerity, to put forth an edition of Æschylus or Sophocles, rearranged on simple hypothesis and internal critical light. A case still more in point is furnished us by Mr. Grote, the historian of Greece. You well know the questions that have been raised concerning the incomparable Dialogues, the authenticity of many, their chronological arrangement, etc. Our chief ancient authority is Aristotle, Plato's pupil. Then come Dionysius and Thrasylus, who give us the opinions of the grammarians as to authenticity. In modern times scholars of the true German type, like Ast and Schleiermacher, have attempted to upset the traditions of the past. Ast summarily denies to Aristotle any authority in matters of criticism, and denies that he could judge of his master's dialogues! He then proceeded to rearrange and to expunge till he felt in turn the critical lash of Thiersch and Socher. Schleiermacher ventured on a similar revolutionary proceeding, supported by the adequate light of his own internal consciousness.

Mr. Grote's opposition to such proceedings is thus expressed. A fixed residence and school at Athens had been founded by Plato, and transmitted to his successors. Grote opposes the authority of this school to the conclusions of the "higher criticism" concerning the authenticity of certain of Plato's works. "It appears to me," he says, "that the continuance of this school . . . gives us an amount of assurance for the authenticity of the so-called Platonic compositions such as does not belong to the works of other eminent contemporary authors." It is surely hazardous, he adds, to limit the range of Plato's varieties "on the faith of a critical repugnance, not merely subjective and fallible, but withal entirely of modern growth."<sup>1</sup> Why should not the judgment of the sensible Englishman against the abusers of Plato be a sufficient answer to the lawless imaginations, the wild flood of sub-

<sup>1</sup> Grote's *Plato*, Vol. I., pp. 136, 206.

jective criticisms, inconsistent with themselves and with sound logic, poured forth by the Wegshneiders, the Bretshneiders, the Ewalds, against the authenticity and inspiration of the sacred books? I cannot help reminding you here of the well-known words of Carlyle, who once greatly admired the Germans. He speaks of their "spiritual atrophy, the flaccid pedantry, ever rummaging and re-arranging among learned marine stores, which thinks itself wisdom and insight; the vague maunderings, flutings, indolent, impotent day-dreaming and tobacco-smoking of poor modern Germany."<sup>1</sup>

It will now be best to give an instance of this critical and monstrous pedantry. And I will select Heinrich Ewald, professor at Göttingen, as my example, because he presents both the best and some of the very worst qualities of the class to which he belongs. He gave proofs as a youth of nineteen of extraordinary attainments in Hebrew, and exhibited a singular genius in the comparative philology of the kindred Oriental tongues. A peculiar vice in his character at the same time showed itself in the contempts and slights he showed to his former instructor, the veteran Gesenius, especially in defence of Eichhorn, his oracle in those. Gesenius treated his youthful assailant with good-humored indulgence, and Ewald was generally petted and encouraged by the scholars until his intractable disposition was more fully developed. Because he was no mean philologist, he took it into his head that he was a great historian. Knowing the Hebrew of the Old Testament as a grammarian and philologist, he resolved to reconstruct, by the aid of this knowledge alone, out of his own inner consciousness, a new and correct history of the chosen people, and of the origin of their sacred books. His ambition was to produce a religious history as novel and revolutionary as, in profane history, was Niebuhr's *Rome*.

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle's *Frederick the Great*, Bk. III., Ch. VII., Vol. I., p. 200. "endeavoring to construct a rational theology formed an irrational philosophy."—Lessing.

Ewald had none of the modesty which makes a true artist shrink when asked to reconstruct, in thought or actually, the great monuments of the past, whether material or intellectual. Sir Christopher Wren said he could build another King's College Chapel ceiling "if any one would show him how to lay the first stone."<sup>1</sup> Ewald would have said he could easily produce another, and a better, and point out the errors in the first.

He is utterly disqualified to be an historian from a total lack of the capacity to weigh. He disdains what is properly proof, especially when it is not confirmed by his own interior light. He will bring forward a conjecture, and, after seeming to weigh it for a while in his critical balance, it suddenly comes forth as a "certainty."

We must give some examples of this, lest we be suspected of exaggeration. After balancing two hypotheses about Judges, ii. 6-23, and 2 Kings, xvii. 7-23 (and drawing a fanciful conjecture from Judges, xviii. 30), Ewald says: the former assumption appears not only probable, *but absolutely* certain, from the relative position as well as from the style of the two passages."<sup>2</sup>

Again: "This poem [the song of Hannah, 1 Sam. ii. 1-20] was then *undoubtedly* taken from an older collection of songs, *in which it stood without a name*. . . . It does not seem to have been composed by David himself when he was already king, but was *undoubtedly* written by one of the earliest kings of Judah."<sup>3</sup> This is worth considering. An anonymous poem, whose contents were of a very general nature, so that it could be "applied to a different age and person from the one originally intended, Ewald first inclines to give it to David, but then decides it to be *undoubtedly* the property of another royal personage, also anonymous!

Ewald introduces as a "suggestion" this remark: "The words Ex. x. 14 sound exactly as if the narrator had in

<sup>1</sup> *London Qu. Review*, Jan., 1884.

<sup>2</sup> *History of Israel*, Vol. I., p. 161 (note), Eng. tr. Lond., 1871.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem*, p. 159.

his mind the passage Joel, ii. 2, *seq.*” Then, as he thinks over it, the “suggestion” grows into a *certainty*.<sup>1</sup>

Can anything be more exquisitely absurd than the following style of writing *history*? “The *very late* Psalm lxxxiii. 7-9 *certainly* obtained the appellation ‘Sons of Lot’ only from a learned study of primeval history.”<sup>2</sup> Still this is Ewald’s usual style. A psalm whose date is unknown *certainly* got its appellation only in one particular way.

Let these suffice as a few examples among hundreds, of this *historian’s* treatment of the limits between conjecture and certainty. He is not a whit more trustworthy when speaking of facts themselves. Here is his report of the simple statement (in Gen. xxix. 10) that “Jacob went near, and rolled the stone from the well’s mouth, and watered the flock of Laban.” “It contains a tradition,” says Ewald, “that Jacob lifted with ease a well-stone which all the other shepherds together could scarcely raise.”<sup>3</sup> It contains nothing of the kind! One would be tempted to chastise a boy in a historical class who could be so careless.

Take another specimen: “But Deborah, Rebecca’s nurse, died, and she was buried beneath Beth-el under an oak: and the name of it was called *Allon-bachuth*,” “the oak of weeping” (Gen. xxxv. 8). “And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time. And she dwelt under *the palm tree* of Deborah, between Ramah and Beth-el in Mount Ephraim: and the children of Israel came up to her for judgment” (Judges, iv. 4, 5). Now, what is the *historian* Ewald’s treatment of these two passages? He *invents* a discrepancy in them in order that he may condone it. The second Deborah, he says, was “a kind of hero-nurse, and had her seat under this same tree at Bethel.” This is a direct contradiction of the sacred text. Then he adds: “The same topographical position is assigned in either case [a false state-

<sup>1</sup> *History of Israel*, Vol. II., p. 61 (note).

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I., p. 312 (note).

<sup>3</sup> Vol. I., p. 298.

ment]; the *discrepancy* in the name of the tree is not of essential importance;"<sup>1</sup> the fact being that there is no discrepancy at all, except of his own invention.

We will add one more example. After praising tradition, such as existed among the people of Israel, as alone able "to preserve the permanent basis of a story," and "the venerable forms of history," from the assaults of time, he gives the following characteristic illustration. The story of Gideon's fleece (Judges, vi. 36-40) "is a striking example" how "even a *new story* has been formed by later development out of a proverbial phrase about a remarkable incident of antiquity."<sup>2</sup> Ewald does not condescend to inform us where he learned so accurate an account of his "new story."

This vice of Ewald's mind is by no means limited to his treatment of sacred history (though there doubtless among some he enjoyed greater impunity), but may be seen in the two following examples, when touching on things profane.

Quoting from Photius out of *Diodorus Siculus* (the lost fortieth book),<sup>3</sup> a passage which Photius says was written by Hecatæus of Miletus, Ewald summarily decides that "it *must have been written* by Hecatæus of Abdera, *because* Hecatæus of Miletus lived long before the Macedonian Empire"<sup>4</sup> (to which there is an allusion in the passage). But why may there not have been another Hecatæus, and with what propriety is the passage assigned to the Abderite?

The second example is where, to vindicate Judah from the charge of cruelty in cutting off the thumbs and great

<sup>1</sup> Vol. I., p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I., p. 18. Ewald will transfer a book of the Bible from one age to another, on no other ground than that it exhibits the transition by which יִשְׂרָאֵל was used instead of דָּבָר, very much as if an English critic should remove an author from Queen Elizabeth's to Queen Anne's reign, on no other

ground than his use of "by which" instead of "whereby;" and yet on no stronger premises Ewald perpetually pronounces his conclusion "certain," "incontrovertible."

<sup>3</sup> T. II., p. 542, ed. Wessel.

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. of Israel*, Vol. II., pp. 91, 92.

toes of Adoni-bezek, Ewald says: "Cæsar relates (B. G., VIII., 44) with *perfectly frivolous excuses* how he caused the hands of all the men bearing arms in the city Uxelodunum to be chopped off. In comparison with this, what is told of the king of Bezek is mere child's play."¹ Now, in the first place, every school-boy knows (and he need not be so intelligent as Macaulay's) that Aulus Hirtius, not Cæsar, wrote the eighth book of the Gallic wars. And in the next place, the only excuse, frivolous or otherwise, Hirtius puts forward is this: *Exemplo supplicii deterrendos reliquos existimavit*. "He thought that by this example of punishment the rest would be restrained."

Ewald, who is by no means destitute of sagacity when passion and theory are not goading him overmuch, and always a thorough-going rationalist, scorning the very conception of supernatural religion, still is conscious in a vague way that something more than individual enlightenment is necessary to preserve religious ideas uncorrupted in the world, and writes now and then as if he had caught a glimpse in Israel of the Kingdom of God. "This people, through the conception of true religion, not only conquered at once a problem new in antiquity, *affecting its inner life and continuous existence* on the earth, but obtained a beautiful country as its home, and a voice among the nations." "All aims of external dominion, commerce, philosophy, yielded at once to the pursuit of another aim, to which, after every cessation, it always returned with fresh pertinacity. Discerned clearly from the beginning, they pursued it for many centuries, through all difficulties, and with the utmost firmness and consistency,<sup>2</sup> until they attained it as far as, among men and in ancient times, attainment was possible." "The religion of Israel attained its full glory" when it was ready to spread itself as from a centre irresistibly from

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Israel*, Vol. II., p. 350. Israel was developed out of their own

<sup>2</sup> But no statement could be framed more thoroughly contradicted by every fact, than that the religion of varied career because the majority of the nation loved it and clung to it.

the Holy City, bringing a treasure "never again to be lost," but destined "to become the eternal possession and blessing of all nations."<sup>1</sup> Ewald's native sagacity gave him a gleam of the Kingdom of God, or at least of its necessity. Still he is always held in the iron fetters of the theory of rationalism, which forbids him to think that there can be any other revelation than through his own mind and will.<sup>2</sup> Thoughts were suggested to the patriarch, lawgiver, king, or prophet (as are other thoughts): these were turned into stories, and modified from age to age as other literature is modified. It is characteristic of Ewald, however, that he will not permit his fellow rationalists to throw doubts on the historical reality of Abraham, of Isaac, of Moses, or of David, but beats off their attempts with scornful invective. He likes to praise the great natural virtues of these saints and heroes, and defends them against vulgar infidel slanders. Yet he himself does not scruple to turn the history in Genesis upside down in this wise—always on the sole authority of his inner consciousness. He thinks Abraham's and Isaac's visits into Egypt may have been later than the migration of Jacob's sons, and types of that event!<sup>3</sup> He says the blessing of Joseph should antedate the blessing of Isaac.<sup>4</sup> In saying this, too, he seems to forget that he maintains a Canaanitish origin for Ephraim.<sup>5</sup> He thinks the treatment of Rebecca by Abimelech older than the corresponding treatment of Sarah by Pharaoh,<sup>6</sup> and that the account of the latter transaction in Gen. xx. is *older* than that in Gen. xii. He considers Jacob's vision at Bethel in Gen. xxxv. to be earlier than the one recorded in chapter xxviii.<sup>7</sup> He

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Israel*, Introduction, Vol. I., pp. 4, 5.

<sup>2</sup> What Ewald thought of the Deity he worshipped may be inferred from such language as the following: "The great Unnamed One (*i.e.*, Jehovah) is yet driven to the new declaration."—*Hist. of Israel*, Vol. I., p. 295.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Gen. xii. 10-20; xxvi. 1-6, with Gen. xlv., xlvi. *Hist. of Israel*, II., 389.

<sup>4</sup> *i. e.*, Gen. xlvi. 13-20 come before Gen. xxvii. *H. of I.*, II., 353.

<sup>5</sup> *H. of I.*, II., p. 383.

<sup>6</sup> Gen. xxvi. 6-11; xx.; xii. 10-20. *H. of I.*, II., 327 (note).

<sup>7</sup> *H. of I.*, II., 354.

knows better than Leah the meaning of the name of her son Reuben. "In spite of the ingenious story" (Gen. xxix. 32), "Reuben," he says, "is *probably* originally a diminutive."<sup>1</sup> Ewald adds that Reuben's misconduct<sup>2</sup> is "*obviously borrowed*" (!) from the account of Absalom's similar crime. He rejects the derivation of Japhet ("God shall enlarge, or persuade, Japhet," Gen. ix. 27, the verb and noun being the same) suggested by the sacred text (and sanctioned by Gesenius, as able an Hebrew scholar as Ewald), and his chief reason appears to be "*because* it comes from the fifth narrator *only*,"<sup>3</sup> one of the imaginary writers among whom he has distributed the Pentateuch.

But I fear lest I may have given you something too much of this. It often happens that Ewald bestows strong praise on the sentiments of some of the imaginary writers to whom he assigns fragments of the sacred text, which still he treats with such summary disrespect. His mental position is described accurately by the Duke of Argyle, when writing on the antiquities of Iona. "To believe nothing of the truth of a narrative, and to believe everything of the truthfulness of the narrator," his grace says, "is rather a difficult mental operation."<sup>4</sup> Ewald is fond of balancing himself in this position. When called to account by men who believe, and are better theologians, he simply retorts with savage bitterness. "The opinions of such as Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Keil, Kurtz," he cries, scornfully, "stand below and outside of all science."<sup>5</sup> On the strength of a difference of meaning, according to the pointing, of the Hebrew word אֵלֶךְ, he published the following insolent declaration concerning Dr. Pusey, Professor of Hebrew at Oxford—a most careful and profound scholar in this department, and a man infinitely surpassing Ewald, not in character alone, but in solid learning of multifold description. "He betrays," says Ewald, on no evidence but his criticism of this one word, "so complete and, I must say, so gross an ignorance of all and every kind of

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. of Israel*, II., 367 (note).

<sup>2</sup> *H. of I.*, II., 279.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xxxv. 22; xlix. 3, 4. 2

<sup>4</sup> *Iona*, p. 48.

Sam. xvi. 21, 22.

<sup>5</sup> *H. of I.*, I., 64 (note).

philology, as well as of historical knowledge, that one is ready to suppose that he could never have been appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford."† This sentence may be said to be a fair picture of Ewald, his method of drawing inferences (he knows not how to argue) on the matter before him and on all other matters. The madness of literary arrogance can no further go. He is sure of one thing alone—his own infallibility, first in religion and gradually in all other matters. In a devout nature relying only on inward light, we know how this bent naturally ends in mysticism. Ewald at times simulated this. To some persons who interrogated him as to the grounds of certain statements, he replied, with daring impiety, that he knew it "by the Holy Ghost"!‡ We may dismiss him with the wise man's adage, "Into a malicious soul wisdom will not enter."

A plain man may easily understand the incurable weakness which besets the whole class of critical and pedantic objections of which we have been giving a few specimens. Philology alone can never reproduce the past, though it may be an important help. Especially absurd is the attempt to make the Hebrew bear the burden of such an attempt. I may remind you of the strong words of Warburton on this point. It is "the pedantry that is the ape of criticism," he says, that would attempt in the Hebrew, from considerations of style, to fix the age of compositions, as a Bentley could do in Greek and Latin.<sup>3</sup> The works produced by really learned men have always some real value.<sup>4</sup> But even the grammars, lexicons, hand-

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Dr. Pusey's *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet*, introd., p. lxxiii. See more on Ewald in an "additional note" at the end of this introduction.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey, *Int.*, pp. lxxviii, lxxix.

<sup>3</sup> *Divine Legation*, Bk. VI., Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> We instance, both in proof of this

and in illustration of the sphere where such labors are truly useful, such a work as *Ilios* by Dr. Schlie-mann, a typical German scholar, of the average kind, of inexhaustible labor and perseverance, examining everything, books, cities, at first hand, finding Homer's Troy in the centre of seven buried cities,

books, of Hebrew and Arabic, produced in the past in Germany, are tainted with a deadly distemper. They, and far more their introductions, their rules of interpretation, their critical remarks on the Pentateuch or any part of Scripture, are full of peril to minds not guarded by a clear and firm grasp of the dogmatic faith, and in particular by a loyal reliance upon the authority of God's kingdom, the holy Catholic Church, the witness and keeper of God's word, "the pillar and ground of God's truth." Wherever the thought of her has grown dim,<sup>1</sup> or has been deliberately thrown away, the critical and pedantic plague, which is individualism, clothed with religious impunity, spreads with deadly power, ending in the old heathenism, or in simple indifference, or despair.

Let us try to imagine, if we may not logically develop, a true remedy for a case like this. A soul shaken with critical doubts, through the perverse application of every kind of learning to the text of Scripture, in doubt of itself, distrusting all authority, even that of the God to whom he prays, hears the voice of some friend saying to him, You have mistaken the end of the learning and critical powers bestowed upon you. They were given you to build with and to defend, not to destroy. Religion, of which Church and Scripture are both factors, offers you

coming from its grave before the astonished learned world, with the cool statement—supported by figures on exhumed vases, coins, etc., —that *γλαυκῶπις* means the "owl-faced" monster of a woman, not "blue-eyed" Athene, and again emerging with terra-cotta vases, etc., from buried Mycenæ, asserting that *βοῶπις* signifies not "ox-eyed" Juno, but the "cow-faced" monster. It is instructive to see Mr. Gladstone's reception of this critic, and to watch Prof. Max Müller and Dr. Curtius hedge on the question whether Mycenæ can come from

*μυκάομαι*. "Names of villages," says Prof. Müller, "are ticklish as to origin." Schliemann is not an Erasmus or a Porson; but though his taste may be rude, he has plenty of facts.

<sup>1</sup>As at Oxford, when Middleton's *Free Inquiry* called forth no measures from the authorities; and the late Bishop Marsh recommended such writers as Eichhorn, without adding any cautions; and in the beginning of our own General Theological Seminary, see the *Essays and Dissertations* published by a "Society of Clergymen." N. Y., 1829.

facts and principles. Among its facts are, first and greatest, the Incarnation, which cannot be paralleled by anything in nature; and, again, miracles, inspiration, divine teaching, once for all. These things you could neither have discovered, nor can you substantiate, or defend them, by your reason. They rest on external proof. If that proof does not satisfy you, turn your thoughts from this religion altogether, whose essence, so far as these facts are concerned, is authority and obedience, objective not subjective, substituting Scripture and Church for natural conscience. Do not destroy your reverence, your very religious sense, your clearness of mind, by bootless polemics of a subjective character. On the other hand, this same religion offers you most important principles which are the proper objects of subjective illustration and defence, from the analogy of nature, and appeals to the natural conscience. The doctrine of mediation is one of the most important of these principles; probation by means of intellectual difficulties is another; and, again, the testing of a truth offered us by trying to live by it, the acting in important cases on a balance of probabilities, the belief that God hears every true prayer, responsibility for others, etc. These and many other principles which are found in the book of Scripture, but not less certainly in the book of nature, will, when thoughtfully considered, throw light and confirmation on the great facts of religion. Those facts, let me repeat, stand on their own evidence; but they are illustrated by all the great analogies of nature. And they lend a key to explain many of the deeper of these analogies. The Church's scholar, then, has the high, the dignified, the important function of removing by his learning the difficulties which time, and the changes of history, and often the mere ignorance and inattention of men, have fastened on the sacred text; but sooner would he pray that his tongue might be withered, and all secular learning blotted from his mind, than that he should yield to the temptation of corrupting the sacred books, reconstructing the

history therein, in proud independence and defiance of the Kingdom of God, whose sacred treasure they are.

Here, to believe is to understand; and love adds insight to the keenest knowledge; and faith and obedience are the fountains of certainty in the soul from whose depths have welled up the bitter waters of contention and doubt.

## LECTURE VII.

---

### PAGAN AND HEATHEN RIVALS TO THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

WHEN we speak of the Christian religion, we, of course, mean the one system revealed to the Jewish people and to the Catholic Church, foreshadowed in the Old Testament, described in the New. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son" (Ep. to Heb. i. 1, 2). We utterly refuse to take our conception of this religion, either in its earlier or Jewish stage, or in its Christian aspect, from any who are not true and hearty believers in it—from a Spinoza, who, though a Jew by blood, looked at his religion through the confusing mists of pantheism; or from Wegshneider, Eichhorn, Ewald, who, having limited God's power at the bidding of a shallow philosophy, can see nothing divine, or beyond the inventiveness of man, in the words or the history of God's holy revelation. The subtlety and speculative power of the philosophic Jew are a positive disqualification to him when he attempts to interpret the sacred books or their language. The great learning, the philological knowledge, the laborious systematizing of the rationalist leaders, combined with their utter contempt for any authority but their own wills in interpreting Scripture, the detestable spirit of arrogance with which they tramp through

the sacred pages (where they have no right whatever to be), rending, tearing, throwing to the winds chapters and whole books, changing their minds at times with cynical indifference, passionate and indignant only when their sagacity is questioned—these we think more serious obstacles still to real religious knowledge. Their mental habits have destroyed within them almost the capacity of faith, which rests upon humility and obedience. Both the Jewish philosopher and the German critics are virtually heathen, under whatever religious or Christian appellation they may shelter themselves. They are heathen, however, of a peculiar kind. They may in childhood have said prayers to the true God, or repeated the Creed by their mother's knee. They have a profound and perhaps exact knowledge of the letter of Scripture itself, its original and cognate tongues, as they know something of the sacred books of all the tribes of the earth, and, as they suspect, whatever is worth knowing in all literature and science. But it is no new thing, unfortunately, to find able and learned men blinded by some theory, in this case pantheism and nature worship, to the plainest facts and inferences before them. They can explore, like Kant, the mazes of the mind, but lose themselves in the wood behind their own dwelling. We will not take these as our guides, nor any like them, but the clear words of the prophets, apostles, and Christ, and the general interpretation of Scripture by the Church, and the careful explanation of those who dutifully hearken to her voice.

On the other hand, we will not go for information as to the great pagan religions themselves to dilettante critics and fine writers,<sup>1</sup> to the reports of hasty and superficial travellers, or even to the well-meant surveys of those who write to give completeness to some system. But we will

<sup>1</sup> Fine writers, when asked on what grounds they make statements subversive of the distinctions between revealed and natural religion, either reply, like Stanley, with high-bred indifference, or on the other hand, like Farrar, resort to the unchristian weapon (1 S. Peter, iii. 9) of vituperation, of which they are often consummate masters.

examine the best of their books, listen to the most revered of their oracles, catch the meaning (if we may) of those who seem to believe they are really in possession of some truth, and try to find, not the accidental and occasional, but the necessary or habitual, results of the system as they appear practically. We cannot accept, for instance, for a moment such fine-spun, æsthetic philosophizing or picturesque writing as Mr. Ruskin's *Queen of the Air*<sup>1</sup> as containing (whatever other valuable things it may contain) any real account of the Greek goddess Pallas Athene; and Mr. Ruskin, while reading into it meanings of various notices which different writers have given to the myth—*e. g.*, the true cause of the blue as given by Professor Tyndall—frankly confesses that no such thought was probably in any Greek mind. Writers who, like Mr. Gladstone, set themselves carefully to study and compare the actual expressions on the subject by some great authority—*e. g.*, Homer—arrive at very different results.<sup>2</sup> They who systematically view the whole field of mythology,<sup>3</sup> and collect the scattered notices from every source, if they confine themselves to the statements as they stand, arrive at quite different conclusions, or, if they abandon themselves to theorizing and imagination, reach no results at all. We are bound to consider, if we seek real information, the nature and character, the worship, and the practical influence on the worshippers, of each foremost Deity, and of all collectively, as they are described by writers who may be trusted.

Now, applying the rules we have suggested to reach the true meaning of the revelation in the Old Testament, and neglecting the impertinences of sophists and critics, we affirm that there, from the very beginning, is a disclosure of God wholly unique, generically unlike the Supreme

<sup>1</sup> We can imagine Mr. Ruskin's feelings when Dr. Schliemann came forth from his excavations at Hisarlik, and, on the strength of owl figures on vessels found there, insisted that *γλαυκωπις* meant the "owl-

faced monster" of a woman! This instead of "blue-eyed" or "bright-eyed" Athene!

<sup>2</sup> *Juventus Mundi*, Ch. VIII., § 8, pp. 268-290. Boston, 1869.

<sup>3</sup> *E. g.*, Bopp.

One worshipped anywhere else in the world, One infinitely above His works, yet ruling them all with a sleepless providence, making this great truth known to, and devising means for its preservation amid, one people in all the earth; disclosing besides a view of man's nature, elsewhere unknown or inoperative, as created with freed will, yet fallen from his high estate, and still furnished with a deathless hope of recovery. The justice, purity, and mercy of the Creator must be reflected in some sort in His creature and worshipper, man. In testimony of what we have now said, we will quote a writer thoroughly conversant with the subject, and whom no one is likely to accuse of deficiency in strong sense. "To understand the nature of this [the Jewish] economy," says Bishop Warburton, "we must begin with this truth, to which every page of the five books of Moses is ready to bear witness—that the separation of the Israelites was in order to preserve the doctrine of the Unity amidst an idolatrous and polytheistic world."<sup>1</sup> No mind that is seeking the truth can evade this plain conclusion. There is one Almighty Creator; His names, Elohim,<sup>2</sup> El Shaddai, Jehovah, indicate His eminence over everything created. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." "The Lord He is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: *there is none else.*" "I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*; that spreadeth abroad the earth *by myself.*"<sup>3</sup> The idol is always a thing for contempt, despicable in the eye of the plainest reason. "Ye shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold." "They were no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone." This is as unmistak-

<sup>1</sup> *Divine Legation of Moses*, Vol. II., p. 419. London, 1846. *tions on the Pentateuch*, Vol. II., pp. 213-393.

<sup>2</sup> Hengstenberg interprets Elohim, the plural, as designed to intimate that the true God possesses in Himself what men were disposed to divide among a plurality.—*Disserta-*  
<sup>3</sup> Gen. i. 1. Deut. iv. 39. Is. xliv. 24. Cf. Prov. viii. 22, 23. Heb. xi. 3. 2 Maccab. vii. 23. Psalm civ. 1 Kings, viii. 27. 43, 60.

able as S. Paul's words: "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one."<sup>1</sup>

So with reference to what are called nature gods, or natural powers personified, the system that prevailed in Egypt (as in many other parts of the world), the miracles wrought at the Exodus were a direct and unsparing attack, aimed unmistakably at the whole system. "Against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment."<sup>2</sup> And so against whatever power existed in any part of nature's realm, in the water, upon the ground, and in the air, the stroke of the true Maker and Ruler fell to judge and to overrule, till Egypt's religion was put to shame, as her children's hearts were shaken with fear.

Toward His own people the character of their God is depicted in letters of living light in a single passage. "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty."<sup>3</sup> The Ten Commandments marked out with a divine precision and authority the duties to God and man, not only of the chosen people, but of all mankind. It is a vain and shallow objection to say that no people ever came up to the measure even of these commands, and that constant violations of them appear among the Hebrews themselves. Shall we become judges of our Maker, who made us creatures of education, and able by its power to escape the dominion of evil habits?<sup>4</sup> Shall we impugn His patience, wherein alone is hope for the best of us?

"All the souls that are were forfeit once,  
And He that might the vantage best have took  
Found out the remedy."

<sup>1</sup> Exod. xx. 23. Is. xxxvii. 19 (see *Other Masters*, Pt. I., Ch. III., p. 66. xl. 18-26). 1 Cor. viii. 4. He refers to Nah. i. 3, Ps. xxiv.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xii. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7. Hardwick translates the last clause, "but not always pardoning the guilty." *Christ and*

<sup>4</sup> "Precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little."

Now the ordinary and habitual operation of the law was to excite the conscience of the Hebrew worshipper, to make him clear and sensitive as to the grand distinctions of morality. "It set forth especially and in vivid characters, and certified in blood of sacrificial victims, the great truth which every nation more or less admitted and deplored—the truth that sin and holiness are utterly incompatible, and that only by surrendering life can the relations which iniquity subverts be reëstablished and renewed." "The real character of the law is vindicated" by the "coming of the Son of God." "Christ in His character of the burnt-offering was immolated to replace mankind in their original subjection to the Godhead; as the peace-offering He completed our imperfect vows and our defective praises; as the sin-offering He bore in His sinless body to the tree the concentrated weight of penal suffering that was due to man's iniquities. . . . He passed in triumph from the earth, or outer court of the eternal sanctuary, and entered not 'into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us.'"<sup>1</sup>

The expectation of the coming of the Son of God, the Messiah, Prince, and Redeemer, was awakened and kept alive by the worship and the prophecies given to the Hebrews. This strong and growing hope continued with them through every vicissitude, the very life of their spiritual life,<sup>2</sup> and the strength often of unfounded temporal hopes. It was never stronger than at the very time when Christ appeared. It had even overflowed the borders of Judæa, and the limits of the Jewish people themselves, and had penetrated distant cities and nations, as we may read in Tacitus and Suetonius and others. A great Deliverer was expected, though perhaps the sharer in the hope could not tell exactly why.

<sup>1</sup> Hardwick, pp. 73-87.

<sup>2</sup> "It formed the peculiar disposition of hopefulness that characterized the Jewish nation and can be ex-

plained in no other way than that this view was understood and generally accepted."—Archer Butler, *Sermons*, pp. 209, 210. 3d ed.

We know, however, without any uncertainty whatever, on what was founded this great hope in Israel. God, who alone perfectly knows the future, had imparted to His prophets a sure knowledge of this transcendent fact, which in the fulness of time should find place on the earth. This prophecy is an inseparable, a vital part of revealed religion. First, a ray of light in Paradise; then pictured in living parable on Mt. Moriah; then traced in Israel to a given line (Judah), family (David's), town (Bethlehem, house of the Living Bread); then the true character of the Messiah identified yet distinguished from that of David, who in his kingdom,<sup>1</sup> rather than in his person, predicts Him; Divine Omnipotent Ruler, Lord of David, yet a humble and patient sufferer. These wonderful things appear not on the sacred page as allegories, or the mists of subjective conception; they stand there in language plain and most unmistakable. The Lord's challenge to the pretended deities of the heathen was: "Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods." "Mine hand shall be upon the prophets that see vanity and divine lies." With reference to all that concerns the religion by which He was leading them, the Lord's promise was: "Surely the Lord God will do nothing but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets."<sup>2</sup> Of a prophecy of a subordinate matter, Jer. xxxvi. ("the Roll") offers a clear example. In Daniel is an outline of the future history of the world, with particulars that cannot be explained by human conjecture. This is the very picture of prophecy set before us so luminously in the inspired words of S. Peter: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of

<sup>1</sup> 2 Sam. viii. 15. Jer. xxii. 30; future, often the far-distant future, xxiii. 5, 6. Ps. cx., xxiii. Is. liii.; embracing the fortunes of Gentiles and the chosen people, and the Star ix. 6, 7. and the chosen people, and the Star

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah, xli. 23, Ezek. xiii. 9, Amos, iii. 7, Numbers, xxiii. and xxiv., certainly contain a true insight into the conjecture.

the grace that should come unto you : searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." The whole Gospel of S. Matthew illustrates these words of the apostle. In his Second Epistle S. Peter resumes the subject: "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." <sup>1</sup>

We have now an accurate, though brief, outline of the religion revealed to the elder and to the Christian dispensation. We believe it to be true, not because of any criticism or piecing out of independent texts, but because it fairly states the plain meaning of the whole; it is confirmed by facts and results; it is the view which the Kingdom or Church of God has sanctioned, and transmitted to her children from age to age. Our task brings us next to compare this religion with the rival systems of the pagan and heathen world. And one of the most striking and instructive of these comparisons, it seems to me, is offered to us by a people lying close to the Hebrews, of the same origin and speaking at first the same language, usually on friendly terms with the chosen people, and especially so in the reign of Solomon, and who in the arts that constitute civilization must be confessed to have been in advance of the inhabitants of Palestine. I refer to the Phœnicians, who perhaps at first worshipped the true God, but in the time of Solomon had exchanged this for nature-religion; *i. e.*, a deification of the energies and laws of nature, an adoration of the objects in which those energies were thought to be present [of ten lewd, obscene symbols], and by which they became active and efficient. With them the Godhead was not a power distinct from nature and ruling it without restraint, *as in the religion of the Hebrews*, but it is the secret energy in nature itself." <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. Peter, i. 10, 11; 2 S. Peter, i. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Movers, *Die Religion und die Gottheiten der Phönizier*, pp. 148, seq. Bonn, 1841.

In the foul and cruel orgies of this worship, carnage alternated with licentiousness, and groans of abject terror with the frantic songs of revelry. Jezebel was an active propagandist of this religion. The Phœnicians united in one the attributes of Baal, the male divinity, and Ash-toreth or Aphrodite, their female divinity, and the story of Hermaphroditus was carried by the Phœnicians to Cyprus and other regions.<sup>1</sup>

We shall not include in our comparison with other religions here any view of Muhammedanism, which is rather a Jewish than a Christian heresy, borrowing from the religions of Western Asia the unchristian doctrine of fate, and using without scruple as its most effective allies the baser passions, as lust and the sword. In regard to its unscientific character, Ewald once, in disparaging a passage of Scripture,<sup>2</sup> says, as a sort of climax: "It is a license of historical description not exceeding that which the Arabian historians often employ." He adds soon after, "Owing its own birth to a neglect of history, Islam has never given birth to any true history."<sup>3</sup>

Turning now to an actual comparison of the Christian religion with the principal systems of the pagan and heathen rivals that have contested or still contest its claims, and some of which still exceed it in numbers, it will be convenient, after the example of Hardwick,<sup>4</sup> first to classify these various rivals under the following heads:

First, those that seem to have been always entirely external to Hebrew or Christian influence. This group would include the religions of Hindustan and some adjacent countries, as well as those of Mexico, China, and the southern seas.

Second, the religions of ancient Egypt and Persia, which have been often alleged to have seriously modified the religion of the Hebrews; Egypt during their long residence and bondage, and Persia during the Babylonish captivity.

<sup>1</sup> Movers, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Ezra, vii. 12-26.

<sup>3</sup> *History of Israel*, pp. 194, 203.

<sup>4</sup> *Christ and Other Masters*, Pt. I., Ch. I., p. 32.

Third, the religions of Greece and Rome, which we know Christianity directly encountered, vanquished, and rooted out.

And fourth, the religions of the Saxon, Scandinavian, and Slavonic tribes, with which, though the conflict has been direct and stubborn, still complete triumph has been delayed, frustrated, and sometimes apparently completely lost, as in no other instance. Heathenism among these strong natures had a strange vitality.

We shall endeavor while glancing very briefly, for we can do no more, at these four groups, to take some note of what is best and what is worst in each system; what is professed, and what is really operative; the teaching of sages, and the practice of the people. Especially should we guard against gilded bits of philosophy or sentiment, as representing the religion of a tribe or a people. "Across the night of paganism," said Coleridge, "philosophy flitted on, like the lantern-fly of the tropics, a light to itself and an ornament—but alas! no more than an ornament—of the surrounding darkness. Christianity reversed the order."<sup>1</sup>

In Hindustan and the adjacent countries the prevailing religions, which still impose their yoke on over one-half of the human race, are Brahmanism and Buddhism. It is well known that historically the system represented in the Vedic hymns preceded both these. On these hymns Professor Max Müller makes this remark: "In the hymns of the Veda we see man left to himself to solve the riddle of the world."<sup>2</sup> And, in spite of many passages which have a noble sound when taken by themselves, we know that that solution was pantheism, with the degrading results that follow—the loss of the sense of sin, of conscience, the striving for recovery, and the yielding to the surrounding impulse toward idolatry. In Brahmanism what was required of the many were chiefly, almost exclusively, outward and mechanical acts of worship. It is

<sup>1</sup> *Aids to Reflection*, p. 140. Amer. ed. New York, 1850.      <sup>2</sup> Bunsen's *Phil. of Univ. History*, I., 134.

not too much to say that moral merit was by them confounded with ritual punctuality.<sup>1</sup>

Declaimers against Western slavery have sometimes declared that it summed up all the crimes and misery of man. But its most odious forms in Greece or Rome, or in modern America, were a mild apprenticeship compared with the unimaginable horrors of Hindu caste. There was no hope or possibility of escape or rising out of this fearful condition. Neither money could purchase release, nor merit procure alleviation, because their very religion forbade the change as impious, and kings were as powerless as private men to save human beings from this miserable condition. From father to son the horrors of the most degrading bondage were fastened forever. This single fact, which is still a fact among millions in Hindustan, it seems to me renders it entirely unnecessary to say more of Brahmanism as a religion for man—from whose neck the true religion came to break every yoke.

Buddhism was introduced by Prince Gautama, called at first Sákya-muni (*i. e.*, “the Solitary”), of the race of Sákya, and afterward “Buddha” (“the Enlightened”), who died B.C. 543, about two centuries before Alexander’s expedition into India.<sup>2</sup> The Buddhists labored at first distinctly as reformers of the oppressive and odious system of Brahmanism. Buddha, beyond question, taught unqualified atheism: “God is nothing,” *nirvana*.<sup>3</sup> He asserted with peculiar energy the traditional doctrine of transmigration (or metempsychosis), but it seemed for the purpose of utterly destroying the whole system of animal sacrifice. “The worm that we crush under our

<sup>1</sup>The following is a memorable and striking example: In the Laws of Manu (Ch. II., § 79, Sir William Jones’s *Works*, III., 94) we read: “A twice-born man (*i. e.*, a member of any of the superior castes), who shall a thousand times repeat those three [Óm, the vyáhrítis, and the gáyatrí], apart from the multitude,

shall be released in a month even from a great offence.” Even immortality, like that of the gods, was promised to other similar repetitions.

<sup>2</sup>E. Burnouf, *Introd. à l’Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*. Paris, 1844.

<sup>3</sup>See the proof in Lecture II., Course I.

feet," he did not shrink from saying, "may in the course of ages become a supreme Buddha." The most serious and glorious contest which he undertook was against caste: men of every caste were invited to his lectures; but this proved too much for the new sect, and was at length abandoned. This was doubtless the crucial test of a religion that kept possession of the peninsula for a thousand years,<sup>1</sup> but is now found only in a nook at the foot of the Himálaya and in Thibet, China,<sup>2</sup> etc., whither persuasive missionaries took it, and where it flourished and endured. Its spirit was a mild despair; it was a religion without priesthood, sacrifice, or even a God; its founder was worshipped with prayers, incense, and hymns; it founded hospitals for all kinds of wretched people and for travellers; it adopted a habit of speaking of sin as cosmical, not personal; and it has been called "puritan quietist."

After Buddhism was expelled, Brahmanism returned like the demons into the possessed of whom we read in Holy Scripture. The Vedic poetry, the bright philosophy of Kapila, the Lucretian strains of the *Bhagavad Gita* have no practical effect in the vast peninsula of Hindustan, whose religion is polytheism and the most degraded idolatry (the religion of the primitive people in the mountain ranges is different in expression, but not higher in character), debased, irrational, licentious, restraining no passion. The Brahma, or he who is sometimes called the first of the Hindu trinity (a name that ought never to have been applied to this doctrine of Hinduism<sup>3</sup>), is often found to be attractively worshipped in

<sup>1</sup> B.C. 300—A.D. 700: King Asoka, its first great patron; King Saukara-Ahárya, its energetic enemy.

<sup>2</sup> Where it is called Fo-ism.

<sup>3</sup> A learned and thoughtful Jewish writer has pointed out that "the Trinitarian Godhead of Christianity" differs from all other triads in being "exclusively and wholly good, where-

as in heathenism one of the three divine powers was conceived to be opposed to the other two, the principle of evil."—Philippsohn, *Development of the Religious Idea*, p. 156. The tendency among the first missionaries to India, China, Mexico, was to exaggerate the coincidences with Christianity; afterward, a re-

the North, with quiet rites, prayers, flowers, melancholy music, in some attractive spot, perhaps by a lake. In the South, on the other hand, Siva the Destroyer, the third of the triad, (Brahma, Vishnu, Siva), is sought to be propitiated in gloomy temples, with frantic and bloody rites, and screaming processions of what is truly a devil-worship. We may behold here, among a people mild, philosophical, reflective, as extreme a degradation of our nature as amid the lowest tribes of Africa. Lines of worshippers may be seen, self-wounded, with knives in their limbs and tongues, with arrows, swords, sometimes a living serpent, drawn through the wound; others are whirled on high by means of hooks fastened in the flesh of their backs.<sup>1</sup>

The religion of China, if we seek system in it, is a chaos, a vague belief in a Divine Being neither spiritual nor natural, but hovering, in its ghostly unreality, between heaven and earth, but whose chief representative is the emperor. Confucius refused to say anything (if he could help it) concerning God. He writes chiefly of the duties of man, especially duty to parents. The distinctively religious customs and practices of the Chinese are elaborately frivolous. The most serious things become trifles, and the veriest trifles are exalted with deliberate seriousness. Even the mourning for a parent, the one thing that seems respectable in this curious system, is degraded by histrionic directions such as these: "The son should appear quite overcome, and as if he were at his wit's end; when the corpse is put into the coffin, he should cast quick and sorrowful glances around, as if he were seeking for something and could not find it; when the interment has taken place, he should look alarmed and restless," etc.<sup>2</sup>

The literature of India and China, after the discoveries of modern days, was at first too much exalted. It then

vulsion ensuing, the learned went to the opposite extreme, *i. e.*, that all the resemblances have a later, sometimes a surreptitious origin.

<sup>1</sup> Elphinstone's *India*, p. 89. Siva-

worship appears also among the Buddhists. Stühr.

<sup>2</sup> *Text of Confucianism*, by Prof. Legge, Oxford.

suffered the inevitable result, on examination, of being treated with too indiscriminate contempt. As the translation of considerable portions of the sacred books not only of India and China, but of Persia, and the Koran have given them a place in literature, a fairer judgment perhaps has been approximated. It cannot be considered, speaking generally, to be favorable among men of letters. The mass is either demoralizing, insipid, or trivial. Of the Koran and the Vedas an English scholar has lately said: The larger portion of "the matter is so foul and degrading that it has been found impossible to select continuous portions of sufficient length to set in government examinations, which should not offend the most tolerant canons of taste."<sup>1</sup> Our own Professor W. D. Whitney (of Yale), and an eminent Orientalist, says of the Upanishads: "The great bulk of their material is, past contradiction, *the purest twaddle*, a worthy continuation of the most inane parts of the Brahmanas." "Buddhist literature," adds the plain-spoken professor, "is a great insipid, washy ocean."

The Spanish navigators who set sail from Mexico in the third quarter of the sixteenth century, in quest of fresh conquests, found in the islands of Oceanica two principal groups: the first inhabited by people unmistakably identical with the Khonds of Central India; the second (and larger) by natives, with just as little doubt, of the same race as the people of Eastern India and Western China. With regard to the emigration of these last-mentioned people, the following facts are pretty certainly ascertained: "The emigration to New Zealand, that is to say to the most distant portion of Polynesia, took place in the beginning of the fifteenth century, and the emigration from New Zealand to people the isles of Chatham occurred scarcely a century ago."<sup>2</sup> In both the Papuan and Malayo-Polynesian branches their language and mythology con-

<sup>1</sup> *English Church in Other Lands*, Nat. Hist., Paris, *Nat. Hist. of Man*, Lect. II., p. 58, Appleton, Rev. H. W. Tucker.

<sup>2</sup> A. D. Quatrefages, Prof. Mus. *Pop. Scien. Lib.*

firm the identification to which their physical characters point. Touching their religion, of which I have already spoken<sup>1</sup> as to its chief point, I need not further dwell upon it.

The inhabitants of the two continents of America were different from any of the tribes of which we have been just speaking, and yet were homogeneous from the Arctic Ocean to Cape Horn. Their polysynthetic language, religion, and physical characters point them out as "Turanian," the same as the Tschud and the Scythian, who, whether by Behring Strait, or along the way of the Aleutian Islands, or by a greater sea-voyage through the open Atlantic, reached America. Their religion<sup>2</sup> was distinctly polytheistic, and often clearly a worship of natural powers, and in its results, alike among the North American Indians and the Mexican Aztecs, conspicuous among all forms of heathenism, as melancholy, dark, funereal, and ghastly to the last degree.<sup>3</sup>

It may be truly said that nothing we have yet met in this review can with any seriousness be called a rival to the religion of Christ. Turn we then next to ancient Egypt, which some have boldly alleged gave shape to the religion of the Hebrews. It is difficult to decide from which point of view this statement is proved to be the most glaringly false, whether when we consider the object of worship, or when we look at the details of that worship and the doctrines they teach, or lastly upon the present condition and hopes of man. With regard to the first point I have already<sup>4</sup> said something. If the oldest Egyptians possessed the conception of One Supreme God (as perhaps did the Hindus), it was quickly corrupted (as everywhere else) into a number of elemental natural powers, Ptah

<sup>1</sup> First Course, Lect. II.

Ewald to confess his impotence), pointing to the origin of these people from Central or Northeastern Asia.

<sup>2</sup> One of the most remarkable traditions preserved by the Indians of Mexico is that of a universal deluge, in the story of which Noah can be identified and many other strange particulars (which reduced even

<sup>3</sup> Nowhere were human sacrifices invested with such peculiar horrors as in Mexico.

<sup>4</sup> In the First Course, Lect. II.

(creator of sun and moon), Neith (Athene), Pasht (Diana), Ra or Phra (sun-god), Ammon (Zeus), etc. Herodotus<sup>1</sup> testifies that before and during his time "the common worship of two deities (Isis and Osiris) prevailed in every canton of Egypt. Typhon, the enemy of these, introduces the dualistic principle, so prominent afterward in Persia. The animal worship, so characteristic of Egypt, appears to have been very ancient, from the fact that some of the foremost animals in this strange idolatry appear to have been always sacred in particular nomes."<sup>2</sup> The gloom of the Egyptian worship, seen on the faces of its devotees, heard in their music, was constantly remarked in the ancient world. The one national air of Egypt was a threnody<sup>3</sup> on the death of Osiris. Plutarch deplors the effect of the animal-worship of Egypt as "cramming the ritual full with subjects of laughter and opprobrium," "which drives the weak and simple-minded into the worst forms of superstition, and the shrewder and more daring into atheism and beast-like speculations" (*De Is. et Os.*, Ch. LXXI.). There was always a suspicion of utter licentiousness about their secret rites, confirmed at different times by fearful disclosures. It is sometimes said even with a sneer of triumph: "But there were free and happy laborers in the rich valley of the Nile." We will quote, in lieu of many, one bit of evidence on this point. In the British Museum are three copies of a treatise belonging to the glorious twelfth dynasty under the Pharaohs, from which is the following on the condition of the *fellah*: "Behold the humble farm laborer. His whole life is consumed amid the beasts of the field. His strength is spent in tending the vines and the hogs. He seeks his food in the fields. If he is well, he is among the cattle; if he is sick, he lies on the bare ground in the midst of the herds." The metal-worker, the mason, the dyer, the

<sup>1</sup> II., 42.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Plutarch, *De Is. et Osir.*, Ch. LXXI.

<sup>3</sup> Called *Maneros*, explained by

Brugsch as "come to the house," "come home again," the passionate cry of the sister, spouse, and mother,

Isis.

blacksmith, the weaver, are in general misery, though in greater confinement. The weaver "tastes not the free air. If for a single day he fails to weave the prescribed length of stuff, he is bound with cords like a bundle of the marsh lotus." In the painted tombs of Thebes and Beni-Hassan these various workmen are depicted, and always accompanied by the overseer, *stick in hand*."<sup>1</sup> This is perhaps not quite so bad as caste, but is still a hopeless slavery.

To say, then, that the religion of the Hebrews was borrowed from that of Egypt, is to affirm that contradictions can be true. To say that certain rites, like circumcision, outwardly similar, but having no like significance, are identical, is to say nothing to the purpose. The same can be asserted of sacrifice, which among the heathen became in time entirely separated from an acknowledgment of sin in the worshipper.

It is curious that in ancient Persia the Sanscrit *Deva*, the god of light, becomes in the Zend language *Daéva*, the class of hostile genii following in the train of the great Evil One, who corresponds with Siva. Historically we should not forget that three populations existed, and for a time coëxisted, on the plain of the Tigris and Euphrates: one, Turanian; the second, Semitic (comprising Babylonians and Assyrians); the third, of the Indo-European family, and consisting of Medes and Persians. Among the first Magism prevailed;<sup>2</sup> Darius exerted all his energy to extirpate this system, and to substitute the worship of Ormazd ("the good divinity"), whose great rival is Ahriman (the "evil minded"), whose great expounder was Zartúsht or Zoroaster. Cyrus, at length supreme in every province of Iran, sought to conciliate his Scytho-Median subjects by placing Magism on a level with the worship of the great Ormazd and other Aryan deities.<sup>3</sup> In Persia and Medo-Persia, the power of the

<sup>1</sup> London *Times* (newspaper), Oct., 1884.

<sup>2</sup> Erroneously ascribed by Herodotus to the Persians, I., 131.

<sup>3</sup> Xenophon, *Cyropædia*, VIII., 1, § 23.

monarchs checked and repressed that of the priesthood. Along with the dualism which so strongly marks the religion, elemental nature-worship, especially that of fire, prevailed. The Yezidees were devil-worshippers. Traces of them appeared among the early Gnostics;<sup>1</sup> and the Orientalist dualism appeared in sects within and without the Church (*e. g.*, among the Manichæans) to vex her in early days. The Persians have been praised as possessing eminently the sense of human personality and morality, and counted as among the most active and truthful nations of antiquity. But such a belief could furnish no enduring support to the human spirit. It was almost inextricably bound up with the stern doctrine of fate. Its rivalry with Christ, therefore, is but the rivalry of deformity, though sometimes a brave and strong deformity, with perfect beauty and perfect strength.

The religions of Greece and Rome, which for our purpose may be viewed as one, are well known, because they were met by Christianity, resisted in many a bloody, not verbal, conflict, the character of their deities and the practical results of their worship were fully discussed, and the whole system was finally torn up by the power of Rome itself. In Homer there are distinct traces of the old nature-deities mingled with a new (the Olympian) system, the distinctive product of the Greek imagination.<sup>2</sup> Fragments of a different kind (as in oaths, with Jove and Bacchus for subject) are strangely found still in the writings and on the lips of Christians themselves. It had a strong effect on the Greek national life, as may be seen in particular in the great national games and oracles. The wisest philosophers, a Socrates or an Aristotle, were not allowed in earnest to dispute the existence of these gods. Still it was freely allowed, that, if seriously followed, no vice,<sup>3</sup> however degrading, and no

<sup>1</sup> Von Haxthausen's *Transcaucasia*, in what Homer says of Athene and Apollo.—Gladstone's *Juventus Mundi*, Ch. VIII., § 8.

<sup>2</sup> A golden thread, too, as of divine revelation, has been discerned

<sup>3</sup> The sin for which Sodom is most

crime, however revolting, would be without sanction. The orgies of certain rites and temples, *e. g.*, those of the Bona Dea, often went beyond the tolerance of even a pagan public. The event described by Josephus,<sup>1</sup> which led even a Tiberius to destroy the temple of Isis at Rome, and to cast her statue into the Tiber (although this had hitherto been a *religio licita*), is a very illustrative example of the same subject.

What philosophy could do to redeem this religion from contempt has been finely stated by Coleridge: "Of the sects of ancient philosophy, the Stoic is perhaps the nearest to Christianity. Yet even to this sect Christianity is fundamentally opposite. For the Stoic attaches the highest honor (or rather attaches honor solely) to the person that acts virtuously in spite of his feelings, or who has raised himself above the conflict by their extinction; while Christianity instructs us to place small reliance on a virtue that does not bring the feelings to a conformity with the commands of the conscience. Its especial aim, its characteristic operation, is to moralize the affections. The feelings that oppose a right act must be wrong feelings."<sup>2</sup>

To the Hindu with his dubious, hopeless creed, his cruel, iron caste; to the Chinese with their mechanical, unapprehensive treatment of things highest and lowest;

conspicuous was, with the gods for examples, practised throughout this heathen society, lauded by the poets and in romance, denounced by scarcely any ancient author, with two noteworthy exceptions, Socrates in Xenophon's *Mem.* I., ii., 29, and Plato, *De Legibus*. Ennius had said, "Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque." Compare this with Cicero, quoted in S. Aug., *Civ. Dei*, II., 21. Juvenal's words at the close of the first century A.D. may be taken literally, rather than as poetic exaggeration: "Omne in præcipiti vitium stetit" (*Sat.*, I., 49. Döllinger,

*Heidenthum*, p. 685). Xenophon, Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus—almost every pagan moralist, in fact—recommend compliance with the religion and its rites of every country they happened to visit.

<sup>1</sup> *Antiquities*, XVIII., 3. "The worship of Isis was the most widely spread of all the pagan deities; it was received in Ethiopia and in Germany, and even the name of Paris has been fancifully traced to it."—Newman's *Dev. of Ch. Doct.*, IV., i., p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> *Aids to Reflection*, p. 64.

to the Mexican amid the gloomy horrors of a creed of despair; to the wisdom of the scarcely less gloomy Egyptian, which alleviated no grief and kindled no hope for man; to the Greek and Roman who, amid the triumphs of intellect, taste, and dominion, beheld with indifference the degradation and permanent slavery of man—to one and all there issued from the Kingdom of God a voice sweet and powerful, effective through the ages where it spake, and hushing all rivalry, saying in ancient days: “Behold, all souls are mine.” “One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you.” “Exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high.” “Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.” In that kingdom “there is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, *bond nor free*;<sup>1</sup> but Christ is all and in all.” And to all and each Christ made the wonderful promise: “If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and *we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*”<sup>2</sup>

Among the Saxon, Scandinavian, Slavonic (and it might be added Kymric) tribes it has been said that “the principles of heathenism appear to have been the strongest, and some were not converted to Christianity till a thousand years after its promulgation.”<sup>3</sup> The human cause of this persistence may have lain perhaps in the strong individuality, supported by frames and brains alike powerful, which has no parallel among other human beings.

<sup>1</sup> Art thou called being a slave? (δοῦλος) care not for it: for he that is called in the Lord, being a slave, is the Lord's freeman (ἀπελευθέρωτος Κυρίου). 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Ezek. xviii. 4. Exod. xii. 49. Ezek. xxi. 26. Is. lvii. 15. Col. iii. 11. S. John, xiv. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Hardwick's *Christ and Other Masters*, Pt. I., Ch. I., p. 32. “In the middle of the fifteenth century serpent-worship was still dominant in many districts.”—Æneas Sylvius, *De Statu Europæ*, Ch. XXVI., p. 275, etc. Helmstadt, 1699.

Their bards elaborated into song a mythology almost as intricate as, and far more terrible than, the Homeric theogony. It was clung to as an heirloom with a kind of personal pride. Even when converted, this personal independence was always tempting them to heresy, faction, schism. A great master of human nature, and who knew this variety well, Scott, in his *Old Mortality*, depicts the Cameronian praying for the persecuted Church (meaning his own little sect), and against Erastianism, and for constancy to bear testimony to the death, with a constancy and force which would have made him a saint and martyr had he been within the fold of the Catholic Church. But side by side with these prayers there are exhibitions of heathenish revenge,<sup>1</sup> recalling the worst excesses of their pagan ancestors, and a pitiless and cold-blooded cruelty rivalling that of the most thorough inquisitors. And still again, breaking through and overcoming all, the true Christian spirit, gentle, merciful, forgiving every injury, will assert its resistless power.

Such inconsistencies lie hidden deep in our nature. They are by no means confined to the ignorant and uneducated. The critical absurdities, the captious perversions, the fruitless ingenuity, the laborious researches—all leading to no result but an incredible irreverence

<sup>1</sup> The Cameronians (like the Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy men, etc.) virtually regarded themselves as a spiritual aristocracy, but with a right to worldly dominion and property, and wrested from all who did not accept the Covenant their property, and lives too, without scruple or mercy. This suggests a contrast, curious but real, with the preference for gentle blood which marked some of the Churchmen of the Middle Ages. Take the canon and historian, Froissart, for example. "The noble canon," says Claverhouse, in *Old Mortality*, "with what chivalrous feeling he confines his beauti-

ful expressions of sorrow to the death of the gallant and high-bred knight, of whom it was a pity to see the fall, such was his loyalty to his king, pure faith to his religion, hardihood toward his enemy, and fidelity to his lady-love! Ah, benedicite! how he will mourn over the fall of such a pearl of knighthood, be it on the side he happens to favor, or on the other. But truly for sweeping from the face of the earth some few hundreds of villain churls, who are born but to plough it, the high-born and inquisitive historian has marvellous little sympathy." — Vol. II., Ch. XXXV.

toward Church, Scripture, and finally the very idea of religion—developed among learned Protestants in modern times, are a manifestation in another form of the same innate proud independence. To them the only Master of the human spirit speaks, as to the devotees of all other religious systems, old and new: “He that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.” The special cross for these people is perhaps mentioned by the same Master in words soon after spoken: “If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican” (S. Matt. x. 38; xviii. 17). And to heathenism many have actually returned.

## LECTURE VIII.

---

### SCHISMS.

THE instinct of unbelievers, wiser often in this matter than the instinct of many Christians, has always told them that if the body of Christ, the Catholic Church, be really rent asunder so that its life escapes, the religion of Christ, Christianity, is destroyed. This is of more importance than the apostasy of individuals, the revolt of congregations or dioceses, or even the loss of nations to the faith.

Hence the children of unbelief have been wont from the beginning to say either that rigid unity in belief, etc., was not in itself a rational or good thing, or that no such unity actually existed; that the Church was only one sect among many; that neither in idea nor in fact could she be separated from or preferred to other bodies that excelled her in numbers and in attractiveness; that no single body whatever had preserved the pure apostolic doctrine or discipline.

This necessitates a brief elementary study of the nature of schism. This Greek word, denoting "a splitting off," or "division,"<sup>1</sup> is used in the New Testament of the incipient parties in the Church. "Now I beseech you, brethren," says S. Paul, "by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions (schisms) among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judg-

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. i. 10, *σχίσματα*. . . . *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ*, 1 Cor. xii. 25; *σχίσμα*.

ment." "That there should be no schism in the body." Our Lord prayed for unity,<sup>1</sup> we may say, with his dying breath as He went from the earth by the path of agony and sacrifice. The sin of schism concentrates in itself the malice that crucified Him, and deprives men of the only evidence, convincing and resistless, that God sent Him into the world to accomplish the blessed work of salvation; "that they all may be one," He prayed for His disciples, "that the world may believe, may know, that Thou hast sent Me."<sup>2</sup>

Hooker gives us, in the true spirit of the ancient Church, the true interior character and working of schism. "The multitude of them that truly believe (howsoever they be dispersed far and wide each from other) is all one body, whereof He is corner stone. . . . That which linketh Christ to us is His mere mercy and love toward us. That which tieth us to Him is our faith in the promised salvation, revealed in the word of truth. That which uniteth and joineth us amongst ourselves in such sort that we are now as if we had but one heart and one soul, is our love." "If they break the bond of unity whereby the body of the Church is coupled and knit in one, as they do which wilfully forsake all external communion with saints in holy services, purely and orderly established in the Church, that is to separate themselves by *schism*."<sup>3</sup> The spirit of this deadly sin may be discerned in very slight symptoms, as *schisma* in music is said to be of the length of but half a comma. The evil temper cherished ends in permanent division or separation from the body, which alone can supply them with a divine life. The martyrs and great teachers of the early Church, in the midst of their conflict, speak to the same effect as Hooker, in even sterner words. Take the following from S. Cyprian and S. Augustine. Says the martyr-bishop of Carthage: "Inexplicable and heavy is the sin of discord, *and is purged by no suffering*. They cannot dwell with God who

<sup>1</sup>S. John, xvii.

<sup>2</sup>S. John, xvii. 21, 23.

<sup>3</sup>Hooker's *Sermons*, Sermon V.,

§ 11.

have refused to be of one mind in God's Church; a man of such sort may indeed be killed, crowned he cannot be."<sup>1</sup> The following is from an address of S. Augustine to the Donatists: "Whoso is separated from the Catholic Church, however laudably he thinks he is living, by this crime alone, that he is separated from Christ's Unity, he shall not have life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."<sup>2</sup>

These are severe words. It may be asked, how could the one Catholic body be certainly known in the ante-Nicene age, amid the confusions, rivalries, state persecutions, heretical calumnies, corruptions of doctrine, subtle imitations, when even in the age of S. Augustine, a century later, heretical and schismatical bodies boldly lifted their heads to contest the claims of the Bride of Christ? The inquiry is of especial interest for us for whom, according to the late Bishop of Lincoln, the experience is in preparation of seeing the Church "live, as it were, again in the ante-Nicene age."<sup>3</sup>

Not being able, in a lecture like this, to give even an outline of so great a subject, perhaps something may be learned even from a bare list of names of teachers and parties who simulated the doctrine, and claimed the prerogatives of the Church of Christ.

Tacitus calls the Christian religion *exitiabilis superstitio*; and Suetonius, *superstitio nova et malefica*; Pliny, *superstitio prava et immodica*. This superstition, moreover, was embodied in a secret, unlawful, and proselytizing society. Now at this same time there were spread through the empire the rites of Cybele, Isis, and Mithras,

<sup>1</sup>S. Cypriani de Unitate, v. 12. Inexpiabilis et gravis culpa discordiæ, nec passione purgatur. . . . Cum Deo manere non possunt, qui esse in Ecclesia Dei unanimes noluerunt. . . . Occidi talis potest, coronari non potest. Another expression in the same chapter: Qui caritatem non habet, Deum non habet.

<sup>2</sup>Quisquis ergo ab hac Catholica Ecclesia fuerit separatus, quantumlibet laudabiliter se vivere existimet, hoc solo scelere quod a Christi unitate disjunctus est, non habebit vitam, sed ira Dei manet super eum. —Ep. 141, 5.

<sup>3</sup>Bishop Wordsworth's preface to his *Ch. History*, Vol. I., p. v.

practised by the Chaldeans and Magi, wizards, astrologers, fortune-tellers. The Emperor Hadrian <sup>1</sup> believed that the Christians of Egypt allowed themselves to take part in the worship of Serapis. The chapel of Alexander Severus contained statues of Abraham, Orpheus, Apollonius, Pythagoras, and—our Lord!

Coming next to another class of rivals that rose to obscure the Christian name and doctrine, the Gnostics sprang from the mixed race in Samaria (where Simon Magus was their patriarch), and mingled Orientalism with revelation. The multitude of sects that sprang from this heresy seemed to vie with the catholicity of the Church itself. S. Polycarp, at Rome, met with Marcion of Pontus, where his father was bishop. This Marcion had then followers throughout Italy, Egypt, Syria, Arabia, and Persia. Valentinus, another Gnostic, preached his doctrines in Alexandria, Rome, and Cyprus; and had disciples in Crete, Cæsarea, Antioch. Bardesanes was found with followers in Mesopotamia; the Carpocratians, at Alexandria, Rome, and in Cephallenia; the Basilidians (with their indecent amulets) were spread through Egypt; the Ophites (snake-worshippers, but still Gnostics), in Bithynia and Galatia; Cainites or Caians, in Africa; and Marcosians, in Gaul. The Ebionites, Cerinthians, and Encratites,—associated with the Gnostics, though not strictly of their stock,—were found, respectively, in Palestine, Asia Minor, and all the way from Mesopotamia to Syria; thence westward to Gaul, Aquitaine, and Spain. The Montanists, who also were not precisely Gnostics, taking their rise in Phrygia, reached at length from Constantinople to Carthage.

Some of the teachers who gave their names to these sects had for a time a reputation that threw that of Aristotle and Plato into the shade. Many of the sects had an imposing ritual. The chants of Bardesanes and Harmonius became famous. Montanus delivered prophecies in a state of ecstasy. There is evidence at the same time

<sup>1</sup> Tert., *Ap.* V. This emperor was famous for his inquisitive temper.

that in their secret rites every kind of lewdness was practised.<sup>1</sup> But as in earlier times the Church's worship had been confounded even by intelligent observers with the pagan mysteries, so not merely careless spectators, but philosophers like Celsus and Porphyry, identified the Church with the Gnostics. Of course, on this careless hypothesis the Church's real unity could be readily impugned. Many other circumstances might add to the perplexity of honest but half-instructed inquirers. Athanasius, an apologist in the second century, appears to have used] eclecticism, before an eclectic sect existed, and when he was a Christian. Ammonius, the founder of this sect, sometime called the Neo-Platonic, had been educated at the Catechetical School of Alexandria. There is some evidence that Pantænus in philosophy adopted the eclectic principle; and many of Origen's Platonic pupils rose to high dignities in the Eastern Church without being required to relinquish their principles. The author of the *Clementines* defended these views. Even in the fifth century, Synesius, though a Platonic philosopher, was made bishop in Cyrene. Though something might be said to minimize the importance of these cases, considered one by one, still to uncritical minds they were capable of obscuring the true position of the Church. Celsus, in his work<sup>2</sup> against Christianity, answered by Origen, adopts Jewish objections, though he was himself an Epicurean, and sometimes personates the Platonist. At one time he says Christians forbid inquiry and teach men not to examine, but to believe. Then he inconsistently points to the variety of Christian heresies, the fruits of restless inquiry, as an argument against Christianity. Origen answers that the existence of a variety of schisms and heresies among Christians is not an argument against

<sup>1</sup> The Nicolaitanes [Rev. ii. 15, 6], who taught a doctrine of libertinism, adopted by many sects, are said by Epiphanius to have been the source of the Gnostic parties.

<sup>2</sup> Entitled *λόγος ἀληθής*, "The True Doctrine;" answered by Origen in a work addressed two years before his death, A.D. 249, to his friend Ambrosius.

the truth of Christianity, any more than the existence of a variety of philosophical and medical schools is an argument against Philosophy and Medicine." <sup>1</sup>

These may serve as specimens to help us to conceive how the world and its guides looked upon Christianity as it arose and spread from land to land. It combined a number of wild and barbarous rites poured into the empire from ancient superstition, or was itself but one of them, and it fostered a numerous progeny of sects marked with the Orientalism of Egypt and Syria.

If now we compare the same religion while persecuted by the civil power and after it had been recognized, we may say that what Gnosticism, Montanism, and the Eastern sects were to the Church in the early days, such were the Manichean, Donatist, and Apollinarian sects afterward. In the days of S. Athanasius, S. Basil, and S. Augustine the Meletian schism in Egypt had one-third as many bishops as the whole number in the Patriarchate; while in Africa the Catholic bishops were four hundred and sixty-six; the Donatist, four hundred. They had also a bishop at Rome. The Priscillianists in Spain spread from the Pyrenees to the ocean. The Luciferians were sprinkled over Christendom from Spain to Palestine, and from Treves to Libya. The sect that seemed most dangerous to the unity of the Church (as well as to the purity of her doctrine) was, of course, the Arian, with its numerous varieties. When S. Gregory Nazianzen began to preach at Constantinople (A.D. 379), he found the Arians in possession of its hundred churches. Apollinarians, Eunomians, Semi-Arians were there in great numbers, while in the provinces the Semi-Arian bishops were as popular as the Arians at the capital. They had possession of the coast of the Hellespont and Bithynia; and were found in Phrygia, Isauria, and the neighboring parts of Asia Minor. The whole tract of country from the

<sup>1</sup>Bp. Wordsworth's *Church His-* Origen in the Abbé Fleury's *Hist.*  
*tory*, Vol. I., Ch. X., pp. 116, 117. *Eccles.*, II., 257-268.  
The bishop uses the analysis of

Hellespont to Cilicia had nearly lapsed into Eunomianism, and that from Cilicia to Phœnicia into Apollinarianism.

The Novatians abounded also at Constantinople; and the Sabbatians, who had split off from them, had a Church and prayed at their founder's tomb. The Novatians were in force, moreover, at Nicæa and Nicomedia, and were found in Alexandria, Africa, Spain, and had a bishop even in Scythia. During the Arian persecution the Novatians sided with the Orthodox. The disorders of this time may be briefly represented to us by the state of the great city of Antioch, where, besides two orthodox claimants, there was an Arian succession, and a bishop of the Apollinarians. On the authority of the Theodosian Code we are able to say of one country at least, Gaul, at this era, that it was perfectly free from heresies.

There was another cause of perplexity ready, in skilful hands, to become an instrument to mislead the seeker for the true Body of Christ. Even the greatest teachers of the Church had not always been safe guides, and sometimes stumbled: S. Augustine was nine years a Manichee; S. Basil for a time in admiration of the Semi-Arians; S. Sulpitius gave a momentary countenance to the Pelagians. Nor, on the other hand, were the sects of error everywhere disfigured by such excesses as the fury of the Arian women at Alexandria and Constantinople, or the savage cruelty of the Circumcellions.<sup>1</sup> Learning, talent, eloquence, characterized the Apollinarians, Manichees, and Pelagians; Tichonius, the Donatist, was distinguished in biblical interpretation; the leaders (in particular, of the Semi-Arians and Apollinarians) were men of grave and correct behavior. They had clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; celebrants and altars; hymns and litanies; schools, professors, doctors. The hymns of Bardesanes and Harmonius in Osrhoëne so nearly took the place of national tunes that S. Ephrem could resist the heresy only by setting the tunes to fresh words.

<sup>1</sup> *i. e.*, vagrants. The latter part of the word is said to be from *cella*, the peasants' cottages.

Now, is there any brief rule, some simple but sound and decisive test, by which a Christian might recognize his true Guide, the Church, to which his Lord bade him take heed, amid such a Babel of claimants (as it seemed) within and without the fold, such formidable rivals, such plausible imitations, so far-extended, so numerous, often so attractive? We believe that there is such a rule or test, and that it may be expressed in some such way as this: "The Church is everywhere, but it is One; sects are everywhere, but they are many, independent, and discordant." In other words, it is the "Catholicity" of the Church which will put to shame every attempt to counterfeit her being or her functions. This is the principle used with such eloquence and effect by the great fathers and teachers in these perilous times. Thus S. Clement<sup>1</sup> employed it against the Gnostics; S. Pacian, in particular, in his famous letters to the Novatian bishop Sempronian, against the Novatians; S. Optatus, against the Donatists;<sup>2</sup> S. Augustine, against both Donatists and many other sects. It was an argument for both educated and simple. It had made the most powerful impression upon the mind of S. Augustine himself when his skilful teacher, S. Ambrose, pointed out to him the Catholic character of the Church revealed in the prophecies.<sup>3</sup> And when S. Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>4</sup> would give his catechumens, in his catechetical instructions, a short practical safeguard, should they travel into distant cities, against the wiles of heretics, seeking to draw them into conventicles, he said: "Inquire not simply where the Lord's house is (for the sects of the profane also make an attempt to call their own

<sup>1</sup> Strom., VII., 17. "In substance then, and in idea, and in principle, and in preëminence, we call the ancient Catholic Church sole."

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Parmen.*, II., *init.* "What is that one Church which Christ calls 'dove' and 'spouse'? . . . It cannot be in the multitude of heretics and schismatics?" He enumerates a large number of provinces,

districts, islands, where the Church is found, but no one heresy or schism at the same time. "The word Catholic is given to the Church as being according to reason (rationalis, used also for the receiver-general), and diffused everywhere."

<sup>3</sup> Isaiah, liv. 3; lx. Psalm ii.

<sup>4</sup> *Catech.*, XVIII., 26.

dens houses of the Lord), nor merely where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church? For this is the peculiar name of this Holy Body, the Mother of us all, which is the Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the fifth century the threatening of schism took a different form, and, in some respects, one even more terrible toward the unity of the Church. In the ante-Nicene age heresy had been a domestic enemy intermingled with the Church; but now the portentous spectacle arises of a schism more or less organized to defend the most dangerous error that had assaulted the faith of the Church—organized in her own territory, over against her, and thus not to be so summarily refuted by the mere test of Catholicity. Of course, I mean Arianism, which, after being vanquished within the civilized limits of the empire, had been adopted from their missionaries by the Gothic race in its three great branches, who overran Italy and the West. The Goths, it need hardly be said, had no appreciation of the subtleties of the Arian discussion, but being fierce in temper they quickly learned to hate the Catholics; and they listened with pride to their bishops who could hold disputations. It must be owned, too, that this race, though cruel, were a moral people, and often contrasted favorably with their adversaries. These, though possessing a sounder faith, were often deeply stained with the vices and crimes (even pagan crimes) of the day, and made their extirpation seem like a judgment upon them. This is acknowledged with shame by Christians (*e. g.*, Salvian, *De Gubern. Dei*, VII., pp. 142, 134, 135, 137, 152). The barbarians were chaste, temperate, just, and devout. Theodoric is noted for his strict attendance to divine worship in his chapel. An imperial force is said to have defeated a body of Visigoths on Sunday because, instead of preparing for battle, they were engaged in religious service.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dunham's Hist. of Spain*, Vol. I., p. 112. These sneering lines were written of Spain:  
"A stately monastery rose.

The king in summer did repair  
With his light loves, of course for  
prayer,  
For their confessors came with  
them."

Ulphilas taught the Arian doctrine to the pastoral Mœsogoths, at the foot of the Mœsian Hills; then the Visigoths received the same heresy under the Emperor Valens, but through whom is unknown. Gibbon thinks that the Visigoths (Western Goths) themselves then became missionaries in their predatory march from Thrace to the Pyrenees, advancing something like the Muhammedans, with sword in one hand and their doctrine in the other. By the end of the fifth century the Ostrogoths (Eastern Goths) had been Arianized and established in Italy, the Visigoths in France and Spain, the Suevi in Portugal, the Vandals in Africa. All these tribes adhered pertinaciously to the narrow Arian tenet; they were organized, and jealous alike of the Catholic Church and of the Roman power. "The Arian rule lasted in France for eighty years; in Spain for a hundred and eighty; in Africa for a hundred; for about a hundred in Italy." These periods were not exactly contemporaneous, but lasted in all for about two centuries, from the beginning of the fifth to the end of the sixth century. This schism, so vigorous and enduring, had a character which seemed to rob the Church of her right to the name Catholic: for not only was she buried out of sight beneath these heretical populations, but "that heresy was one, and maintained the same distinctive tenet, whether at Carthage, Seville, Toulouse, or Ravenna."<sup>1</sup>

There are two other powerful and closely allied heresies which developed in the East into schisms as destructive as the Gothic Arianism we have just considered, but far more lasting. I refer to Nestorianism, and the Eutychiean doctrine which gave their name to the Monophysites. There are three things which give to the career of these two schisms a peculiar interest and admonition for us.

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Devel. of Ch. Doct.*, in Constantinople they split in that city into the Dorotheans, the Psathyrians, and the Curtians; and the Eunomians into the Theophronians and Eutychieans. The history, however, of the Arians within the limits of the empire was quite different in this respect. As soon as they were deprived of the churches

First, they both proceeded historically from the great exegetical school of the Syrian Church, and their arguments when defending their heresies were framed, like the arguments of Protestants, on the literal and critical interpretation of Scripture. We know how this method was employed by the Arians also, and their forerunners, who were almost without exception disciples of the same school. Far different was the spirit of the great School of Alexandria, which revered the fulness of Scripture, and made its interpretations in submission to the Church. The Syrian School, like the German Protestants, were separated from ecclesiastical control; the great school at Antioch was supplemented by numerous others, some almost private, which, of course, still further tended to diversity. "In all Western Aramæa—that is, in Syria—there was but one mode of treating, whether exegetics or doctrine, viz., the practical."<sup>1</sup> Their comments have been admitted, even by adversaries, to have been generally clear, natural, methodical, and logically exact. But they were characterized, too, by that pedantic stupidity, united often to great critical attainments, so painfully familiar to us among the biblical critics of post-Reformation days. Theodore of Mopsuestia<sup>2</sup> understood as well as any German how criticism was a more effective instrument than even the mystical interpretation, or allegory, to destroy both doctrine and Scripture together. Like Luther, he resorted to the Hebrew and to Jewish commentators; and, like Luther,<sup>3</sup> he rejected one chapter or book of Scripture after another. The eighth chapter of Proverbs had for him no Christian meaning. He excluded the Canticles from the Canon. The book of Job was really a Gentile drama. He gave up the books of Chronicles and Ezra

<sup>1</sup> Lengerke, *De Ephræm Syr.*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Condemned in the Fifth General Council, A.D. 553.

<sup>3</sup> "Luther disclaimed the Pope, he spurned the Church, but, varying in almost all else, he never doubted of

his own infallibility. He thus piously regarded himself as the authoritative judge both of the meaning and of the authenticity of Scripture."—Sir William Hamilton, on "Eng. Universities," *Edin. Review*, June, 1831; *Discussions*, p. 484.

and (again like Luther) the Epistle of S. James, though this was in the Peshito version of Theodore's own Church. He denied that there were more than four Messianic psalms. He anticipated many unsound interpretations of particular texts, was a Pelagian, and denied the eternity of punishment. To return to the point which, for want of a better word, I have called "stupidity," Theodore excluded from his idea of a sacred composition (and this was all he permitted to guide him) "that fulness of meaning, refinement of thought, subtle versatility of feeling, and delicate reserve or reverent suggestiveness, which poets exemplify."

Some of the greatest teachers of the Church, on the other hand, came from this school: S. Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> S. Chrysostom, S. Ephrem, S. Basil, Theodoret,<sup>1</sup> who all, it has been alleged, have still the mark of the school—directness and pointed application—though in no invidious sense.

The second interesting point brought up by the Nestorian and Monophysite history is the way in which the schisms were employed to injure the Church Catholic, by those who were enemies to both, or loved the heretics only for the use that could be had of them. This may remind us of the way in which, at the Reformation, petty states of Germany, and sometimes the emperor, now sided with the various parties of Reformers, and then abandoned them, rarely in either case for any but political reasons, and never on purely religious grounds. Again, in modern days we have frequent illustrations of the old maxim, *Bellum hæreticorum pax ecclesiæ est*; but more often, as in our day, we hear of combinations among the children of schism, especially in the presence of a powerful enemy (as infidelity now), to resist the Church more effectually, which in many places threatens to swallow up the more religious among them. An English paper, a few weeks

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret has been said to have an "English" mode of thinking and reasoning; and S. Cyril of Jerusalem, with some changes, is quite intelligible to a modern reader.

ago, said: "The movement to reunite the Methodists in England by receiving the New Connection, who split off in 1797, is almost the first evidence that English Non-conformists have shown of the sense that schism is in itself an evil—that unity is better for religious purposes than unrestricted competition." The Methodists hitherto, and other sects also, quarrelling in the same towns throughout the kingdom over their converts (a spectacle common enough, I may say, in our own country), illustrate the ancient maxim, *bellum hæreticorum*, etc.; their later more formal attempts at an outward union have nothing of the promise of which the English editor speaks: "It is their contentment," he says, in the same article, "with schisms and divisions as the natural result of spiritual freedom, as indeed necessary for the exercise of the rights of conscience, prevalent among the great majority of Dissenters, which proves one of the principal obstacles to their intellectual reception of that article of the creed which treats of the Holy Catholic Church."<sup>1</sup> The third thing, both instructive and curious, in the Nestorian and Monophysite history, is that in the former especially, and in some portion of the territory seized upon by the latter of these most enduring of schisms—for we read of Nestorian churches at the present day—they appear to have totally forgotten the heresy for which they separated, and use the creeds and worship of the Orthodox.<sup>2</sup> This is precisely the reverse of the usual career of schismatics. They usually proceed under new divisions to endless corruptions of the truth. "A fourth part of the Donatists speedily became Maximianists; and besides these were Rogatians, Primianists, Urbanists, and Claudianists; Montanists, before this, were propagated into Tascodrugites, Pepuzians, Artotyrites: Novatians in Constantinople, Rome, and Africa felt no constraint to agree with one another." With this we may compare some well-known facts of our own day. Methodists in

<sup>1</sup> *Church Times*, Dec. 3, 1886, Lond., England.

<sup>2</sup> See Badger's *Nestorians and their Rituals*.

England and in America have deteriorated toward Zwinglianism and rationalism, notwithstanding the Catholic principles of their founder, John Wesley. The Protestants of Germany and Switzerland began by persecution, and have ended in unbelief. The churches of Geneva over which Calvin ruled, and burned Servetus, in a few generations were preaching, with hardly an exception, the very doctrine for which Servetus died.

We turn now to the Nestorian<sup>1</sup> and Monophysite histories, where we shall find plenty of illustrations of these three points, besides many other things portentous to the unity of the Church.

1. The germ of Nestorianism may be seen in a doctrine put forth<sup>2</sup> by that master, Theodore, in the Syrian Exegetical School, of whom we have spoken; viz., "that our Lord's manhood is not so intimately included in His divine personality, that His brethren according to the flesh may be associated with the image of the One Christ." This doctrine was immediately accepted by other and sounder members of the same school—S. Chrysostom, S. Ephrem, S. Basil—and as the school tended to separate the divine person of Christ from His manhood, so, before Nestorius appeared, we can see that it tended to explain away His divine presence from the sacraments; or, in other words, adopted the teaching known in modern times as "Sacramentarian."<sup>3</sup>

The course of the Nestorian schism eastward was determined by the removal of the great school from Cilicia and Antioch, first to Edessa, then to Nisibis. Edessa, it is well known, being on the confines of the two empires of Persia and Rome, was the seat of various celebrated schools, Christian and heathen. S. Ephrem presided over the orthodox Christian school; Maris over the Persian Christian school (as it was sometimes called). Rabbula the bishop, in A.D. 435, expelled, for their Nestorianism, its

<sup>1</sup> There is a sharply drawn picture of Nestorius himself in the historian Socrates, VII., 32.

<sup>2</sup> In a comment on Ps. xxii.

<sup>3</sup> Eccle. Theol., III., 12.

masters and scholars, who took refuge under the Persian king. They were gladly received by him, but for a very sinister reason. He would have no Church in his dominions that had intercommunion with the West. But when Barsumas, one of the most active leaders of the banished school, said to him that he knew a way to destroy the Catholicity of the West, the monarch listened gladly, and placed Barsumas in the Metropolitan See of Nisibis, where the banished school was reëstablished. Maris was thrust into the See of Ardaschir. Then ensued a series of plots to get possession of Seleucia, the seat of the Primate of Babylonia. Barsumas accused the last Catholic primate, Barbuæus, before King Pherozes, whispering, "These men hold the faith of the Romans and are their spies. Give me power against them to arrest them."<sup>1</sup> The death of Barbuæus was thus secured, and the Catholic Christians who attempted to secure a successor were slain to the number of 7,700, "the price of the severance of the Chaldaic churches from Christendom."<sup>2</sup>

Upon the heresy of Nestorius we need not dwell, being defined with precision in the General Council<sup>3</sup> that condemned him. Briefly, "it lay in the ascription of a human as well as a divine personality to our Lord." One of its most energetic manifestations was its persistent refusal to give to our Lord's mother the title *Θεοτόκος*, "mother of God." Some practical measures of the Nestorian exiles of Edessa, when they had obtained power in the Chaldean communion, strongly illustrate their spirit, which, though resembling Protestantism, was not in so congenial an atmosphere for development. First, they abolished the celibacy of the clergy, and allowed, as Gibbon says, "the public and reiterated nuptials of the priests, the bishops, and even the Patriarch himself."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Asseman, p. lxxvii.

<sup>3</sup> Ephesus, A.D. 431. Confirmed,

<sup>2</sup> Through a series of ages this oppressed Church "discovered the energy, when it had lost the purity, of saints."—Newman.

of course, by all that followed.

<sup>4</sup> Ch. XLVII.

Barsumas, an active leader in this measure, is said to have set the example, and, on the testimony of a Nestorian writer,<sup>1</sup> to have even married a nun (like another Luther). A restriction, however, was afterward placed on the license which ensued. Next, the monastic order was destroyed: though in the accounts of their far-reaching missionary labors in after-ages we again hear of monks.<sup>2</sup> It is said that the Nestorians did not like to be called after the name of their founder, though it still clung. They never called themselves "Catholic" but once.<sup>3</sup> In the sixth century Christianity had been successfully preached by them among Bactrians, Huns, Persians, Indians, Medes, and Elamites; and in a subsequent age missionaries from Balck and Samarcand followed the roving steps of Scythian and Tartar. In the time of the Caliphs there were under the Patriarch of Babylon "twenty-five archbishops; the communion extended from China to Jerusalem; and its numbers, with those of the Monophysites, are said to have surpassed those of the Greek and Latin churches together."

2. Eutyches, an abbot, who had lived a blameless life for seventy years (during many of which he had been an assistant of S. Cyril of Jerusalem), is certainly one of the most startling examples Church history presents of how

"The gray-haired saint may fail at last,  
The surest guide a wanderer prove."

Meditating, it is said, over the best way of stating the true doctrine of the Incarnation in opposition to Nestorius, but after the example of the Syrian School, guiding his thoughts of Scripture rather in self-sufficiency, or by rules of grammar and logic, than by the tradition of the Kingdom of God, or the writings of Fathers and Councils, he stumbled into an error that might at first seem the extreme opposite of Nestorianism. It has been suffi-

<sup>1</sup> Asseman, T. III., p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, Ch. XI.VII.

<sup>3</sup> It has been said that Nestorian-

ism "became a political power, rather than a dogma, and despised the science of theology."

ciently defined in the Ecumenical Council<sup>1</sup> that condemned him, and in the *Tome* of Leo, Bishop of Rome, adopted by the council.<sup>2</sup> Eutyches appears to have affirmed (though not without indecision and ambiguity) something like these two tenets: First, "that 'before Incarnation there were two natures, after their union one,' or that our Lord was *of* or *from* two natures, but not *in* two;" secondly, "that His flesh was not of one substance with ours, that is, not of the substance of St. Mary." Eutyches, it is true, appealed in support of his statements not only to S. Cyril of Jerusalem, but to S. Athanasius, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Flavian, and professed to subscribe heartily the decrees of Nicæa and Ephesus. Here was a serious and perplexing case to thoughtful minds. But it is to be observed that Eutyches appealed to Scripture to support his denial that a human nature pertained to our Lord; and when it was pointed out to him that this was contrary to his former promise of an unconditional assent to the Councils and Fathers, he answered, in the unmistakable spirit of his school, that he would search the Scriptures, as being surer than the expositions of the Fathers, and that he "would not accept anything read from any author teaching that our Lord Jesus Christ came of two natures personally united, because the Holy Scriptures [which did not teach this], as he said, were better than the teaching of the Fathers."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Fourth, Chalcedon, A.D. 451, October 8. It had 630 bishops in attendance, a larger number than in any council before or since.

<sup>2</sup> This great Bishop of Rome gave, theologically, its death-blow to the rising heresy. But when the same heresy made its expiring effort in Monothelitism, a less worthy bishop of the same city (Honorius),—consulted by the zealous Sophronius, afterward Patriarch of Jerusalem, as to the opinion of the Monothelites, defended by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and sent by him to Honorius—this same

Honorius gave his sanction to the fatal words: τὸν αὐτὸν ἔνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἰὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπαρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ. For this he was anathematized in the Sixth General Council (A.D. 680). And for three centuries succeeding Popes repeated the anathema along with the confession of faith which they made at the ceremonies of their accession. We may allow here that the glory of Leo has hidden the black stain on Honorius.

<sup>3</sup> Harduin, *Concil.*, T. II., p. 142.

This is all the more noticeable because Eutyches personally appears not to have been of the learned, speculative, restless class of critics of Scripture, but rather to have been a fair representative of the character of his sect—mystical, severe, enthusiastic, without polemical skill. Of old, Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, in the fifth century, was reputed as almost their only scholar, having had learning and ability enough to found a Monophysite theology.<sup>1</sup>

After incredible disorders, riots, murders, in Egypt, beginning thirty years after the Council of Chalcedon, and lasting about thirty years, the Monophysites procured from the Emperor Zeno the famous "Henoticon," viewed by many as a virtual repudiation of the decrees of the council.<sup>2</sup> It is curious that in the course of these disorders a portion of the more zealous Monophysites, disgusted at their compromising leaders, broke off from the heretical body, and for three hundred years remained a sect by themselves, though without bishops (Acephali), and then returned, not to the Eutychians, but to the Church. The variations of the Eutychian doctrine were from Timothy the Cat's extreme position, "The Divinity is the sole nature in Christ," to that of Severus, who symbolized with the Phantasiasts; and, lastly, another party (Theodosians), who united temporarily with the Gaianites. Thus an extravagant tenet was first corrected, and then quickly abandoned. The same thing, as is well known, had happened to Arianism.

The Monophysites obtained possession of nearly all Egypt, and at times, as seemed, of the whole Eastern Church. Their peculiar possessions, however, were soon swept from them by the Muhammedans,<sup>3</sup> who denied both

<sup>1</sup> They were also thorough ascetics, practising greater austerities than any other monks, and (unlike the Nestorians) devoted to this discipline through their whole history.

<sup>2</sup> The Eastern bishops signed this formulary, and for this the whole

East lay under the ban of the Papal excommunication for thirty-five years.

<sup>3</sup> "It was the aim of the Caliph, by conciliating the heretical communities, Nestorian and Monophysite especially, to use them as his agents in diminishing the number of

the divinity of Him whose nature they had profaned, and the peculiar glory of man, his free-will, wherein is pictured the image of God. Thus while the whole of the West may be said to have been possessed by Arianism in the fifth century; Italy the prey of robbers seizing on its farms and settling in its villas; the peasants thinned by famine and pestilence; Tuscany almost literally without an inhabitant;<sup>1</sup> the Bishop of Rome exchanging a persecuting Arian Goth as master for a still more persecuting master in the Lombard Arian; Pelagianism next descending from the Britons to Picenum:<sup>2</sup> in nearly the whole of Asia, on the other hand, east of the Euphrates, as far as it was Christian, the Nestorians had possession. Surely schism never had a more successful conflict, it would seem, in the utmost vigor of the modern Reformation and the peculiar triumphs of Protestantism, which renewed, as we have shown, the principles of Scripture interpretation of the Syrian School; schism never seemed nearer victory in its battle against the majesty and unity of the Catholic Church, which now appears, not as in the fourth century, amidst a multitude of sects, all enemies to her, but a community utterly withdrawn from large tracts of the *orbis terrarum*, her promised possession, collecting herself in some points with greater strength than ever; possessing whole kingdoms with scarcely a rival; stemmed in her course by external obstacles, as well as by heresy, in substantive shape and mass from foreign lands, and with the support of the temporal power. The battle of Christianity against the world had to be refought, under

the Catholics, who, firm in their allegiance to the emperor, were branded with the name of Melchites." The Jacobites in Egypt were favored by the Moslems. "Of the four hundred sees that once shed a salutary light [being orthodox] on Africa, four only were surviving in the eleventh century."—Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. in Middle Ages*, I. Per.,

Ch. I., pp. 34-36. Neale, *Eastern Ch.*, "Alexandria," II., 72.

<sup>1</sup>Gibbon, Ch. XXXVI., *ad fin.*

<sup>2</sup>Haddan asserts that "neither Pelagius nor Cælestius originated the heresy. It was imparted to Pelagius by Rufinus, a Syrian [another testimony to the influence of the Syrian School]; and not in Britain, but in Rome."—*Remains*, p. 336 (note).

forms far different from those of the ante-Nicene period. In place of pagan and unbeliever, new and very different pagans and misbelievers had to be overcome. At the very outset of this new conflict the Roman Empire sank out of sight. By degrees a shadow of it gathered around the spiritual champion in the West, the See of Rome, which collected to itself and directed the efforts of the Church's militant children against her powerful foes. Thus district by district, tribe after tribe, nation after nation, kingdom after kingdom, were brought from heathenism, weaned from heresy, instructed in the truth, and thus became defenders, instead of destroyers, of the Church's unity.<sup>1</sup> The imperial power, however, which wielded for many ages an influence so necessary, so noble, and beneficial, in behalf of religion, even of civilization, itself produced new evils, first to allow a needless schism, as in the case of the Greek Church, on worldly grounds,<sup>2</sup> and then tempted Christians, as individuals and in whole nations, to run again the career of heresy, schism (beginning as before by setting Scripture at variance with the Church), and endless sects and parties, which at first agreed in nothing but in opposition to the Church, but within a short time have shown a tendency to substitute, in this ill-starred opposition, their critical views of Scripture<sup>3</sup> in place of the "Church," and "religion" itself.<sup>4</sup> In other words, a

<sup>1</sup> The Church arose like her Master and cast from her the elements of death, for she is immortal. But no schism has ever thus risen again.

<sup>2</sup> Pope Leo IX.'s legates laid the sentence of excommunication on the altar of S. Sophia, 16th July, 1054.

<sup>3</sup> The following saying of a shrewd New Englander is not unlike some things in S. Jerome and S. Augustine: "To many of our present young students *exegesis* practically means *exit Jesus*."—E. P. Whipple, 1877.

<sup>4</sup> In the United States a sect

adorned, sixty or seventy years ago, by the writings of Dr. Channing (who in the fourth century would have been a high Arian), a few weeks since sent from what is called the "ethical party" in the East the following answers to questions propounded by some fellow-members in the West: "Is belief in God essential to Unitarianism? No. Is worship essential to Unitarianism? No. Is belief in immortality essential to Unitarianism? No."—This is quoted from *Unity* (1), an organ of the Unitarians.

return to paganism, or to the doubt and indifference of paganism, is contemplated and proposed.

But the past cannot assuredly be without instruction and use for thoughtful minds. The varied facts we have hastily reviewed teach, if they teach anything, that there is no strength but in unity, no sin unpardonable but the defying its spirit. The life of individual souls is love, the breath of eternal life; schism is hatred put into action. And if any man say he loves God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar. The first murderer, Cain, offered flowers and fruits—what he chose—in preference to the prescribed sacrifice to God. The Siva-worshipper in Hindustan, whose ancestors broke up the unity of God (a truth they once knew) into contrariant principles, does the same thing to-day, when his despair drives him not into the frenzy, the shrieks, and tortures of open devil-worship.

When the infidel taunts the believer, then, with the results of lack of unity, his true answer is to preach to himself, not to cover his sin. Thus ever did the true prophet to apostate tribes and cities. Thus did our Lord to Jerusalem. And in the Holy City is a figure of Christendom: "Behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city; that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. . . . O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see Me, henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord."<sup>1</sup> This sin has been the same in Jews and Christians, whether it were money

<sup>1</sup>S. Matt. xxiii. 34, 35, 37, 39.

or the error of their wilful choice which they preferred to the glory of God's Kingdom. "To gather thy children together" is to give them "the things that belong to their peace."<sup>1</sup> They *could* not have them, only because they *would* not. They can never have the offer of them again till they voluntarily pray for them. Hence the sin was the same, and its punishment was the same ;<sup>2</sup> its remedy, therefore, must be the same.

<sup>1</sup> S. Luke, xix. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Fourteen hundred years ago Christians were more than one-half the human race ; now they are less than one-third. Daniel's *Lehrbuch der Geographie* for 1885. See Lecture IX., Second Course. Dr. Legge and Sir Monier Williams believe the

Buddhists to be not more than 100,000,000. Döllinger reckons 350,000,000 Christian people in the world, about thirty per cent. of the entire number.—*Lecture on the Reunion of the Churches*, Lecture I., p. 1. New York, 1872.

## LECTURE IX.

---

### FAULTS OF CHRISTIANS.

MY purpose is, in the present lecture, to reverse the method of replying to objections adopted in the last lecture. When the schisms that have sprung up among Christians and obscured the evidence which the Catholic Church in her glorious unity can give, both to her own children and to the unbelieving world, of the truth of her Lord's mission—evidence the most powerful and convincing, according to her Lord's own words—when these schisms (I say) are made an objection to the Christian religion, it is more becoming a Christian man, as it seems to me, not to stop even to consider who are the objectors, but to own at once, that if schism cannot be quelled within and against the Catholic Church, her cause is lost, so far as this world is concerned. For the triumph of schism is as if the Jews and Roman guard had held the body of the Lord Jesus in the tomb of Joseph, in despite of angelic and almighty power. Schism is the rending of the Body of Christ—His Church—so that its blood and life are poured out. The dear Lord's very robe, seamless and perfect, the symbol of the unity of His mystical Body, was prevented from being thus rent by a providence which the rude soldiery heeded. The Christian apologist, therefore, may deem it more suitable, in answering the objection from schism to the Church's perfection, and her power to give the evidence her Lord promised, rather to own the sin and shame of this mon-

strous crime, wherever it has appeared, to point out its essential antagonism—for it is the spirit of hate and murder—to the very life and breath of the Christian spirit, which is love; to show the folly and treachery of such as would gloss over its real character under fair names, like “freedom” and individual development; and to point sorrowfully to the historical proofs that schism alone was able to arrest the conquests of that shining host that went forth in the morning of her life, “fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.”<sup>1</sup>

But in answering objectors, who, in lieu of arguments, throw at Christians the mud that has been scraped from the pulvicus of history—the acknowledged faults, the suggested failures, of heroes and champions whose names are connected with this religion; the lies and exaggerations which the imagination of blasphemers has endeavored to fasten upon the admitted infirmities of souls that were still noble in their imperfection—it seems to me that a very different method is appropriate.

I think we could be perfectly justified in following one or both of two methods of reply.

I. Adopting in this case with singular propriety the *argumentum ad hominem*, we might ask, Who are ye that thus set yourselves up as censors? The objects of your attack may be open to censure, and should be censured; but not by you. They would, perhaps, be the first to own the wrongs that they have done, but not at the reproof of such as you. Ye speak not for truth or for the public welfare, but to stir up the bad passions of the multitude, that is ever fond of tales of crime, and malevolent toward the great. It is not a difficult thing for a man of rude, arrogant mind to say a harsh thing to men in power; nay, rather, it gratifies him. We may, therefore, boldly read the self-appointed censor a lecture upon the laws of reproof, of which he seems to be regardless. To reprove well is a special gift, and requires besides, we may venture

<sup>1</sup> Cant. vi. 10.

to say, the particular help of God. The boldest preacher of righteousness, like S. John Baptist, could reprove Herod without making him a personal enemy; he spoke sharply and faithfully, and still with gravity, command of temper, sincerity, and evident good-will toward the sinner. The thought that will restrain every conscientious man, every one, that is, whose judgment of others is worth anything, is that every severe word he utters binds him to obey the law of right he is vindicating, and that he must be ready patiently to accept whatever penalty his faithfulness may bring with it. There is very little of this, it is needless to say, in the temper of the popular demagogue, the infidel lecturer, or the more learned and scientific unbeliever, who one and all consider that they have a perfect right to arraign and condemn, to impute motives to, to belittle the greatness of, Noah and Abraham, and Moses and David, Joshua and Samson, Solomon and Daniel, as well as of S. Peter and S. Paul, of S. Clement and S. Athanasius, of S. Augustine and S. Bernard, of a S. Louis or a S. Anselm, of a Hooker or a Taylor, a Charles I. or an Archbishop Laud. The hypocritical affectation of gravity with which this is sometimes done—as if they were champions of some important principle of morals which these erring Christians were prone to forget—is very curious, often ludicrous.

Gibbon, for instance, says, "It is a *fair deduction*, from two *remarkable* passages in Eusebius,"<sup>1</sup> "that he *indirectly confesses* that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace, of religion."<sup>2</sup> Now, in the first place, it is unfair and unscientific for a historian to attempt seriously to damage the reputation of a writer by what he calls "a fair deduction" and "an indirect confession" contained in a short passage *which he does not quote*. In the second place, Eusebius's words furnish no solid ground for Gibbon's "deduction." Far from it. Eusebius, sketch-

<sup>1</sup> *Hist.*, VIII., 2. *De Martyr. Palest.*, Ch. XII.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, Ch. XVI., n. 178.

ing the persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, plainly says, "It belongs not to me to record the dissensions and follies" among Christians themselves. After this manly declaration Eusebius proceeds: "Hence, also, we have purposed not to extend our narrative beyond the events in which we perceive the just judgment of God. [We confess we think this contrasts very favorably with the infidel's presumptuous habit of deciding off-hand on all persons and things.] Hence, also [continues Eusebius], we shall not make mention of those that were shaken by the persecution, nor of those that suffered shipwreck in their salvation, and of their own accord were sunk into the depths of the watery gulf. But we shall only, upon the whole, introduce those events in our history that may be profitable, first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity. Now, let us proceed to describe, in a condensed account, the holy conflicts of the witnesses of divine truth."<sup>1</sup> This is the whole passage. We leave it to every candid man to decide whether by any "fair deduction" from it, Eusebius even "indirectly confesses" "that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace of religion." Gibbon, in fact, in this passage, if we change the places of the words "glory" and "disgrace," has exactly described his own habitual practice in regard to religion. Eusebius owns that Christians had their "follies and dissensions." He says his own narrative undertakes to include no other events than those "in which we perceive the just judgment of God." He leaves the tempted and fallen in reverent silence to that dread, yet merciful, judgment. He frankly declares his purpose to be—and it is so far from being "remarkable," that something like it, we venture to say, has been made by almost every historian—"upon the whole" to "introduce those events in our history that may be profitable, first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity." Lecky, for instance,—who is not ashamed to

<sup>1</sup> Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, VIII., 2.

repeat Gibbon's groundless sneer, that the principle of Eusebius "in writing his history was to conceal the facts that were injurious to the reputation of the Church,"<sup>1</sup> admits that in his account of the morals of the Christian Church he has "excluded . . . all discussions concerning the origin of the faith in Palestine, and concerning the first type of its doctrine," and determined "to regard the Church simply as a moral agent,"<sup>2</sup> might be plausibly charged with much greater and more glaring bad faith and unfairness than he has laid at the door of Eusebius, because the key to the true character of every institution is usually to be found in its origin and "first type," and because the Church has always refused to be considered as merely or principally "a moral agent." But we do not imitate here the narrow and illiberal criticism of these unbelievers. Gibbon himself, in the preface to his history, avows his intention of dwelling with less minuteness on the events from the seventh to the eleventh century than on those of the first four centuries. For the later period, he says, he will content himself with a "concise narrative of such facts as may still appear either interesting or important."<sup>3</sup> What right has Gibbon to do this, if he believes in the principle on which he condemned Eusebius, whose language his own here closely resembles? Why should the Christian be condemned who professed to describe events "profitable, first to us of the present day, and hereafter to posterity," while the infidel is acquitted, who, in running over a long period, declares he will relate only "such facts as may still appear [*i. e.*, to him] either interesting or important"?

II. These may suffice as specimens of the *argumentum ad hominem*. But the Christian advocate, I think, may, in the second place, look the specific charges in the face, and, neglecting the weakness and shameless inconsistencies of the accuser, reply with even greater effect to

<sup>1</sup> *European Morals*, Ch. III., Vol. I., p. 492.

<sup>2</sup> Pref. to *Decline and Fall*, etc., p. xxvii. Am. ed., 1852.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem.*, pref., p. vii.

the charges and libels thrown out at the principles and champions of his religion, one by one.

Perhaps it may be considered fairer to let the adversary state his case fully, without interruption, that we may thus perceive the strength of it as a whole, and realize the importance of its separate parts.

“You Christians,” then (we may hear him say), “are an incurably rude and uncultivated tribe. Whatever professions you make of studying philosophy, science, art, politics, your religion is really uppermost in your thoughts; that is, if you are sincere. You are, in fact, quite indifferent as to the comparative merits or the peculiar differences of Plato and Aristotle, of Zeno and Pyrrhus, of Heraclitus and Leucippus: but if any one attempts to show you, by the aid of one or other of these eminent men, how that the world may have made itself, or how that there is really only one substance in the world, that is, matter, and that spirits, souls, all immaterial substances, are imaginary; or even the opposite, that spirit or mind is the only real thing, and the world of appearance a delusive vision; or, lastly, that logic has established that nothing can be proven, either truth or falsehood, and that in philosophy, morals, or politics one statement can be as easily defended as another—on hearing such high matters, you Christians become heated, and look as if you knew something of the subject, and charge the sages of the world with impiety and self-contradiction—chiefly with ‘impiety.’ And the same is true of what you say of science, which you are always referring to Him whom you call its Author: you even venture to say that what you know of Him is worth more than all the unaided discoveries of the wisest of men. Your conception of art, too, seems very narrow and poor; your music is monotonous; your sculpture and painting lacking in variety and finish, till in modern days you really became acquainted with the pagan models, which at first, on religious grounds, you shunned as the plague; architecture alone seems, for some inexplicable reason, to have flourished in your hands.

“But, leaving the abstractions of philosophy and art, I am not at all attracted by the character and appearance of a typical Christian. It is very true that a man or woman of this sort is often very comforting in a time of sickness or sorrow. In the early days, little as their appearance seemed to promise it, they often exhibited a strange courage and firmness, amounting at times almost to heroism, though one would rather have expected them to run away and hide themselves. They were often seen—what seems still stranger!—to sacrifice themselves for their enemies and persecutors, and actually heard to pray for them. Still they evidently had no love for the empire—no patriotism; they exhibited a singular aversion to social intercourse, and to any participation in festive joys, processions, the theatre, races, etc. They leave, on the whole, the impression of a mean-spirited, weak, effeminate, superstitious class of men. Though for three centuries there was little reason for charging them with hypocrisy—because there was nothing but suffering usually attending the profession of their name, and even their monks and asceticism were respectable—still a portentous change appeared as soon as the powers of the empire gave them recognition.

“Christians were found to be, after all, as greedy as other men for place and power. They were ambitious, intriguing, and often used power to crush an opponent in a relentless and cruel manner. In process of time bishops even appeared as leaders of armed hosts. A powerful order, at once military and sacerdotal, was seen in the Church. Then districts infected with heresy were harried by soldiery. Lastly, in the case of the Inquisition, where Christians have stopped their own mouths forever from complaining of persecution, more persons were put to death cruelly and with tortures for their religion under the presidency of Torquemada alone, or in the Netherlands during the reign of Charles V., than in the ten persecutions from Nero to Diocletian.

“The only kind of Christian,” we may conceive the

accuser saying in conclusion, "that seems at all tolerable, is a peculiar product of modern times; some radical Protestants come up pretty nearly to the mark: it is the man who has broken entirely with the past; who feels no responsibility for the faith of fifteen hundred years; who has little regard, as he says, for historical religion; whose views of Scripture are as good as those of fathers and councils (and even if not, so much the worse for Scripture and councils); who by philosophy can extract the essence, all that is worth attending to, out of the books, sacred and profane, or out of the doctrines of the sages of the world; who can sing<sup>1</sup> (for a salary) Shemang and Barechu in the Jewish synagogue and then pass to a *Te Deum* or *Gloria in Excelsis* without moral or mental shock, though posing as a Christian. I like one whose religion consists in 'the rights of man,' the freedom of the conscience, and the progressive marches of humanity, not in the Church nor in stereotyped doctrine. No man has any more right to impose his dogmas upon me, than I mine (if I happen to have any) upon him.

"I like a cheerful man, whose views of religion are not tinged with bigotry, strictness, or pretending to know more of the future than his neighbors; I like to see him enjoy and not to be forever talking of giving it up for another and (what he calls) a better one. According to religion, both the present and the future life are the gift of God. Let him, then, think less of his creeds, his dogmas, his anxieties about the future; or let him leave them to the discussions of those whose tastes incline them that way, but whose judgments are nothing to him; let him rather enjoy his freedom, call no man master, keep

<sup>1</sup> Archbishop Elder lately forbade Roman Catholics to sing in Jewish synagogues, whereupon the Hebrew *Journal* says it is glad of it. "The Christian," it says, "reciting our Shemang and our Barechu in a synagogue, utters falsehoods. This is the plain language of truth; it cannot

be sicklied over with any of the grandiloquent reasoning of professed liberality—not over the threshold of the synagogues and the Church, if the one and the other be what they profess and what they ought to be."—Quoted in *Albany Press and Knickerbocker*, 3d Jan., 1887.

clear of theological controversy; be always good-natured, polite, even to infidels, who are by no means in every case the very worst of fellows."

I have thus, in a kind of oration, summarized (I believe not unfairly) the unbeliever's habitual account of the "faults of Christians," giving him opportunity to express his objections both positively and negatively, as to what they have and what they lack, the furniture of their heads and hearts, even their outward appearance and deportment.

It seems appropriate after this to give the Christian's answer to these charges with the same attention to fairness and impartiality. Adopting a similar form of reply, we may conceive a Christian saying in rejoinder: "I am not in the least ashamed of the uncultivation and rudeness of mind of which you complain as the result of the neglect of philosophy, of the works, for instance, of Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and the rest mentioned. No obligation, either philosophic, scientific, or of any other kind, binds one to attend longer, upon a given subject, the instructions of a teacher who owns, 'What I have said to you is simply conjecture; I have nothing further to say, except to advise you to await the coming of some teacher from heaven.' These things are plainly said by Plato, and by his master, Socrates,<sup>1</sup> who had acquired all the philosophy and learning of their day. Still you will find on more careful inquiry that Christians do not altogether despise Plato; the greatest Christian doctors have felt the charm of his wonderful style and spiritual imagination.<sup>2</sup> So of Aristotle; there is no doubt whatever that this man of unequalled acuteness and power of analysis has

<sup>1</sup> Plato's *Republic*, II., 4, 5 (cf. Cic., *De Rep.*, III., 17), Philebus, 28. "Having formerly heard, either in a dream or broad awake, certain sayings. . . . I have them now again present to my mind" (Socrates). Cf. 41. "Some deity seems to have become favorable to us."

<sup>2</sup> "Recentiores quique philosophi nobilissimi, quibus Plato sectandus placuit, noluerint se dici Peripateticos aut Academicos, sed Platonicos." —S. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, VIII., 10; cf. I. 8. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.*, I. v. S. Ambrose, *De Obit. Theod.*, s. 14. "Maximus philosophorum."

received more enduring honor among Christians than anywhere else. His analysis of the faulty tendencies of human nature we especially commend to the infidel objectors who love to expatiate upon the faults of Christians. Aristotle says that the faults of our nature may be all included under two heads: temper and ill-regulated desire. Now, we are inclined to think that these hardly seem faults at all to the ardent orators upon 'freedom' in religion and politics. If they met with Aristotle's analysis apart from his name, they would say: 'Oh, this is some Christian sermon!' I shall have occasion to recur to this doctrine of Aristotle again.

"Aristotle taught, with unequalled force and clearness, that no one can pretend to philosophy who cannot perceive when he contradicts himself; that to reason at all, some things, as, for instance, axioms, must be accepted without proof, otherwise no step forward can be taken in any kind of knowledge; that contradictories cannot be true; that to deny or doubt these things is mental imbecility, not acuteness. Applying these unassailable principles to the favorite doctrines of some of the philosophers commended to Christians for the improvement of their minds, we say, for example, that the world could not have made itself, because this involves the contradiction that something can be, and not be, at the same time. That which makes anything must already exist; and if it already exist, it cannot make itself. Or again, looking at that debased form of philosophy called materialism, or the assertion that there is nothing in the universe but matter—a doctrine of which Socrates said, after reading the works of its most acute exponents,<sup>1</sup> that he wanted to hear no more, he wanted to hear of '*mind*' (*νοῦς*)—it is not hard to see how this stupid error falls before the analysis of Aristotle. We must not assign to the same

<sup>1</sup> *E. g.*, Anaxagoras. See Plato's *Phædo*, § 104. "It appeared to me to be well that intelligence (*νοῦς*) should be the cause of all things," and "order all things, and dispose each in such way as will be best for it." (See the full passage in note on Lect. I., Ch. III., p. 19.)

substance incompatible attributes. Matter has extension, impenetrability, weight, figure, color, etc. Our senses inform us of these things. Mind has none of them, but is just as certainly a substance possessing reason, affections, and a will. We know this by our consciousness of a mind within ourselves, by observing and reflecting upon its operations. The same consciousness and observation tell us with certainty that mind and matter, though most intimately united, are essentially different substances. Their difference is not a hypothesis, but a simple fact. We discriminate instinctively between our own flesh and our real selves,<sup>1</sup> which we always identify with our spirit or mind. It is probable that the word 'intellect' (from *inter* 'between,' and *lego* 'to choose') was so named to mark the act, the beginning of all knowledge, and the accompaniment of all real knowledge, of the power that distinguishes between ourselves and the external world. Matter and mind are shown to be distinct substances by our senses and by observation—the only sources of information we have on the subject. The materialist, therefore, who confounds them on a hypothesis, violates a first principle of science. And something of the same kind may be said of the idealist, who says that there is nothing but spirit or mind, and that all matter is an illusion, a bank of clouds.

“Proceeding to the next point in the arraignment of Christians, we say that the knowledge of the Author of science which we possess is more valuable than the separate scraps of science man has picked up by his unaided efforts, because, knowing that our faculties—our senses, reasoning power, etc.—are the work of One infinitely wise and good, we can trust them absolutely. No malignant demon can deceive us through them, but by our own fault. Trust in our faculties is trust in God. The mere man of science, however, beset by philosophic sophisms, has no such ground of confidence.

“We are told next, that, in the first three centuries at

<sup>1</sup> The one we call a person, the other a thing.

least, though a Christian was often found very comforting and useful in times of sickness and sorrow, yet he was evidently unsocial, and in particular avoided the festivities of his neighbors, processions, the theatre, the games. Well, when your priest or your nearest relations run from you at the first symptoms of a fever or the plague, it is not a bad thing to have any fellow-being to stay by you and nurse you, and, if you die, see that you are decently buried—just because you are a fellow-man. You may forgive him if he avoids a procession, gay as it looks, which is really a form of worship of the deities whom he abhors; or the theatre, where his religion is a favorite subject of ridicule; or, above all, the games, where his brethren, innocent of every crime, are cruelly torn by wild beasts, to yield sport to a brutal populace.

“But your Christian, the objector has said, looks mean-spirited and tame, and receives insult and injury without return; though I have observed in him a strange heroism in the face of actual danger, and have heard that he then often prays for his persecutors. Well, he must be excused for *this*, being constrained thereto by the example of his Divine Master, who when ‘He took upon Him the form of a servant’ (or slave), to become a Sacrifice for the sins of the world, did the same things.

“But your Christian ‘loves not the empire and has no patriotism.’ Still he fights courageously in his appointed place, is faithful to duty, and by his Lord’s command prays for the emperor and ‘the powers that be,’ though he feels that they are not his friend. You acknowledge, besides, that in those first ages at least, a Christian was no hypocrite (and that is something), and that the monks and their ascetic and laborious life in the desert were respectable. Let me dwell for a moment on one particular, their devotion to labor, in the life of these first monks. To do for one’s self what another can be made to do, is an idea even more repugnant to the Oriental than to the Western mind. ‘The Mosaic law had been in many

respects a consecration of labor.'<sup>1</sup> The Lord Himself spent a life of service, working at the carpenter's craft, till the hour of His ministry came. So that we need not wonder that the dignity and sacredness of labor became a familiar idea to the Christian soul. 'The character of men,' it has been wisely said, 'depends more on their occupations than on any teaching we can give them.' 'The employment forms the habits of body and mind.' 'A man taught to plough, row, or steer well, and a woman taught to cook properly, and make a dress neatly, are already educated in many essential moral habits.' Labor is a most important agent in reforming the criminal; but its 'noblest function' is 'not *re*-formatory, but formatory.'<sup>2</sup> Now, what was the spectacle that was seen in Egypt in those early days? 'Each monastery was then a great school of labor.' 'Under a burning sky, in a climate which has always seemed the cause or the excuse of vice, in a country given up at all times to every kind of luxury and depravity, there were thousands of men who during two centuries interdicted themselves from the very shadow of a sensual gratification, and made of the most rigorous mortification a rule as universal as a second nature.'<sup>3</sup> This stupendous miracle (for it deserves to be considered as nothing less) by no means stands alone in the history of the Church. In the seventh, the eighth, and following centuries, to the twelfth, in the forests and marshes of Germany, of eastern France, in Scotland and the Hebrides, and in England, the very same type of self-sacrifice reappeared, and the servile labor of the hands, the beginning in all these lands of civilization, as it showed the wealth that lay in peaceful agriculture, equally shared in by high and low, the delicate hands of the high-born Abbot of Clairvaux<sup>4</sup> and the

<sup>1</sup> Canon Liddon's Sermon on S. *Saints*, Jan. 15. S. Macarius of Egypt. Luke, XXII., 27, preached in S. Vol. I., pp. 226, 227. Lond., 1872. Paul's, London, 19 Dec., 1886.

<sup>2</sup> Ruskin, *Queen of the Air*, § 127, 131. <sup>4</sup> How much gain to humanity, or even to the material wealth of the world, is there in the prison and

<sup>3</sup> S. Baring-Gould's *Lives of the* penal factory for the production of

sturdy frame of the brother whose lot had been always labor.<sup>1</sup>

“ We have to realize by an effort how utter had been the destruction and oblivion not only of the ancient arts and learning, but of the commonest mechanical instruments even for the cultivation of the soil ; and how great were the poverty and rudeness that thence of necessity ensued. ‘ The manners of the Italians,’ says a writer <sup>2</sup> of about the year 1300, quoted by Muratori, ‘ were rude. A man and his wife ate off of the same plate. Wooden-handled knives were unknown, and there were but one or two drinking-cups in the house. . . . A servant held a torch during supper. . . . The clothes of men were of leather, unlined. . . . The common people ate flesh but three times a week. . . . A small stock of corn seemed riches.’

“ In England we find in the inventory of the furniture of a gentleman at Easton, estimated as having better things than many of the nobility, that his plate consisted only of sixteen spoons and a few goblets and ale-pots. He had two best beds, a servant’s bed : the rest slept on mattresses on the floor. This was in 1539.<sup>3</sup>

“ Labor re-created civilization in modern Europe ; and the Church—chiefly the monks—for a thousand years led the way in this hard but salutary path of improvement.

“ The laborious monk, however, was not the only form of saintliness that appeared in the Kingdom of God. ‘ There were saints in every century for eighteen hun-

articles of silk and straw, which now occupies the site of this celebrated monastery, over what it furnished when it was the home of labor and religion ?

<sup>1</sup> “ The Benedictines were the agriculturists of Europe ; the Cistercians were the growers of wool, at that time the staple of England’s wealth ; to them the country was indebted for food and clothing, and

indirectly for much of its prosperity in trade and commerce.” They were the friends of the poor. The monasteries were schools for the young, hospitals for the sick, asylums for the poor, the refuge of learning, sacred and profane.—Dean Hook, III., 42.

<sup>2</sup> Ricobaldus Ferrarensis.

<sup>3</sup> Strutt’s *View of Manners*, Vol. III., p. 63.

dred years.'<sup>1</sup> Without attempting to give even an outline of the various types, the learned saint, the teacher, the preacher, the missionary, the mystic—we do not exclude the warrior saint, having S. Louis for an example—we will mention two instances of a kind of sainthood (the penitent saint) of such as, having fallen through self-confidence into deadly sin, have still been recovered; and of such as, after a real religious life, have returned to worldly frivolity, and yet have been won again to their first and deepest impressions. We may refer as examples of each of these to the remarkable histories of S. James the Penitent,<sup>2</sup> a hermit of Porphyrio in Samaria, in the sixth century, and of S. Hyacintha, A.D. 1640.<sup>3</sup> The unbeliever declines to admit any real reformation in such cases, we well know, and so continues to regard them not as shedding any glory on the power of Christ,<sup>4</sup> but as a scandal wherewith religion may be assailed. The proofs, however, rest on facts, not on sentiment or profession, and cannot well be put aside.

“Of persecution and violence exercised by Christians upon one another, or upon those outside the fold, we say that they are not ‘faults of Christians,’ but sins which nominal and badly instructed Christians have committed, like the rest of the world. Persecution and violence and revenge are clearly forbidden by the Christian’s Lord, by His apostles, by the great lights of the Church, S. Augustine, S. Martin, S. Bernard. The Roman Church is not more deeply stained with blood-guiltiness on this account

<sup>1</sup> Mr. S. Baring-Gould has in the preparation of his twelve volumes of the *Lives of the Saints* consulted in the great Bollandist collection the account of three thousand six hundred of them. This collection began in 1643 (Jan. two folios, double columns, twelve hundred pages each); the fifty-seventh volume appeared in 1861.

<sup>2</sup> Jan. 28. See S. Baring-Gould’s *Lives of the Saints*, Jan., p. 433.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, Jan. 30, p. 462.

<sup>4</sup> A modern writer, contrasting the faults of pagans and Christians, says: “Many motives, powers, and insights have been added” by the Christian religion. “The very corruptions into which Christians have fallen are signs of a subtle life higher than the pagans’ was, and therefore more fearful in its faults and death.”—Ruskin’s *Queen of the Air*, § 176, p. 129.

than all the first Protestant sectaries.<sup>1</sup> The Pope now living quotes S. Augustine's saying, 'Force can give the soul everything but faith.' We must not judge of the mediæval conflicts by the peaceful maxims of our day. The popes who carried through the contest about investitures were fighting the battle of religion and morality, though that conflict 'occasioned sixty battles and the loss of two million of lives.'<sup>2</sup> 'Mediæval history is a history of rights and wrongs.'<sup>3</sup> We know how quickly, sometimes inevitably, a contest about these passes into a personal life-and-death grapple.<sup>4</sup>

"Finally, the unbeliever requires above everything a cheerful Christian. Well, the Christian religion allows cheerfulness as a matter of course, whenever there are good grounds for it. If we are in a ship, however, that has not yet reached harbor, and many dangerous rocks and currents lie between, watchfulness is a more rational virtue than cheerfulness. It is foolish, besides, to put away the thought of a future life, if this happens to be, as all analogy suggests that it is, the supplement and larger part of the very same life that begins here.<sup>5</sup> But a man who cherishes such thoughts, it is

<sup>1</sup> What might be called the debased popular conception of a Christian, derived from Protestant sects, is humorously given by Dickens in *Oliver Twist* (Ch. XVIII.). The Artful Dodger describes Bill Sikes's dog: "He's a rum dog. Don't he look fierce at any strange cove that laughs or sings when he's in company!" pursued the Dodger. "Won't he growl at all when he hears a fiddle playing! And don't he hate other dogs as ain't of his breed!"—"He's an out and out Christian," said Charley. Dickens adds the remark that there are out and out Christians (though not in Charley Bates's sense) who strongly resemble Bill Sikes's dog.

<sup>2</sup> It lasted fifty-six years, and ended A.D. 1122.

<sup>3</sup> Stubbs. "Modern history," adds the bishop, "at first that of powers, dynasties, and forces, and, since the French Revolution, of ideas."—Lect. VIII.

<sup>4</sup> John VIII. (circ. 878) declares that absolution is to be granted to those Christians who have died while fighting "pro defensione sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ et pro statu Christianæ religionis et reipublicæ," *against pagans and infidels*.—*Mansi*, XVII., 104.

<sup>5</sup> "If the company will be persuaded by me, considering the soul to be immortal . . . we shall by all means pursue justice in unison with prudence. . . And when we afterwards receive its rewards, like victors assembled together . . .

urged, has no freedom, and loses a great part of his present enjoyment. But not to be misled by the misuse of such fair words as 'liberty' and 'freedom,' we ought to see that freedom to think or do wrong, in the most important work of our life, is not a blessing, but may prove the greatest loss. A child allowed to choose its own medicine out of a collection of deadly and beneficial drugs is a fair illustration of the folly of such 'freedom.' A little 'present enjoyment' is too dearly purchased at the risk of lasting illness (which means the loss of all power to enjoy) or a sudden death."

These, then, are specimens of such answers as may be given (and we think they are quite as sound as the objections) to those who delight to dwell on the *faults* in the heads, or the hearts, or the manners of Christians. We hope we have been able (in some cases at least) to make this hunting pack in theological sport to recall an obsolete sense of the word "fault," which in Shakespeare, you may remember, means also "a lost scent"—

"Ceasing their clamorous cry till they have singled,  
With much ado, the cold scent clearly out."

The hounds of Satan will never recover that scent, for it is cold. The fugitives from the hunter of souls are with Him who "hath spoiled the spoiler of his prey;"<sup>1</sup> who lifts the fallen, and "breaks not the bruised reed, nor quenches the smoking flax:" no life-blood of souls shall ebb away, that have been touched by the Good Physician. He answers the accuser in their name, and the terror that Satan and his pack once excited becomes (as in the ballad) a fading echo on the midnight air.

both here and in that journey of a thousand years, which we have described, we shall be happy."—Last words of Plato's *Republic*, X., 16.

<sup>1</sup>"And let thy fate instruct the proud  
God's meanest creature is His child."

Scott's *Wild Huntsman*.

See the story of the repentant robber Jonathan in the life of S. Simeon Stylites, Jan. 5 (A.D. 460), S. Baring-Gould's *Lives of the Saints*, I., 79.

## LECTURE X.

---

### SCEPTICISM AS A HABIT.

SCEPTICISM, if we look at its derivation [*σκέπτομαι* = "to look about," or "to look for one's self"] and first use, has nothing in it that can fairly be called wrong, or liable to objection. To look carefully at an object before us in order to form a right estimate of it, to test it by some experiment or proof before we trust it, whether the object be physical, or food, or a particular act, or principle of action, or something offered us as truth in science, philosophy, or religion, is an instinct of wisdom; and, as preparatory to something to follow, worthy only of praise. Scripture even commands it to Christians: "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."

And yet scepticism, I need hardly say, actually describes a most serious wrong, a malady perverting and corrupting all that is best in human nature. The title of my lecture will show you that I do not consider this wrong to spring from the object to which scepticism attaches itself—so that, while innocent or even praiseworthy in regard to some matters, it must be condemned in connection with others—for I say: "Scepticism as a habit." And I say that the habit of holding one's judgment in reserve, of suspending and indefinitely deferring our decision in cases where truth and duty are plain, is one dangerous to real sagacity and energy of character. Few persons can bring home to themselves the full significance of what we call "habit," and especially how it will wrap

itself like a garment (a sense the word itself often bears) around the soul and even body of a man. This means that a habit—doing the same thing again that we have done before in a given case—will, if unregulated and unchecked, attach itself to other cases where it is less appropriate, or wholly unsuitable. Thus because a man has hesitated long, and come to a slow decision in a matter of great difficulty, he will have a tendency, which may require a vigorous will to throw off, to hesitate where he should be prompt, and to defer action where action is much to be preferred to deliberation.

Thus “the provisional suspense of judgment recommended by Descartes and others as the true beginning of philosophy, we may allow, or even commend, as no more than a passing phase of the individual’s mind in his search for truth. Of this Kant says, “It is not a permanent resting-place for human reason.” To consider, to suspend one’s judgment, to lay aside preconceptions, to pause, to examine, are therefore merely preliminaries, in a matter of importance, for vigorous, and, it may be, unrelaxing exertion, where further reflection will probably be difficult. Every earnest, superior mind yields to this reflective delay only with the purpose of finding some worthy decision. Plato even uses the verb from which “scepticism” is formed to indicate the arriving at this conclusion. Exhorting a young man tempted to a great crime by bad example, he tells him to flee from the evil company, to try “expiatory rites,” to “consider”<sup>1</sup> (which here means “firmly believe”) “that death is more honorable than life” stained with such a blot.

The words of the Athenian sage descriptive of careful examination, followed by prompt and vigorous action, are as applicable to a Christian tempted by speculative doubts or practical snares, at times spread for him by fel-

<sup>1</sup>καλλίῳ θάνατον βεβήμενος ing come to a conclusion. Attic writers were not accustomed to use the present and imperfect of βέβημαι. ἀπαλλάττου τοῦ βίου.—Platon. *De Legibus*, IX., 1. The past participle βεβήμενος indicates the hav-

low-Christians, as to an educated heathen walking by the light of nature alone, but still wishing to obey his conscience.

The strong and healthy sense of Socrates is said to have beaten back the tide of scepticism in the schools of philosophy for a hundred years, even until the Socratic impulse in Aristotle had been exhausted. Aristotle, whose acuteness surpassed that of the most thorough-going sceptic, likewise uses doubt for a constructive, not destructive end,<sup>1</sup> and so treats of "the utility of doubt," and what "we ought first to doubt of," and says, "The success of philosophy depends on the art of doubting well." This most acute of reasoners is best qualified to teach us where to put an end to doubt. "A principle," he says, "which one must be in possession of who understands any entity whatever, this is not an hypothesis." Doubts on such a point, he says, "are similar to one's doubting whether we now sleep or are awake." The following are cases where doubt is inadmissible: "It is impossible for the same inquirer to suppose that at the same time the same thing should be and not be." Again: "Causes are first principles." "That is called a cause from which, as inherent, anything is produced;" whence, a cause "is the first principle of change or of rest; as, for instance, the designing cause . . . and, generally speaking, the forming of that which is being formed, and that capable of effecting a change of that which is undergoing a change." "There is something which always moves the things that are in motion, and the first impartor of motion is itself immovable."<sup>2</sup>

Thus did he who was best qualified to doubt scientifically set up the barriers to doubt. He knew the excesses of the sophists that had gone before him, and he anticipated the aberrations of those that would appear in the

<sup>1</sup> It is a saying characteristic of Aristotle's strong sense that "a man's mind was organized to discover truth." <sup>2</sup> τὸ πρῶτον κινου ἀκίνητον αὐτό.—Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, III., 3; II., 4; III., 8.

future. Protagoras had dissolved knowledge into individual and momentary opinion: "Man is the measure of all things." Gorgias denied the possibility of knowledge. Scepticism took the form of "a thorough-going impeachment of man's power to know."<sup>1</sup> Arcesilaus, a later Academic, said, "We know nothing, not even this itself, that we know nothing." The Sceptics gave various names to this condition: ἀταραξία, "rest," "freedom from disturbance;" ἐποχή, "reserve of judgment;" ἄρρηψία, "equilibrium;" and their maxim was οὐδὲν μᾶλλον, "One statement is as good as another."

Such statements, if viewed seriously, look like an abnegation of reason, and the worship of paralysis. It is probable, however, that what looks like an unqualified denunciation of reason was at first a lively invective against the uncertainty of physical science, with which the first efforts of philosophy were chiefly employed. Self-contradiction and increasing perplexity marked these researches as they advanced from Thales and the Eleatic school to the various theories of Leucippus, Heraclitus, Democritus, and the rest, till nature seemed to have no order; then reason turned to prey upon itself. The most alarming result of this was seen when the scepticism engendered by false science "passed, in a less reputable generation, into a corroding moral scepticism, which recognized no good but pleasure, and no right but might." Unlimited scepticism has been found in every age to take this direction. It has been noted that one of the earliest of the amorous poets in the north of France—a school that lapsed into the "most revolting sensuality"—was Abélard the Schoolman.<sup>2</sup> Later developments in this direction need not be specified; the sceptic and the libertine, Montaigne and Rabelais, are linked together as inevitably as the negative and the positive electricity of the battery.

Not even the enlightenment of our boasted science, the hard common-sense that scorns scholastic subtleties, can

<sup>1</sup> *Ency. Brit.*, XXI., 329.

<sup>2</sup> Hallam's *Literature of Europe*, Pt. I., Ch. I., § 36.

protect the sophist of the nineteenth century from the worst follies of his brethren in ancient Greece. Still there is something peculiarly revolting in hearing an educated Englishman, like Mr. Mill, say in cold blood: "There may be worlds in which two and two make five, in which parallel lines meet, in which a straight line may return upon itself and inclose a space, and in which there may be effects without a cause."<sup>1</sup>

We conceive it to be far more creditable for a man to feel and to own, as did Hume, that his state of universal doubt is a "malady," "philosophical melancholy and delirium." And so, though Hume forces himself to say, when elaborating his sceptical theory, that there is no proof of "an external world independent of our perception," and that "cause is not a real relation, but only a mental habit of belief,"<sup>2</sup> etc., yet in conversation and in writing on other subjects he ignored without scruple such unnatural speech, and excused his inconsistency by saying, "I must yield to the current of nature: nature compels me to judge as well as to breathe and feel." Mr. Arthur Balfour, a modern follower of Hume, frankly owns that "the practical foundations of our convictions" about "*science and theology*" do not rest on "rational grounds of conviction," but on "a kind of inward inclination or impulse."<sup>3</sup> This is a formal abandonment of the supposition that scepticism is the peculiar enemy of religion. It is, in truth, the enemy of knowledge and mental soundness.

We have heretofore strongly insisted that the religion of Christ has ever been the kind foster-mother of all real science, and of whatever can be regarded as an effective instrument in human education. One proof of this is, that it gives an account of the condition of human nature that is verifiable by facts, and an intelligible reason for the glory and the weakness of that nature; that it offers solid grounds of hope to man for regaining his better

<sup>1</sup> See McCosh, *Christianity and Positivism*, Lect. VI., p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> *Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding*.

<sup>3</sup> *Defence of Philosophic Doubt*, 1879.

estate. It need hardly be said that neither this religion, nor any other agency, could effect such results by informing human beings that all knowledge, natural and supernatural, is beyond their reach ; that they can never think rightly or act rightly ; that contented despair is the only thing left for them. The Father of human souls says to His children, by the voice of His only-begotten Son : “ Ye were made in God’s image ; ye fell from innocence and happiness by the abuse of your freedom ; ye lost the vision of heaven ; ye darkened and disordered your natural powers : but ye have been redeemed to Me by a priceless ransom ; ye have been deadly sick, but the Good Physician is at your door ; ye can regain health, knowledge, a reasonable measure of happiness and comfort in the present life, and bliss without measure in the world to come.”

Humility and self-renunciation do not need long recommendation to those who are in want of everything ; for no one can be more deeply conscious than themselves of their misery, their helplessness, the weakness of reason, the fluctuations of feeling, the feebleness of their will. The only method to silence doubt and unreasonable contradiction is to bring prompt and effective help :—to the hungry, food ; to the sick, medicine and kindness ; to the erring, the simple truth spoken from the heart of faith and love. The voice of religion, regulating the schools of philosophy and education, speaks in this fashion : “ O<sup>1</sup> helpless reason, humiliate yourself : be silent, feeble nature.” At times “ to despise philosophy is the best course of philosophy.” “ Man<sup>2</sup> is more inconceivable without the mystery of his fall and original sin than these mysteries are inconceivable to man.” “ Philosophy, like true religion, requires that its disciples throw off old prejudices, and come with hearts willing to receive

<sup>1</sup> Humiliez-vous, raison impuissante, taisez-vous, nature imbecile.  
Se moquer de la philosophie c’est vraiment philosopher.

<sup>2</sup> L’homme est plus inconcevable sans ce mystère que ce mystère n’est inconcevable à l’homme.”—Pascal, *Pensées*.

knowledge, and understandings open to conviction." "Consciousness is to the philosopher what the Bible is to the theologian."<sup>1</sup> They ought both, therefore, to be received without question, because of their Author, who in the one discloses to us natural truth, and in the other truths supernatural. Lord Bacon said:<sup>2</sup> "The entrance to the kingdom of man, which is founded in the sciences, like the entrance to the kingdom of heaven, is not permitted save to him who comes in the likeness of a little child."

The confessions we have quoted from authorities in science and philosophy concerning the insufficiency of reason are enough to expose the unfairness of writers unfriendly to religion (like Professor Seth, who contributed the article on "Scepticism" to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*<sup>3</sup>) whenever they find the defenders of religion using the like language. Professor Seth, *e. g.*, says: "In an access of pious rage . . . they turn upon reason to rend her." "They labor to show that she is in contradiction with herself even on matters non-theological." Such language comes with a very ill grace from sceptics who have just been reducing "reason" to "delirium,"<sup>4</sup> and asserting that she can reach neither truth nor certainty in anything.

As a matter of fact, however, it is notorious that all the greatest Christian doctors, following Holy Scripture,<sup>5</sup> delight to exalt the powers of man, his reason included, for the very obvious reasons that he is God's image, that he was created but "a little lower than the angels," and that even in the natural order he was "crowned with glory and honor." S. Thomas Aquinas, the "Angelic Doctor" of the middle ages, whose honors

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Hamilton, *Metaphysics*, Lect. V., pp. 57, 63. Hume, it is said, was too shrewd to cast doubts on the veracity of consciousness.

<sup>2</sup> *Aditus ad regnum hominis, quod fundatur in scientiis, quam ad reg-*

*num cœlorum, in quod, nisi sub personâ infantis, intrare non datur.—Nov. Organ., L. I., Aph. 68.*

<sup>3</sup> Vol. XXI., pp. 378-384.

<sup>4</sup> See Hume.

<sup>5</sup> See, *e. g.*, Psalm viii. 4, 5.

have blossomed forth into a second spring in modern days, says, with reference to the reason itself, that "the truths of theology,<sup>1</sup> communicated by supernatural revelation, are subjects of devout inquiry, and admit of argumentative defence." "For since grace,"<sup>2</sup> he adds, "does not destroy nature, but perfects it, it is fitting that natural reason should render (this) service to faith, even as also the natural bent of the will becomes the servant of charity." The very titles of two treatises of S. Anselm<sup>3</sup>—among the most celebrated works of the time, and proceeding from one of its ablest and most saintly men—show the high place assigned to reason: "Monologium, sive exemplum meditandi de ratione Fidei;" that is to say, "a specimen of how man's reason proceeds with itself in seeking a reasonable basis for the mysteries of the faith. The other was "Proslogium, sive Fides quærens Intellectum;" that is to say, "Faith's effort to answer the devout questioning of the intellect." The sentiment which Friar Bacon<sup>4</sup> put into his *Majus Opus*, addressed to Pope Clement IV. in 1266, is not foreign to Christian teachers in any age of the Church: "In every man,<sup>5</sup> whether among the saints or the sages, there is great imperfection of wisdom"—a remark that he expressly extends to Aristotle, while acknowledging the unrivalled sagacity of that philosopher. We believe that Addison, who was a sincerely religious man, expressed the usual thought of the best Christian intelligence, clerical as well as lay, when he said: "Discretion is the perfection of reason, and a guide to us in all the duties of life." "The

<sup>1</sup> *Summa Theologiæ*, qu. I., art. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cum enim gratia non tollat naturam, sed perficiat, oportet quod naturalis ratio subserviat Fidei; sicut et naturalis inclinatio voluntatis obsequitur Caritati.

<sup>3</sup> Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1093-1109.

<sup>4</sup> *I. e.*, Roger Bacon (not to be

confounded with Grossteste's friend Robert), the full title of whose work is *Opus Majus de Utilitate Scientiarum*. He died A.D. 1294. The passage here quoted is from Ch. XII.

<sup>5</sup> In omni homine sunt multa imperfecta sapientiæ, tam in sanctis quam in sapientibus. Nihil est perfectum in humanis inventionibus.—*Id.*, P. II., Ch. VIII.

cast of mind natural to a discreet man makes him look forward into futurity and consider what will be his condition millions of ages hence, as well as what it is at present." "His hopes are full of immortality, and his schemes large and glorious." "It is the guide of a mortal creature, and in general of a reasonable being."<sup>1</sup> This is by no means a bad account of the relation of reason to faith, each retaining its own proper position and advantages.

If I were seeking to justify the praise I have given to religion, as fostering and encouraging man's natural powers, and placing him in the right attitude toward all knowledge and science that can become instrumental in education, I should point out that its effort is always constructive rather than destructive, to edify rather than to pull down. Amid the inevitable variations and mistakes of scientific researches and hypotheses, it does not point to every error as a new proof that reason cannot be trusted, but tries rather to find in many coincident indications a suggestion of the dawning of an important truth. In treating evidence, especially evidence for religion, the sceptic is constantly guilty of a fault which betrays repugnance to this wholesome habit of mind. He represents "any insufficiency of the proof, in its several branches, as so much objection;" and "manages the inquiry," says Mr. Davidson—who, in his admirable work on prophecy, thus describes what he calls this "vicious manner of reasoning"—"so as to make it appear that, if the divided arguments be inconclusive one by one, we have a series of exceptions to the truths of religion, instead of a train of favorable presumptions growing stronger at every step. The disciple of scepticism is taught that he cannot fully rely on this or that motive of belief, that each of them is insecure; and the conclusion is put upon him that they ought to be discarded one after another, instead of being connected and combined."<sup>2</sup> It has often been noted, by the way, what an advantage in oral argument

<sup>1</sup> *Spectator*, No. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Davidson on *Prophecy*, Disc. I., p. 28. Lond., 1825.

the lively insistence on individual objections has over the attempt to show the weight of an argument that consists in the cumulative force of many particulars.<sup>1</sup> Every great discovery in natural science, every truth of value derived from the examination of the outer world, has been the fruit of patient study of many details, the careful comparison and weighing of facts, without apparent connection or perhaps in seeming contradiction. This habit, which is natural to a religious mind—whether studying the Word or the works of God—is absolutely essential to the success of science. A lively series of objections might develop contradictions between mechanics and some of the effects of electricity, which would have been insoluble while the science of the latter was as yet imperfectly known. The most common and necessary experiments of chemistry are usually failures unless supervised by experts. Such facts may suggest the kind of service religion has done for education.

The normal result of true science of even natural things, upon the mind, is an unfeigned humility and willingness to learn from whatever source. Such a mind clings to the solid sense of Aristotle, that "man's mind was organized to discover truth," without forgetting the weakness and mistakes that have always attended the actual endeavor. The thing most opposite to this, both in reason and education, is the despair of truth, the giving up of effort, the assertion that because nothing is known to us fully, nothing is rightly known, the contemptuous rejection of help, the paradox that truth and falsehood, proof and disproof, are equivalent—including in this the very postulates by which the paradox itself is made out—and all this is scepticism, when we can give to its boneless lubricity anything resembling logical shape.

What remains of this lecture I will devote to the study of two aspects of the subject: I. The abuses to which the reason of man is inevitably exposed and tempted in a world like our modern one, that continually discusses,

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bp. Butler's *Analogy*, II., 7.

with or without intelligence, all imaginable subjects from the highest to the lowest, and even in the treatment of the greatest has usually a mocking majority out of those who attend at all, but more frequently must address a mass who are indifferent or ignorant. II. In the second place I will endeavor to present the ideal of which scepticism is the caricature. If I succeed in this, I may suggest a remedy for this "delirium" and sore malady of man's reason.

I. Before dwelling on the abuses to which the reason of man is tempted in actual life, we should remind ourselves that the reason, the feelings, and the will are one in essence, and make up each indivisible human person. They are inseparable in fact, and mutually serve one another. The reason enlightens, the will gives energy, the feelings supply motives and vivacity. The reason may become the slave of the other two. This is precisely what religion forbids, claiming the service of will and feeling to all real light, natural or supernatural. This is the only tyranny over the natural man included in "the obedience of Christ."<sup>1</sup> "With intellect itself," as has been said many times, and cannot be said too often, "with really moral and reasonable intellect, with the thought of man recognizing at once its power and its weakness, its vast range and its necessary limits, religion has, can have, no quarrel. It were a libel on the All-wise Creator to suppose that between intellect and spirit, between thought and faith, there could be any original relations other than those of perfect harmony."<sup>2</sup>

Still we ought not to be surprised at the charges, numerous and groundless as they are, brought against religion by reason, when we consider the actual condition of that reason in the world around us.

A young man believes that with money he could command and rule the world; and when he finds himself in possession of a keen, cultivated intellect, but without

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. x. 5, τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>2</sup> Liddon's *University Sermons*, Sermon VIII., p. 167. Rivington, 1869.

money, he often, half in scorn and defiance, will offer his services as a writer, to those whom he despises, in order to win the money which to him then seems his first need. Then are we presented not seldom with a piteous spectacle. The world of which he dreamed to be the master he finds has made of him its slave. He is bidden to write up this measure, to depreciate that; to sound the praises of some leader in politics, and to pick out and magnify the faults of a chance adversary who stands in his way—to do both with vivacity and an air of conviction, though knowing nothing of either. He must present views of politics, morals, even religion, in the interests of the parties or men who have bought his services, not as they seem to him right or true. If a young and generous soul chafe at this bondage, as it can hardly fail to do, it is coolly reminded that its bargain is an affair of commerce, not of conscience. If, constrained by harsh necessity, it submits to its hateful task, its whole intellectual life becomes poisoned and warped. The human soul sometimes seeks to avenge its own degradation by denying the ideals against which it has sinned. He who by practice has acquired skill to confound truth and falsehood, and right and wrong, by sophisms which, though they do not convince, can confound, plain people, because they may have no answer ready, comes to take pride in his power, and ends by blunting the keenness of his own intellect, and half believing the lies he has defended. His conscience shows itself by irritation and unfairness toward those who plainly tell him of his real condition. He will even boast of his own freedom, and taunt the friends of religion with their subjection to bondage. Thus the mercenary writer, attacking religion as he by turn attacks everything else, wears his degrading yoke, and still refuses the only offer of deliverance.

Another class of pernicious books and writings proceed from authors who have resolved to achieve notoriety, if they cannot have fame, at any price. As the class just mentioned are the victims of pride, so those now to be

described are the fools of their vanity. At one time it is an able man in his own department (say) of natural science, but restless till he enters the field of theology, of which he knows little or nothing; at another it is a versatile and stirring writer seeking for a new sensation; at another it is a theorist resolved to prove his particular hypothesis at any cost, whether of Bible, Church, or morals; at another it is an unprincipled sophist, whose vanity courts reputation by some plain and stinging exposure. Sometimes among these we find an eccentric man of wealth, who will expend his money to put forward some novelty in religion. What is to be noted in these vainglorious writers, whether they have much ability or little, is that they seem content, as if their end had been gained, if they make a sensation in the religious world, call forth criticism, examinations, answers, unsettle the faith of some, spread an impression that the foundations of religion have been shaken. They care nothing for the religious distress, the loss of peace, the tears, the despair, of those who through their means have been robbed of their only guide in life, their sole comfort in affliction.

Perhaps the most revolting phase of scepticism—the phase which at times brings it under the chastisement of the civil law—is when it deliberately allies itself with sensuality.<sup>1</sup> The power of literature infused with this malign spirit has at different times displayed itself in an appalling and incredible degree. Its agents have not wanted human ability; but, amid the pollutions of the imagination and unbridled passions, all beauties of language and imagery are lost in a hideous animalism.

“Many years ago a German in Dresden, defending sensual sin, said, ‘Does not nature itself bid you indulge yourself?’ I did not well know what to answer, but I ought to have said, ‘Nature is that which my Maker meant me to be. I am sure

He did not mean me to be the slave of every passing desire.’ ‘The ruling powers in man are reason and conscience. Passion must submit to them, or misery and dissolution follow.’—Bp. Walsham How (Bedford), Sermon in S. Paul’s, 25th Dec., 1886.

The typical modern assailant of religion may be said to be characterized by a self-reliant cynicism. He will not acknowledge any enthusiasm for, hardly any belief in, virtue. He is too proud or too fastidious to be numbered with those whom vanity incites to write, and he respects himself too much to join the sensualists. Still his intellect, without doubt, though he may not suspect it, is the slave of an inordinate egotism. The writings of such often deceive good judges by a semblance of impartiality, by their cool, clear vigor, and are thought models of intellectual perfection.

II. The following may be taken as a summary of scepticism when it appears as a foe of religion, and includes both its essential character and its most familiar manifestation.

I. It denies, with all the vigor with which it denies anything, a separate province for religion, especially the system of truths known as supernatural religion, as distinct from those which constitute natural religion. The intellect, it affirms, "commands the whole field of truth." To speak of spiritual facts beyond the ken of the natural reason is too humiliating for this proud spirit. Still, reason is compelled at times to confess, even in its researches in natural knowledge, that certain facts—the existence of the indefinitely small and the indefinitely great, for instance—become probable, of which still it can never reach direct knowledge. So the truths in the province of religion, discovered by unaided reason, remain limited and ineffective.

Even, however, when driven from its exclusive claim to judge of every truth, and brought to admit revelation, it is inclined merely to substitute one form of rebellion for another. Though it allow that a revelation may have been made, it still claims the right to judge and criticise its contents. It thinks it even becoming to put in a stipulation that religion shall contain no mysteries. Still, besides the intrinsic unreasonableness of criticising the contents of a real revelation—as if, while the Almighty is speaking to us, we should undertake to tell Him what to

say—when we examine the various meanings and applications of the word “mystery” in Holy Scripture, it is not easy to see how, even in its deepest sense, it can be excluded from any revelation, or how a great truth like the Incarnation, made known to man as the ground of his faith and salvation, can, while any relation of it be unexplored, as some of its relations must certainly forever be, be anything else than a mystery.

With equal inconsistency and pertinacity, the religious sceptic, coming to a sound mind, is sometimes heard loudly insisting that, though he may admit a supernatural revelation, and even mysteries, he will have no *dogmas* in his religion. He objects to dogma on principle, without reference either to the Authority that proposes it, or to any necessity that seems to demand it. It seems to him in some way contrary to the essence of religion—to its flexible and poetical character. Yet a dogma, every one knows, means, as a Greek word, the “decree”<sup>1</sup> of a sovereign. In revelation it is a plain, unequivocal statement of a truth of religion, *e. g.*, “the Lord our God is one Lord,” “the Word was made flesh.” It is necessary that truths should thus be stated, both to guard them against mistake, and to make them capable of being taught; and it is difficult to see why the same truth, when plainly stated, should be harder to receive than when wrapped in poetic imagery.

2. The ideal sceptic, also, like the more familiar mundane one we have been considering, “looks forth” (*σκέπτεται*) for himself upon the world around him with attentive, searching eyes, scanning its physical constitution and the ways of its inhabitants. He has no prejudice against any truth whatever, natural or spiritual. He has the thirst for truth and knowledge imbedded deep in man’s nature, and bringing him at once his purest and most lasting delight. He has never dreamed that truth is unattainable: his nature was formed for it. If some mysterious barrier

<sup>1</sup> ἐξῆλλθε δόγμα παρὰ Καίσα- πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. — S. ρος Αἰγούστου ἀπογράφεσθαι Luke, ii. 1.

now separates man from the spiritual world and from his Maker, the patient inquirer soon learns that that barrier was raised by man himself. He sees that the world and the constitution of nature have an intelligent Author and a just and benevolent Governor. He sees no reason why he may not expect help if he lifts an earnest prayer to the Author of his being. Instead, therefore, of antecedent doubts of a supernatural revelation, it seems to him the most natural thing in the world to look for one and to seek indications of its coming. His critical reason will be employed in scanning the evidence of the revelation whenever it appears, and applying to this evidence all the rules which guard us from imposture and deception, both without and within. But being satisfied that a revelation has been made, the true sceptic—that is, one, as I have here supposed, who has taken the right measure of his own powers—submits himself without reserve to the words of One who neither will deceive nor can be deceived, and who wills the felicity of His creatures. Heavenly truths, our examiner scans, not to find in them difficulties and objections, but guides and directions to eternal life. Under the Church's lead, he tests all pretenders to new interpretations, by truths already acknowledged, as, *e.g.*, the false teachers of the apostle's day, by their willingness to acknowledge that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." The Catholic Church throughout the Christian ages is for him "the pillar and the ground of the truth," and for individual Christians in general, no more is needed than to live humbly and faithfully by its rule.

"Who thinks of asking if the sun is light,  
Observing that it lightens?"

It is hard to say why, or in what respect, such a sceptic as I have now imagined, who doubts until faith is fairly offered to him, should be thought to have taken a less noble view of man's nature than the other, or to have sacrificed his freedom, or to have neglected any precau-

tion suggested by wisdom, or to have misused his reason, or to have suffered any deception through credulity, and not rather by the best use of reason and wisdom to have attained the highest rewards held out to the nature of man.



## INDEX.

---

### A.

Abraham, history of, 108.  
 " trial of, 113, 528, 529.  
 Agassiz, 500, 516.  
 Albertus Magnus, 203.  
 Alfred, King, 191, 202.  
 Almighty constituted, etc., 54.  
 Ambrosian Rite, hymn in, 432.  
 America, 44, 45, 590.  
 Apocalypse, 326.  
 Apostles, honesty of, 344.  
 " autographs of, 317.  
 " as competent witnesses, 345.  
 Apostolic Succession, 439.  
 Arianism, 606.  
 Aristotle, 95, 103, 628, 629, 639.  
 Assyrian inscriptions, 109.  
 Athens, at A. alone, 446.  
 Augustine, conversion of, 156.  
 " influence of, 157.  
 " retraction of, 157.  
 " works of, 158.  
 " truth concerning, 159-160.  
 " statements against, 160.  
 " salvation of, 161.  
 " instruction of, 161-162.  
 " 384.  
 Austin, venerable, 294.  
 Authenticity defined, 303.  
 Author of Christianity, 382.  
 Aztecs, 44, 66, 186.

### B.

Babylonian inscriptions, 108.  
 Balaam, rebuke of, 115.  
 Belief, definition of, 17.  
 " of China, 27-30.  
 " of India, 30-34.  
 " of Egypt, 34-36.  
 " of Persia, 36-39.  
 " of Germany, 39.

Belief, of America, 44-45.  
 " of Immortality, 57, 77.  
 " of a God, 57.  
 " in the Koran, 74.  
 Bentley, 307, 485.  
 Bernard, St., 555.  
 Bible, unity of, 125-127.  
 " 259, 306.  
 " English, 104, 105.  
 " Hebrew, 6-10.  
 Bishop, the, 294.  
 " of Rome, transformation of, 408.  
*Book of the Dead*, 61.  
 Botany, 252.  
 Brahmanism, 585, 586-588.  
 Buddha, 32.  
 Buddhism, 31, 585, 586, 587.  
 Burke's "golden words," 98.  
 Butler, Bishop, 56.

### C.

Canon, the history of, 320.  
 " of the New Testament, 328.  
 " Muratorian, 329.  
 " Canonical," the term. 302.  
 " Catholic," the word, 288.  
 " clergy, 293-296.  
 Cause, 476.  
 " first, equivalent to God, 477-480.  
 Character, elements of, 146.  
 Children, 452.  
 China, 27-29, 261, 588.  
 Chinese, character of, 30.  
 Christ, words and policy of, 129.  
 " harmony of the words, etc., of, 140.  
 " manner in miracles, 141.  
 " surrender of man to, 141.  
 " claim of, 142.  
 " promises of, 142.

- Christ, forgiveness of, 142.  
 " possessions of, 142.  
 " history of, 143, 144.  
 " religion of, 148, 576.  
 " evidence for the death of, 433.  
 " prophecy of, 582.  
 " 581.
- Christian writers, 21.  
 " religion, proof of, 154.  
 " instructors, 167.  
 " education, 168.  
 " conception of a, 171.  
 " teaching, example of, 191.  
 " state, typical, 193.  
 " ideal, 218.  
 " virtues, devotion, etc., 219.  
 " " test of, 220.  
 " spirit, 222.  
 " virtue, peculiar quality of, 222.  
 " courage of a, 224, 225-227.  
 " self-interest, 232.  
 " religion, claims for, 234.  
 " war, 296.  
 " charges against, 297, 625-628.  
 " habits and maxims, 330.  
 " community, 386.  
 " numerical calculations of, 401.  
 " doctrine, 413, 414, 422.  
 " literature, sketch of, 262-266.  
 " advocate, 624.  
 " reply to the unbeliever, 628-636.  
 " cheerfulness, 635.  
 " 226, 404.
- Christianity produced, etc., 82, 250,  
 262, 444.  
 " institutions of, 172.  
 " influence of, 190, 448.  
 " defenders of, 263.  
 " the only religion, 403.  
 " certain facts of, 426.  
 " battle of, 616.  
 " accusation against, 625-628.
- Church, Catholic, 288, 289, 291, 292,  
 299, 328, 397, 419, 423,  
 437, 440, 525, 605.  
 " early, against Plato, 79.  
 " powers, etc., of, 169.  
 " requires, 218.  
 " taught, 423, 563.  
 " claims of, 289, 473.  
 " growth, triumph of, 289.  
 " sacred books of, 301.  
 " services of the Catholic, 390.
- Church, life of, 403.  
 " consistency of, 404, 405, 418.  
 " three tokens of divine origin of, 405.  
 " conquered, 406.  
 " a task for, 406.  
 " modern period of, 410.  
 " dogmatic history of, 416.  
 " decision, 418.  
 " loss of unity of, 411.  
 " Catholic, first mention of, 437.  
 " missionary zeal in, 461.  
 " sneers against, 467.  
 " ministry, perpetuity of, 436, 439.
- Cicero, 23, 70-72, 260.  
 Circumcision, 127.  
 Clement of Alexandria, 36, 132, 250, 323, 357.  
 " Codex B., class 1209," 309.  
 " Sinaiticus or Aleph, 310.  
 " Alexandrinus, 313.
- Confucius taught, 27, 454.  
 Conscience, 75, 87-89.  
 Constantine, 292.
- Conversion of St. Paul, 149, 150-154.  
 " of Augustine, 156.  
 " of Themistocles, 147.  
 " of Christian in *Pilgrim's Progress*, 163.  
 " of Justin, Tertullian, and others, 357.  
 " of Russia, 192.  
 " of the world, five causes, 298.  
 " in Old Testament, 148.  
 " in New Testament, 149.  
 " modern instances of, 162.
- Copernicus, 251.  
 Creation, controversy concerning, 502.  
 Creationism, 79.  
 Creator disclosed in natural law, 484, 519.  
 Credibility defined, 304.  
 Creed of natural religion, 21.  
 " Critic," 561, 562.  
 Critical doubts, remedy for, 573.  
 Criticism, 558-560.  
 Cross, honor to, 66.  
 Cyprian, Saint, 438.  
 Cyrus, 372, 592.
- D.
- Darwin, 247, 267, 488, 510.  
 David, 120, 123, 533, 534.  
 Deductions of reason prove, 53.  
 Deluge, 127.

Demosthenes, 207.  
 Designer, argument for the Great, 486.  
 " " against, 486-489.  
 Divine oracles preserved, 14.  
 Divinity, two tokens of, 133.  
 Dogma, meaning of, 54.  
 Druids, 61.  
 Duke of Wellington, 33.  
 Duty to the Trinity, reason for, 22.

## E.

Early Church against Plato, 79.  
 Education, 167.  
 Egypt, 34-36, 361.  
 Egyptians first to teach, 61.  
 England, church and state of, 194.  
 Epicurean, 465.  
 Esther, book of, 118.  
 Eternal word, 126.  
 Eusebius, 319, 323, 416, 417, 622.  
 Eutyches, 613.  
 Evidence, defined, 3.  
 " internal, defined, 4, 273.  
 " external, defined, 5, 273.  
 " proper, 18, 19.  
 " difficulty in presenting, 66, 67.  
 " of Moses and David, 120.  
 " two-fold, of Jews, 275.  
 " miracles as important, 336.  
 Evidences of religion, 4.  
 " division of, 4.  
 " in the refutation of, 5.  
 " treatment of, 5.  
 Evidential force, S. Augustine's conversion, 162.  
 Evolution, 393, 509, 572.  
 " final form of, 513.  
 " the only, 521.  
 Experience of race proves, 53.  
 Ewald, Heinrich, 565-572.

## F.

Faith, 14, 460.  
 " Example of trial of, 15.  
 " Religious, 17.  
 " Human, 17.  
 Feeling, nature of, 93.  
 " perfection of, 99.  
 Fijians, 41, 42.  
 Fine arts, lesson from, 93.  
 " " intention of, 91.  
 Fire-worshippers, 266.  
 Future life with Esquimaux, 57.  
 " " with Chinese, 58.  
 Futurity with American Indian, 63, 64.

## G.

Galileo, 252.  
 Genesis, 107.  
 Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 488.  
 Germany, 39, 565.  
 Gibbon, 292-296, 298, 437, 452, 543, 546, 622.  
 Gibbon's unbelief, 543.  
 Gladstone, 49.  
 Gnostics, 389, 601.  
 God, knowledge of, 16, 53, 444-446, 475, 484, 521.  
 " world's message of, 81.  
 " revelation of, 155.  
 " noblest conceptions of, 419, 579, 580.  
 " existence of, 481, 484-489, 499, 519.  
 Goethe, 241.  
 Gorgias, dialogue of, 67-69.  
 Gospel maker, etc., 80.  
 Gótama, teaching of, 60.  
 Government, changes in, 451.  
 " conception of, 197.  
 Grecian philosophy, 131, 132.  
 Greece, 48.  
 Grote, 564.  
 Guizot, 110.

## H.

" He did no sin," 140.  
 Heathenism, aspect of, 65.  
 Hebrew Bible, 6, 7-10, 305, 563.  
 " " history of, 11.  
 Herodotus, 48, 61.  
 Hindu tradition of the Fall, 60.  
 History, 396.  
 " of philosophy, 91.  
 " natural, 109.  
 " of Rome and Israel, difference of, 280, 281.  
 " of Israelites, 296.  
 " of the Church, 397.  
 Homer, 122, 305.  
 Hospitals, 462-465, 466.  
 " rules in, 465.  
 Humility, 233.  
 Huxley, 502, 510, 512.

## I.

Ignorance, confession of, 414.  
 Immortal life, absence of reference to, 113.  
 India, 30, 31, 32, 33, 261, 588.  
 Indian's Great Spirit, influence of, 65.  
 Infidel, if he were wise, 550.  
 Instructor, Christian, 107.

Intellect, intention of, 90.  
 Intellectual errors, 100.  
 Irenæus, St., 291, 321, 322, 327.  
 Israel and Romæ, 280.  
 " children of, 116.

## J.

Jael, 535.  
 Java, 41.  
 Jephthah, 536.  
 Jew, the, 274, 275, 416, 430, 523.  
 " retort of, 10.  
 " survival of, 13.  
 " features of, 274.  
 " evidence for, 278.  
 " lived to see, etc., 285.  
 " teaches a lesson, 286.  
 " contemplates his money, 286.  
 Jewish Church, 14.  
 " history, 275, 281-284.  
 " people, evidence for career of, 278.  
 " " noble specimens from, 284.  
 " Scripture, 284.  
 " people, fortunes of, 355.  
 " economy, 579.  
 " synagogue, 274.  
 Job's language, 77.  
 " Book, 119.  
 Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 16.  
 Josephus, 9, 10.  
 Justin Martyr, 357, 417.

## K.

Kapila, formula of, 31.  
 Kepler, 251.  
 Knowledge, 640.  
 " degree of, 84.  
 " example to realize what is, 85.  
 " foundation of, 86.  
 Koran, 73.

## L.

Labor, 632, 633.  
 Lactantius, 23, 24.  
 Language, 232.  
 Law, definition of, 199-202.  
 " Kepler's, 200.  
 " civil and canon, rules of, 204.  
 " English, distinctions of, 205.  
 " Roman, 206.  
 " description of, 207.  
 " standard of right, etc., in, 208.  
 " directory of, 210.

Law, remedial part of, 213.  
 " vindictory part of, 214.  
 " by the Law and Prophets, 539.  
 " which governs thought, 482.  
 " of sufficient reason, 483.  
 " real character of the, 581.

Lawyers' maxim, 100.  
 Leslie's four-fold proof of historical fact, 428.  
 Letters of alphabet, 255.  
 Light, undulatory theory of, 495.  
 Livy, 276, 278, 279.

## M.

Man, 84, 122, 231, 385, 420, 449, 522, 523, 548, 642.  
 Mani, legend of, 64.  
 Mankind believes, 57.  
 Manuscripts, Vatican, 307, 308.  
 Maori, 42, 43.  
 Materialism, refutation of, 492.  
 McCosh, President, 176-178.  
 Men, wisdom of, 98.  
 " rights of, 208.  
 Metaphysics, irreligious, 89.  
 Metaphysical conceptions, 520.  
 Messiah, prophecy of, 139.  
 Mexican exhortations to virtue, etc., 66.  
 Mexicans, 46-48.  
 Mill, Stuart, 229.  
 Milton's contrast to Homer, 259.  
 Minds, 257.  
 Miracles as attestation of revelation, 337.  
 " of Christ, 338.  
 " of Simon Magus and others, 339.  
 " proof of, 343.  
 Modern pedants, 115, 116.  
 Money, love of, 114.  
 Mongolian Khonds, 39, 40.  
 Monophysites, 609-615.  
 Morality in Scriptures, 221, 528, 529.  
 " utilitarian, 228.  
 Moses, 120, 123, 165, 531.  
 Moses' ritual, 115.  
 Muhammed, teachings of, 74.  
 Müller, 65.

## N.

Natural religion, effect of, 17.  
 " " preface to proof, 25, 26.  
 " " records of, 63.  
 Nature, study of, 83.  
 Neander, 526.  
 Nestorianism, 607, 609-613.

- Newman, 370.  
 New Testament tells, 131.  
 " " presents, 138.  
 " " conversions in, 149.  
 " " 321.  
 " " the phrase, 325.  
 " " disputed books of, 325.  
 " " authenticity of, 330.  
 Newton, 95.
- O.
- Obedience to rulers, 182.  
 "Old Bailey Theology," 16.  
 Old Testament, 16, 105, 107, 124.  
 " " unity of, 106.  
 " " history sure of, 110.  
 " " religion of, 111.  
 " " revelation of, 112.  
 " " religion central figure, 119.  
 " " as literature, 123.  
 " " conversions in, 148.
- Open questions, 363.  
 Origen, 420.  
*Origin of Species*, 247.  
 Osiris, hymn to, 34.  
 Oysters, 518.
- P.
- Paley's definition, 230.  
 Papuans, 41.  
 Parables, the seven, 130.  
 Pascal, 449, 450, 498.  
 Passover, certainty of, 429, 430.  
 Paul, St., 128, 133, 149, 150, 374.  
 Pentateuch, scope of, 12, 13.  
 Persia, 36-39, 63.  
 Phavorinus, tradition of, 551.  
 Pherecydes first, etc., 67.  
 Philology, 246.  
 Phœnicians, 583.  
 Physiology, 245.  
*Pilgrim's Progress*, 163.  
 Plant, 515.  
 Plutarch on Egyptian creed, 36.  
 Poetry, 92, 257, 267.  
 Political economy, 244.  
 Polynesia, 40.  
 Prayer of Hindu religion, 61.  
 Prescott, 46.  
 Pride, a victim of, 648.  
 Prodigal Son, 131.  
 Prophecy, 364, 371, 375.  
 " three conditions of, 349.  
 " the Messiah, 353.  
 " objects of, 358.  
 " and miracle, 355.
- Prophecy of destruction of Nineveh, 358.  
 " of destruction of Babylon, 358.  
 " of destruction of Tyre, 360.  
 " of Christ in Plato, 370.  
 " of Constantinople, 368.  
 " of America, 368.  
 " of Shakespeare, 369.  
 " mentioned by Thucydides, 366.  
 " objection to the idea of, 366.
- Prophecies in Holy Writ, 353, 371.  
 " of St. Malachi, 369.  
 Prophet, definition of, 117.  
 Protestant Sectaries, 411.  
 Protoplasm, 501.  
 Psalmanazar, George, 311, 312.
- R.
- Rabbi Hillel, tradition of, 120.  
 Reason, perfection of, 87, 99, 647.  
 Rebecca and Jacob, 530.  
 Rechabites, 286.  
 Reformation, 253, 254, 559.  
 Religion, 5, 16, 154, 211, 268, 493, 496, 553.  
 " derivation, disputed, 22, 23.  
 " and superstition, 24.  
 " of China, 27-29, 588.  
 " of India, 30-34.  
 " of Egypt, 34-36, 590.  
 " of Germany, 39.  
 " of Persia, 36-39, 592.  
 " of Mongolian race, 39-40.  
 " of Polynesia, 40.  
 " of Greece and Rome, 48-52, 593.  
 " of Old Testament, 111.  
 " of Christ, 148, 254, 258, 356, 402, 421, 576, 600, 641.  
 " of Jewish people, 287.  
 " defence of, 303.  
 " one, 282, 356.  
 " revealed in Old Testament, 333, 357.  
 " testimony to, 422.  
 " cannot logically be rejected, 494.  
 " objections to, in astronomy, 498.  
 " praise to, 645.  
 " necessity of, 241.  
 " the champions of, 552.
- Reproof, 621.

- Resurrection, 434.  
 Revealed truth, 412.  
 Revelation, 377, 526, 557.  
   " summary of, 18.  
   " necessity for, 52, 53, 76.  
   " brings, 80.  
   " "shining" proof of, 117.  
   " author of, 127, 155, 290.  
   " evidence of, 394, 18, 19.  
   " and inspiration, 382.  
 Reward and punishments, 58, 114.  
 Rhetoric, 92.  
 Rig-veda, hymn in, 30.  
 Ritual of Moses, 115.  
 Roman world, 183, 277, 399, 400, 448.  
   " people, 278.  
   " emperor, worship of, 447.  
 Rome and Israel, 280.  
 Rome, fall of, 184, 185.
- S.
- Sacraments, in the, 424.  
   " Christian, 427-431.  
 Sacred manuscripts, authenticity, 11, 12.  
 Saviour, argument of, 56.  
 Sceptic, ideal, 651.  
 Sceptical subtleties, 89.  
 Scepticism, 16, 637.  
   " revolting phase of, 649.  
   " summary of, 650.  
   " religious, 651.  
 Schism, 598.  
 Science, "what is," 238, 493.  
   " of China and India, 169.  
   " of Muhammedan Arabs, 170.  
   " of political economy, 244.  
   " advance of, 237.  
   " circle of, 239.  
   " absence of, 240.  
   " tendency of, 242, 646.  
   " benefits of religion to, 248.  
   " difficulties in, 506.  
   " contradictions in, 516.  
 Scott, 122, 530.  
 Scripture, 306, 379, 384.  
   " contains, 78, 249, 284.  
   " unity of, 103, 383.  
   " superstition in, 24.  
   " confirmation of, 109, 296, 384, 504.  
   " events, preservation of, 110.  
   " destruction of, 301, 302, 316.
- Scripture, real text of, 307.  
   " miracles in, 341, 342.  
   " private interpretation of, 380, 381.  
   " books of, completed, 386.  
   " meaning of, 389.  
   " absence of, in Harvard College, 177.  
 Self-preservation, 54.  
 Sense of right and wrong, beauty, etc., 90.  
 Slavery, extirpation of, 187, 209, 456-460.  
 Sloth, 548.  
 Socrates, martyr of truth, 69.  
   " rested faith, etc., 70.  
   " last words, etc., 76.  
 Sodom and Gomorrah, 127.  
 Sophist shrinks, 97.  
 Soul's preëxistence, 79.  
 Soul, unity of, 91.  
   " four powers of, 421.  
 Sovereignty, legitimate, 195, 196.  
 S. Paul, 133-135, 133, 149, 150, 154, 374, 416.  
   " John, 135.  
   " Stephen, 128.  
   " Peter, 136, 138, 373.  
   " James, 137, 148.  
   " Augustine, Confessions, 81.  
 Stallo, 496, 514.  
 Stoic, 594.  
 Substance necessary to phenomena, 87.  
 Suggestions of man's nature, 21.
- T.
- Tacitus, 72.  
 Talmud, 8.  
 Ten Commandments, 114.  
 Tertullian, 224, 324, 325, 357, 417, 437.  
 Testimony to man's immortality, 75.  
 Theology teaches, 240.  
   " "queen of sciences," 169, 474.  
 Tradition, 388.  
 Traducianism, 79.  
 Transmigration in Brahmanism, 60.  
 "Trinity," the word, 418.
- U.
- Ulphilas, 188.  
 Unbelief, cause of, 542.  
   " treatment of, 546, 547.  
 Unbeliever, a learned, 57.

Unbeliever's accusation against Christian faults, 625-628.

University of Europe, typical, 173.

“ in England, 173.

“ in Germany, 174.

“ function of, 174, 177.

“ organized by church, 174.

“ is it possible, minus religion, 175.

Ur of the Chaldeans, 108.

V.

Vaccination, 505.

Vedas, quotation from, 59.

Virtue, “what is,” 102, 230.

Voltaire, 543.

W.

Walpole, Horace, 261.

Warburton, 114.

Wegschneider, 561.

Wilkes, Capt., 64.

Will, the, 95, 146.

“ conclusions in regard to, 96.

“ freedom of, 97-98.

“ perfection of, 99.

“ what wins the, 100, 101.

Women, 453-456.

Writers, vainglorious, 648.

X.

*Xenodochia*, 466.





















