



REYNOLDS COLLECTION

GEN

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 1833 01735 9529

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1880,
JAN-APR

METHODIST
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1880.

VOLUME LXII.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXXII.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D., EDITOR.

NEW YORK:
PHILLIPS & HUNT.
CINCINNATI:
WALDEN & STOWE.

1880.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXII.—1880.

JANUARY NUMBER.

	PAGE
WESLEYAN SYNERGISM AN ESSENTIAL OF ORTHODOX CATHOLICITY.....	5
The late Prof. JOHN P. LACROIX, of Ohio Wesleyan University.	
IGNATIUS AND HIS EPISTLES.....	31
CHARLES F. THWING, Andover, Mass.	
ISAAH'S VISION OF THE CROSS.....	45
Rev. M. S. TERRY, D.D., New York.	
HARMAN'S INTRODUCTION.....	72
Rev. JACOB TODD, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.	
ECHOES FROM AFRICA.....	88
EDWARD W. BLYDEN, Liberia, Africa.	
THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA.....	111
Rev. B. H. BADLEY, A.M., India.	
THE ITINERANT MINISTRY OF THE M. E. CHURCH.....	181
Rev. J. M. BUCKLEY, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.	
NOTES TO EDITOR IN REGARD TO THE OLD HYMN BOOK.....	157
SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES.....	160
FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.....	175
FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.....	178
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.....	180
EDITORIAL NOTE.....	204

APRIL NUMBER.

THE GLORIOUS RETURN OF THE VAUDOIS.....	205
Rev. ABEL STEVENS, LL.D., Geneva, Switzerland.	
EQUATORIAL AFRICA.....	232
Rev. E. WENTWORTH, D.D., Sandy Hill, N. Y.	
THE BASLE SESSION OF THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.....	257
Rev. JOHN F. HURST, D.D., President of Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.	
DISTRICT CONFERENCES.....	279
Rev. W. H. KINCAID, A.M., Pittsburgh, Pa.	
SHALL EDUCATION BY THE STATE BE EXCLUSIVELY SECULAR?.....	299
Rev. C. H. PATNE, D.D., President of Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.	
THE ITINERANT MINISTRY OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.....	316
Rev. J. M. BUCKLEY, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.	
THE WESLEYAN MISSION IN NEW ZEALAND.....	338
Rev. JOHN AEMITAGE, Editor of "New Zealand Wesleyan."	
SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES.....	353
FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.....	374
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.....	378

JULY NUMBER.

	PAGE
BISHOP WILEY'S VISITATION OF CHINA AND JAPAN.....	405
Rev. J. M. REID, D.D., Missionary Secretary M. E. Church.	
THE ETHICS OF EVOLUTION.....	430
BOLDEN P. BOWNE, Professor in Boston University.	
THE FRENCH REFORMED CHURCH, ITS SYNOD OF 1872, AND SUBSEQUENT EVENTS. [SECOND ARTICLE.].....	455
Rev. E. B. OTHEMAN, A.M.	
F. H. JACOBI.....	486
WESLEY C. SAWYER, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.	
ALZOG'S CHURCH HISTORY.....	504
Professor C. W. BENNETT, Syracuse University, N. Y.	
HARPERS' LATIN DICTIONARY.....	533
Professor J. W. MARSHALL, Paris, Va.	
SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES.....	563
FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.....	572
FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.....	576
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.....	577

OCTOBER NUMBER.

ADMINISTRATION OF CHURCH LAW.....	605
Judge GEORGE G. REYNOLDS, Brooklyn, N. Y.	
THE ETHICS OF SINCERITY.....	625
Rev. J. C. GRANBERTY, Professor in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.	
THE REGENERATION OF PALESTINE.....	646
Prof. WILLIAM WELLS, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.	
ECUMENICAL METHODISM.....	667
Rev. A. C. GEORGE, D.D., Parkersburgh, West Virginia.	
THE GREECE OF TO-DAY.....	681
Rev. A. LOWERY, D.D., New York.	
MILEY ON THE ATONEMENT.....	698
Rev. JOHN F. CHAPLAIN, Allentown, Pa.	
A HARMONY OF THE EGYPTIAN AND MOSAIC RECORDS.....	709
London (Wesleyan) Quarterly Review.	
SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES.....	730
FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.....	759
FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.....	764
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.....	766

5

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1880.

ART. I.—WESLEYAN SYNERGISM AN ESSENTIAL OF ORTHODOX CATHOLICITY.

LUTHARDT: *Die Lehre vom Freiem Willen und seinem Verhältniss zur Gnade.*

SCHAFF: *Creeeds of Christendom.*

DORNER: *Die Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie.*

STANLEY: *History of the Eastern Church.*

Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη.

SHEDD: *History of Doctrine.*

NEANDER: *Church History.*

HERZOG: *Encyclopädie.*

LICHTENBERGER: *Encyc. des Sciences Rel.*

How does man recover from sin? Is he active, or passive, in the process? Is his conversion a something that is simply done to him? or does he himself co-work in it? Does the responsibility for his conversion or his non-conversion rest exclusively upon himself? or does it rest upon God? Does the grace of God visit all men equally? or is it given in more abundant measure to a select few? Did the fall entirely annihilate the image of God in man? or does there still linger in depraved man *some* vitality of the God-consciousness, which may serve as a basis for his moral reconstruction?

The answer of Wesleyan Arminianism to these varied forms of a single question is thus: The fall of Adam introduced such disorder into human nature as to render it morally certain that all men, if left without gracious help, would freely fall into sin, and incur personal guilt. But this disorder, or de-

pravity, with which all men are born, is not to them personal sin, and hence is not punishable. It is of the nature of an inherited misfortune. Hence, if the propagation of the fallen human race is permitted at all, divine justice (not simply divine goodness; but divine *justice*) will feel bound to impart to all men a complete remedy for their hereditary misfortune. This remedy is furnished by the general presence of the Spirit of God, and furnished alike to every soul that is born into the world. This presence of the Spirit so counteracts the bondage of hereditary depravity as to raise every child of Adam into the conditions of a just probation, so that he is now abundantly able freely to elect between sin and righteousness, and thus to save or ruin his own soul. This impartation of the Spirit to all who are born into the world may, in an uncritical way, be called a *grace*, but only in the same loose way in which the original gift of conscience or of freedom of will might be likewise so called. *That, the non-giving of which would violate divine justice, is not properly a grace, but a simple justice.* The result is that every descendant of Adam, on first awaking to rational moral life, finds his hereditary depravity so far paralyzed as to constitute no longer a fatal bondage unto sin. He *can*, by the powers with which he finds himself already possessed, resist this bondage. It is only by the non-using of these powers that he incurs personal guilt, and thus transforms his hereditary misfortunes into a fatalistic bondage to sin—fatalistic until counteracted, upon repentance, by special *grace* properly so called. The question, What is the moral ability of the natural man? cannot, therefore, be answered without some defining of terms. The purely natural man, as he would have descended from Adam without the general gift of the Spirit, is a pure *abstractum*, a mere theological bugbear. He does not, and never did, exist. Divine justice forbade it. The only *real* man with whom theology has any thing to do is the empirical man of history. Now, with this man, the only real man, the influence of the Spirit of God is *congenital*. It is a part of the moral endowment with which he finds himself furnished on first awaking to moral self-consciousness. In virtue of this endowment he is able to choose, obey, and love God at the outset, and to ask for gracious help in the further progress of his life. Should he, however, fail to profit by his original

moral endowment, and thus fall into bondage to sin, he *may* even yet recover from his guilt and enslavement (if not persisted in too far) by accepting the special visitations of *grace*, repenting of his sins, and seconding the regenerating influence of the Spirit. He is, therefore, in either case a *synergist*, (from *σύν ἐργον*,) a *co-worker* with God, throughout his moral life. Such is the answer of Wesleyan Arminianism to the question or questions before us, as to the relation of man's freedom to God's grace.

Is this answer in harmony with the general consciousness of the Church catholic? Is it a heresy, a sectarian individualism? or is it an essential element of orthodox catholicity?

What says the history of theology? Let us consult the records. The results will not be without interest.

Passing over at once the testimony of the Scriptures, and simply assuming that this testimony is either synergistic or monergistic, either for or against the above-given synopsis of Wesleyan Arminianism, we come directly to the earliest Christian theology, that of the Greek fathers, and ask, How did they understand the Scriptures to teach on the subject before us?

We preface our examination by this general statement of Hagenbach, (*Hist. Doct.*, i, 155 :) "Freedom and immortality are those traits of the human mind in which is manifested the image of God. Such was the doctrine of the primitive Church, confirmed by the general Christian consciousness. All the Greek fathers, as well as the apologists, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and the Latin author, Minutius Felix, also the theologians of the Alexandrian school, Clement and Origen, exalt the *αὐτεξούσιον* (the *autonomy*, self-determination) of the human soul. . . . They know nothing of any imputation of sin except as a voluntary and moral self-determination is presupposed. . . . None but heretics ventured to maintain that man is subject to another influence than himself." With this statement Luthardt perfectly harmonizes. He says, (*Lehre vom Fr. Will.*, p. 13 :) "The idea of man's ability to choose between good and evil is a fundamental article with all the Greek theologians. It inspires their entire system of thought." In general, the Greek fathers excluded every thing of a magical character from their conception of sin and grace. Christianity was to them not the exclusive possession of the favored few

who stood in material contact with the written word or the organized Church, but it *virtually* belonged to the whole human family, to all who at any time or in any place honestly sought the truth. The self-revelation of God is universal. Where the specific revelation, through written words or living prophets, is wanting, there the *λογός σπερματικός* (the germinal word or revelation) is given. And all who humbly heed this general self-revelation of God are blessed and accepted of the Father. It is only a later and narrower age which presumed to confine God's pardoning graciousness to the material limits of the visible Church and sacraments.

As to the *modus* of conversion, the Greek fathers as a body, and in fact the entire theology of the Orthodox Eastern Church, are very positively synergistic. The key-note of their whole system is thus well expressed by Justin (born A. D. 89; *ob.* 176) in his *Apology*, i, 10: "Though we had no choice in our creation, yet in our regeneration we have; for God persuades only, and draws us gently, in our regeneration, by co-operating freely with those rational powers he has bestowed upon us." And with this thought Clement of Alexandria (*ob. cir.* 212) fully harmonizes. "God," says he, "co-operates with those souls that are willing." "As the physician furnishes health to that body which synergizes toward health, so God furnishes eternal salvation to those who synergize toward the knowledge and obedience of the truth."—*Strom.*, viii. Clement knows nothing of a *gratia irresistibilis*.—*Strom.*, viii, p. 855.

So teaches also Origen, *ob.* 254. His central view is thus stated by Shedd, (ii, 34:) "The faculty by which to will the right man has from God; but the decision itself is his own act. God's part is, therefore, greater than man's, as the creation of a faculty is greater than the use of it. Moreover, every right beginning of action on the side of man requires a special succor and assistance from God. Through the Holy Spirit this succor is granted, according to the worthiness of the individual; and thus every right act of man is a mixture of self-choice and divine aid, (*μικτόν ἐστιν ἐκ τε τῆς προαιρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς συμπροϊούσης θεοῦ ἀνάγκης*.—*Opp.*, ii, p. 571.)" In the same sense spoke also Theophilus of Antioch, *ob.* 181. He strongly emphasizes man's moral autonomy: "Ἐλευθερον γὰρ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον.—*Ad Autol.*, ii, 27.

In regard to depravity, or original sin, the Greek fathers agree in teaching that it is an inherited corruption or disorder of human nature, but not of the nature of sin proper, or guilt. Says Justin, (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, c. 124:) "All men deserve to die, because they have sinned *as Adam*," (ὁμοίως τῷ Ἀδὰμ.) Of the imputation of Adam's guilt he has no thought. Clement rejects the idea of imputing Adam's sin to his children. *Strom.*, iii, 16. Origen teaches that guilt arises only when we freely yield to the temptations to which our depravity exposes us. *De Princ.*, iii, 2. So teach also Tertullian (*De Bapt.*, 18) and Cyprian. *Ep.*, 64. The latter calls original sin *contagio mortis antiquae*, (*Ep.*, 59,) but says that it does not annul freedom. *De Grat.*, c. 2. Cyril of Jerusalem (*ob.* 386) says, "When we come into the world we are sinless, (ἀναμάρτητοι,) but now we sin from choice." He has the highest ethical notion of virtue: "There is no kind of souls that are either sinful or righteous *by nature*, but that we are either the one or the other proceeds only from free choice." Shedd, ii, 38. And with Cyril agree the other eminent Greek fathers—the two Gregories, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and the rest. Gregory Nazianzen declares (*Orat.*, xl) children to be ἀπονήπους, (innocent.) Gregory Nyssa denies that depravity in infants is sin. *Opp.*, iii, p. 317. Chrysostom held that, though mortal Adam could beget mortal descendants, yet sinful Adam could not beget sinful descendants. "No one owes any thing to justice until he first becomes a sinner for himself," (ὀκιοθεν.)

Evidently the idea of imputing the guilt of Adam to all of his descendants, and then of damning a large part of them because of that imputation, is an unorthodox invention of a later age.

As to the process of conversion, the Greek fathers of the fourth century are well represented by Gregory Nyssa, *ob. cir.* 395. "With him," says Schaff, "human freedom plays a great part." He lays far more stress upon heart-purity than upon a mere forensic justification. The path to deliverance from sin is the path of ethical endeavor, of humiliation, and self-mastery. When the soul in obedience to conscience heeds the voice of God, divine grace meets the soul and leads it into self-mastery. His general view (see Luthardt, p. 18) is as follows: "In consequence of the fall the divine image in us is

marred and affected with imperfection, (*ἀρρώστημα*.) We have from birth a tendency to sin, (*προς κακιάν ὁρμή*.) But this tendency does not break down our moral freedom. Freedom is of the essence of man; it is lost only when man ceases to be man. Moral freedom conditions the possibility of virtue. Take it away, and we cease to be moral agents; we could be neither praiseworthy or blameworthy. Now, freedom of will involves freedom to good as well as freedom to bad. Man is no longer a moral agent if he is unable to shun sin. But when a man has once fallen into sin, how is he to recover himself? First, under the experience of life and the guidance of the Spirit he is awakened to serious thought; he *comes to himself*. Then, when thus brought to see his real moral condition, he opens his eyes and welcomes the light, as a mortally sick man welcomes the physicians. His soul is thus filled with new light and life. The germ, the basis, of this new life lies hidden in every human being. It was not forfeited or annihilated by the fall. It is the ethical conscience, the God-consciousness. Were this lost there would be nothing of the human being left, and the regeneration of such an un-man would be a pure creation out of nothing. But does man regenerate himself? No! he *becomes* regenerate by accepting the chastenings of Providence, welcoming the visitations of the Spirit, and co-operating with divine grace."

These views of Gregory are fully shared by Basil the Great, *ob.* 379. "He teaches the co-operation of human liberty with divine grace, as the Greek Church has always taught."—Lichtenberger, *Encycl.*, ii, p. 104.

So also taught Gregory Nazianzen, *ob.* 390. He holds that the sinner is not to wait until some visitation of overpowering grace *drives* him to repentance, but rather that the grace necessary to his regeneration is congenital with him, and is ever ready to co-operate with him, whensoever he will.

Such is, also, the opinion of the great Chrysostom, *ob.* 407. "Chrysostom's theory of regeneration was firmly synergistic."—Shedd, ii, 40. "His synergism is that of the whole Greek Church."—Schaff, ii, 937. His general position is thus summed up by Neander, (ii, 659-661 :) "Gregory's deep feeling of the need of redemption led him to appreciate the necessity of divine grace, while his correct ethical conception induced him to

set a high value on the free-will of man as a necessary condition of all the operations of grace." In explaining Rom. v, 19, he says: "This passage is not to be so understood, as if by the sin of one all became actual sinners; it teaches, rather, simply that the condition of human nature, which to the first man was a punishment, was thus transmitted to all his posterity. But this misfortune only redounds to man's benefit if he is not remiss in the use of his will." "If we but *will*, not only death, but even Satan himself, shall never harm us." There is no such thing as irresistible grace. Grace is effectual in proportion to our co-operation with it. God draws us to him not by force, but by our own free-will.

The next great theologian of the East, Theodore of Mop-suestia, (*ob.* 428,) stood upon the border of the great Augustinian controversy. He endeavored to keep the true synergistic mean between the fatalistic divine monergism of Augustine and the merely human monergism of Pelagius. He distinctly rejected the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants. Man's inherited nature is not sinful, but corrupt. New-born children are not guilty of sin; hence they do not need baptism and the eucharist in order to their forgiveness. On the subject of grace Theodore held the orthodox view. Redemption extends to the whole human race. We are saved by faith in Christ, and by an obedient life. See Herzog, xv, 718. That Theodore was utterly opposed to all moral determinism is clear from the mere title of the work which he wrote against Augustinianism. It was entitled, "Against Those who say that Man Sins not by Free-will, but by Nature," (*φύσει.*) That this system was, on the other hand, not Pelagian, is thus stated by Neander, (ii, 656:) With the Pelagians he insisted on "man's inalienable freedom, as opposed to the doctrine of a constraining grace and of predestination. But *the great difference* between the two systems was *this*—that in the Pelagian the doctrine of a redemption and a Redeemer had no foothold whatever, while in Theodore's system it had a thoroughly essential one, and, indeed, constituted the central point of the system."

Kindred to the position of Theodore was that of Theodoret, *ob. cir.* 457. He co-ordinated the operations of grace and freedom in the manner of Chrysostom, making the efficaciousness of grace dependent upon its reception and use by human freedom.

Great and original thinkers in the Greek Church appeared occasionally throughout the Dark Ages. Their theology uniformly follows strictly in the wake of the orthodox synergism of Chrysostom and the Gregories.

Maximus Confessor, of the seventh century, (*ob.* 622,) produced profound works in the spirit of Gregory of Nyssa. On the subject of grace and free-will he says: "The faculty of seeking after the godlike has been implanted in human nature by the Creator. In consequence of sin this original faculty is overwhelmed by sense. But the Holy Spirit restores it to its pristine freedom and purity. Grace alone, however, does not operate independently of the natural faculties. Nor do the natural faculties work independently of grace. The Holy Spirit guides the spiritual striving of those who are seeking after the godlike to its desired end. The Spirit works not wisdom without a mind which is susceptible of it; nor knowledge without a recipient reason; nor faith without a rational conviction in the receiver; in a word, it produces no charisma whatever without the recipient faculty of each. The grace of the Spirit destroys not in the least the natural faculty, but much rather makes that faculty which has become inapt by unnatural use once more efficient by employing it conformably to its nature, when it leads it to the contemplation of the godlike."—Neander, iii, 172-3. From Palmer's account of Maximus (*Herzog*, xx, 136-7) we further cite: "In regard to depravity, Maximus is true to the orthodox Greek view. Moral freedom, (*τὸ ἀντεξούσιον*), as a constituent element of spiritual rationality, was not forfeited by the fall. This freedom is the principle of sin on the one hand, and the basis of redeemableness on the other. It is the element which receives and co-operates with regenerating grace."

Greatest among the later Greek theologians was John of Damascus, *ob.* 754. His *Ἐκδοσις ἡς πίστει* is one of the ablest and most systematic dogmatics which the Church had yet produced. In his soteriology he lays great stress on the rôle of human freedom. God made man innocent by nature, and autonomous (free) as to his will: *Ἐποίησε δὲ αὐτὸν φύσει ἀναμάρτητον καὶ θελήσει ἀντεξούσιον*.—ii, c. 12. The source of sin is not in man's nature, but in his volition: *οὐκ ὡς ἐν τῇ φύσει τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν ἔχοντα, ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει δὲ μᾶλλον*. Man has the power

to continue and to advance in the good, co-operating with God's grace; as, also, to turn away from the right, and to become involved in evil, God permitting it in the interest of human freedom: Ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα μένειν καὶ προκόπτειν ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τῇ θείᾳ συνεργούμενον χάριτι; ὡσαύτως καὶ τρέπεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ κακῷ γινέσθαι τοῦ θεοῦ παραχωροῦντος διὰ τὸ ἀντεξούσιον. For virtue is not a something that can be externally compelled: Οὐκ ἀρετὴ γὰρ τὸ βίᾳ γινόμενον. Man, being a rational being, rules over his nature rather than being ruled by it: Ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπος, λογικὸς ὢν, ἄγει μᾶλλον τὴν φύσιν ἢ περ ἄγεται. It is God's will neither that sin should exist, nor that human holiness should be the fruit of a merely divine efficiency: Οὐ γὰρ θέλει τὴν κακίαν γινεσθαι, οὐδὲ βιάζεται τὴν ἀρετήν. Thus is amply confirmed the statement of Hagenbach, as to this great theologian, (ii, 13:) "He every-where retained the principal definitions of the earlier Greek theologians concerning human *liberty*."

The views of John of Damascus were fully shared by all the eminent Greek theologians of the later Middle Ages: by Theodore Studita, (*ob.* 826,) Theophylact, (*ob. cir.* 1107,) Euthymius Zigabanus, (*ob. cir.* 1118,) Nicetas Choniates, (*ob. cir.* 1206,) and Nicolas of Methone. Euthymius, one of the best minds of the twelfth century, thus expresses the inefficaciousness of human effort without divine grace, and also the fruitlessness of grace without the co-operation of man's will: Μέγα δόγμα μανθάνομεν, ὡς ὅτε ἀνθρωπίνη προθυμία κατορθοῖ τι χωρὶς τῆς θείας βοήθειας, ὅτε θεία βοήθεια κέρδος φέρει χωρὶς ἀνθρωπίνης προθυμίας.—Herzog, iv, 250. Nicolas of Methone had even more eminent abilities than Euthymius. "He laid great stress on the freedom of the will."—Hagenbach, ii, 26.

As to the formal symbols of the Greek Church, they uniformly reflect the views of the above-mentioned great orthodox theologians: the Gregories, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, etc. These symbols embrace, 1. The decisions of the first seven Œcumenical Councils, (from A. D. 325 to 787;) 2. Certain extended confessions of modern times, framed in antagonism to Romanism and Protestantism. The decisions of the first seven councils are held in common with the Romish Church. They relate chiefly to the doctrines concerning God. So far as they are anthropological they reflect the Greek view. Of the later confessions we mention the following:

1. "The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church." Drawn up by Mogilas, (*ob.* 1647,) in 1640 it was sanctioned by a synod of the Greek and Russian clergy in 1643. It was then signed by the four Eastern Patriarchs. It is the fundamental creed of the whole Greek and Russian Church. On the subject of depravity and regeneration this confession teaches thus, (Schaff, *Creeds*, ii, 304-8:) God co-operates with our good acts, yet in such a manner as not to force our free-will. Though all are born with a depraved nature, yet each one can, by his will and choice, (*θέλησιν και προαίρεσιν*), through the use of grace, become a holy seed, or the contrary. Whether we are actually the children of God or of the devil depends upon ourselves; yet in this sense, that in our spiritual life divine grace co-operates with us, (*ή θεία χαρίς συμβοηθεύει*), though without forcing our wills.

2. The so-called "Confession of Dositheus" was sanctioned in 1672 by the most important Eastern synod of modern times. It was signed by the Patriarch Dositheus and sixty-eight Oriental Bishops and ecclesiastics. We cite from it the following affirmations: "God has predestinated to glory those who he foresaw would make good use of their free-will in accepting salvation, and has condemned those who would reject it, (*Καλώς [or κακώς] τῷ ἀντεξουσίῳ χρησομένων.*) [See Schaff, ii, 403.] But our free-will needs always the assistance of grace, which is amply given to all men. Those who oppose this view, and teach an unconditional predestination, are impious and blasphemous heretics. They insult God, and make him the author of monstrous cruelty. We lay upon them an eternal anathema, and declare them worse than infidels. God foresees and permits (but does not foreordain) evil, and he overrules it for good. The fall did not destroy man's free-will, (*τὸ ἀντεξουσίον.*) Good works done without faith cannot contribute to our salvation; only the works of the regenerate, done *under* grace and *with* grace, are perfect."

3. The "Larger Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church." This is the most authoritative standard of the Russian Church. It was adopted in 1839, and is very comprehensive. We cite as follows: "God has predestined to give to all men, and has actually given to them, preparatory grace and means sufficient for the attainment of happiness." "As

God foresaw that some would use well their free-will, but others ill, he accordingly predestined the former to glory, while the latter he condemned." "Was it for us all, strictly speaking, that Jesus Christ suffered? For his part he offered himself as a sacrifice strictly for all, and obtained for all grace and salvation; but this benefits only those of us who, for their parts, of their own free-will, have fellowship in his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death."

This brings us to the close of the stream of Greek orthodoxy. As to the question before us, the result is unmistakably clear: The great Oriental Church has taught from the beginning that in the process of regeneration, it is necessary that the human spirit and divine grace shall co-operate; and it has understood this co-operation, this synergism, substantially in the sense in which Arminius and John Wesley afterward taught it. Arminius and Wesley's view of the rôle of human freedom is no theological novelty, but is a correct reflection of the orthodox catholic consciousness as represented by the entire stream of Greek dogmatic thought. The Orthodox Oriental Church (embracing at least eight millions of the Christian population of the world) is *synergistic*.

How will it result with our examination of the other, the Western, stream of theological development? Is the Latin Church (with its modern offshoot, Protestantism) *synergistic* or *monergistic*? Is its general theological drift better reflected by John Calvin or by James Arminius?

Let us examine the records. We have already seen that the earliest Christian writers of the one common Church are very distinct in their recognition of the moral autonomy of man, and that this recognition was equally positive throughout the history of Greek Christian orthodoxy. Turning now to the beginnings of a distinctive Latin Christianity, we meet, first, with Irenæus, *ob.* 202. "Irenæus," says Dr. Schaff, "cannot conceive of man without the two separate predicates of intelligence and freedom." He insists that souls cannot be good or bad by mere nature, (*φύσει ἀγαθαί και πονηραί ψυχαί.*) Man is free, and is himself the cause of the good or the ill outcome of his life: "Liber in arbitrio factus et suae potestatis ipse sibi causa est, ut aliquando quidem frumentam, aliquando autem palea fiat." At the same time he insists that in fallen man

grace must co-operate with man's freedom. See Luthardt, 16: Hagenbach, i, 157.

Next we come to Tertullian, *ob. cir.* 220. His conception of regeneration is strictly ethical: "Fiant, non nascuntur Christiani." The image of God is not destroyed by the fall. Christianity meets a response from man's innate God-consciousness, ("anima naturaliter Christiana.") Even fallen man retains his moral freedom, (*τὸ ἀντεξούσιον.*) Moral freedom is not so much extinguished as hampered: "Quod a Deo est, non tam extinguitur quam obumbratur."—*De Anima*, 41. Grace transforms man only in co-operation with his freedom. Moral freedom, rightly used, constitutes a receptivity for grace, a possibility of faith.

Cyprian (*ob.* 258) was no less a synergist than Tertullian. The reception of grace presupposes faith: "Quantum fidei capacis afferimus, tantum gratiæ inundantis haurimus." And faith is not God's act, but man's: "Credendi vel non credendi libertas in arbitrio forita."—*Testim.*, iii, 54.

So taught also Hilary, *ob.* 268. The incipiency of the new life lies in ourselves: "Incipiendi a nobis origo est." It is of the essence of freedom that it acts of itself: "Voluntas nostra hoc proprium ex se habere debet, ut velit." God co-operates with our efforts: "Incipienti incrementum dabit." This moral significance or value of regeneration lies in the fact that it is not simply a thing done *to us*, like our creation, but one in which *we* have a part from the very start: "Meritum adipiscendæ consummationis est ex initio voluntatis." God helps us on condition of our being willing: "Volentes adjuvet, incipientes confirmet, adeuntes recipiat; ex nobis autem initium est." See Luthardt, 24.

Ambrose (*ob.* 398) laid greater stress than Hilary on prevenient grace, but was very positively synergistic. "We begin," says he, "our return to God, but we do not begin without God. The Sun of Righteousness wills that we turn toward it; and it is *ready* upon our turning." "Both Ambrose and Hilary teach the synergistic theory." Shedd, ii, 49.

Jerome (*ob.* 419) was synergistic. Man has the ability of good or of evil; which he actually does depends on his free choice. He stands between the two: "Inter hoc iurgium media anima constitit, habens in sua potestate bonum et malum

velle et nolle."—*Ad Gal.*, iii. Original sin is not guilt, but inherited disorder. From this disorder springs the necessity of prevenient grace. In order to salvation grace and freedom must co-operate: "Quamvis enim propria voluntate ad Deum revertamus, tamen nisi ille nos traxerit et cupiditatem nostram suo roboraverit praesidio, salvi esse non poterimus."—*In Jerem.*, i, 3. Predestination is conditioned on foreknowledge of man's free conduct.

We now come to the first noteworthy dissent from the catholic orthodox view of the relations of grace and freedom. Augustinianism is an innovation of the fifth century. But for more than half of his lifetime Augustine himself (*ob.* 430) held the orthodox catholic synergistic view. In 387 (at the age of 33) he held that it is by our free act of faith that we are cleansed from sin: "Peccatores credere jubentur, ut a peccatis credendo purgentur." A moral act of the will constitutes the reason why God justifies the one and not the other: "Praecedat aliquid in peccatoribus, quo, quamvis nondum sint justificati, digni efficiantur justificatione." A divine call (*vocatio*) turns man's attention to his need of salvation; but this *vocatio* becomes effectual only through the mediation of the will.

In his work on the will (A. D. 390) Augustine teaches thus: Despite all the weakness of the sinner, he has got the ability to pray, to ask, to strive. God opens to those who knock. Man is honored with the ability to seek rightly after salvation: "Tantum illi praestitit dignitatis, ut in ejus etiam potestate poneret, si vellet ad beatitudinem tendere." In commenting on Romans he says: "It is nowhere said that *God* believes all things in us. Our faith, therefore, is our own." "God gives his Spirit to one who he foreknows will believe."

About the time of his episcopal consecration (396) Augustine (at the age of 42) is thrown out of accord with catholic doctrine by the reaction of his opposition to Pelagianism. In combating undue freedomism he is led to extinguish moral freedom altogether. Two other factors helped to drive him to this extreme; namely, the remnants of his previous Manicheism and a physical conception of the action of grace. These influences were seen in his tractate, *Ad Simplicianum*. He here abandons the ethical character of the *vocatio* which God sends to sinners. The *vocatio* is now not the *occasion* of our

faith, but the *efficient cause* of it, ("vocatio est effectrix bonae voluntatis.") This physical conception of grace landed Augustine necessarily in the non-catholic, unorthodox view of a particularistic predestination. If the *vocatio* is *per se* effective of faith, and if the mass of men do not have faith, then, of course, the *vocatio* is given only to particular individuals—the elect.

Pelagius, ignoring the deep significance of the fall, had taught not only that our freedom enables us to initiate a holy life, ("possibilitas bonae actionis a Deo creatore insita,") but also that all the grace we need consists in simple instruction. Augustine did not correct this by holding that the downward force of universal depravity needs to be counteracted—and *is* counteracted—by an equally universal prevenient grace, (a grace which is only by accommodation termed *grace* at all, inasmuch as it is called for by the mere *justice* of God,) so that by this prevenient grace all men are now in fact able to co-work with the calling Spirit, and thus inaugurate holy lives; but he went to the opposite error, denied that the counteraction of depravity is a debt of divine justice, and held that this counteraction, wherever wrought, gives to us not only the ability to initiate a holy life, but also actually produces that life. Thus Augustinianism and Pelagianism are simply two equal heresies, each equally distant from the catholic doctrine, and each containing that half of the whole truth which the other suppressed. The true half of Pelagianism is its defense of the moral autonomy of man; its false half is its suppression of grace. It is a monergism of *man*. The true half of Augustinianism is its emphasizing the necessity of grace; its false half is its suppressing the moral autonomy of man. It is a monergism of *God*. The catholic view rejects the two errors and embraces the two truths. The catholic doctrine is not monergism but synergism. Neither God nor man, grace nor freedom, is to be suppressed; but grace and freedom co-operate.

The error of Pelagius tends to an insipid deism, that of Augustine to pantheism.

Another error which Augustine introduced into theology was that of a double, namely, a secret and revealed, will in God, the one not always harmonizing with the other. It came about thus: The Gospel is full of invitations to all men to come to God. But the grace of coming to God is not given to all.

Hence the expressed will of God is not identical with his real will. Some are called effectually: these God intended to save. Some are not so called: these God intended not to save. This monstrous dualistic self-contradiction in God the catholic orthodox Church has constantly condemned and rejected.

Anti-catholic consequences of Augustinianism are: 1. The damnation of unbaptized infants. They are damned in virtue of the imputation of Adam's guilt to all of his descendants. See Shedd, ii, 88. But this damnation is of a mitigated character: "Potest recte dici, parvulos sine baptismo de corpore exeuntes in damnatione omnium mitissima futuros." "Quis dubitaverit parvulos non baptizatos, qui solum habent originale peccatum, nec ullis propriis aggravantur, in damnatione omnium levissima futuros." See Schaff, ii, 836. 2. Another consequence is the damnation of the whole mass of the Gentile world. Even the virtues of a Socrates or a Lucretia are but masked sins, *splendida vitia*, and they can only serve to mitigate their damnation—"ut mitius puniantur."

During the lifetime of Augustine the potency of his personality made a profound impression in favor of his system. Soon after his death, however, the orthodox consciousness discarded more or less positively the uncatholic notions which he had taught. The predominant drift of catholic theology after Augustine assumed a mediate position between Augustine and Pelagius, sometimes inclining rather toward the one, and then toward the other.

Predestinarian writers are fond of stigmatizing this tendency as semi-Pelagian. It would be equally correct, however, to call it semi-Augustinian. And neither term can justly be regarded as a stigma. The fact is, the post-Augustinian orthodoxy is simply the catholic synergism which had been catholic from the beginning.

Among those who reasserted the Greek anthropology against Augustine was Cassian, (*ob.* 440.) Said Cassian: Man's depravity is not an extinction of all desire for the good. Man is conscious of his moral bondage, and he can and should seek after salvation—"velle sanari, quaerere medicum." The seeds of all holiness are sown by God in the souls of all men; but without the help of grace we cannot develop them: "Dubitari non potest, inesse quidem omnia animae naturaliter virtutum semina

beneficio Creatoris inserta, sed nisi haec opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire." So taught Cassian. His neglect to refer very emphatically to universal prevenient grace as counteractive of depravity has given pretext for accusing him with leaning toward Pelagianism. But in fact he taught in the same way as Chrysostom and the Gregories.

Cassian was warmly opposed by Prosper, (*ob. cir.* 455,) who endeavored to induce Pope Cœlestin to condemn Cassian. But the papal brief was quite unsatisfactory. It entirely omitted Augustine's irresistible grace.

Much less Augustinian than Prosper was the author (perhaps Pope Leo the Great) of the work *De Vocatione Gentium*. This work teaches thus: There is no particularistic predestination; God wills the salvation of all; grace is universal, but not dynamic (*violenta*) in action; human freedom has some co-operative influence in conversion. These views are insisted on without giving up some of the harsh features of Augustine.

Faustus of Rhegium (*ob. cir.* 493) stood between Cassian and Leo. He taught the universality of grace, the co-operation of freedom with grace, and the possibility of Gentile salvation—"lege naturae, quam Deus in omnium cordibus scripsit in spe adventus Christi." "The efficaciousness of grace," said Faustus, "depends upon the free-will of man."

The provincial synod of Orange, A. D. 529, gave its sanction to a very mild Augustinianism. It decreed as follows: "Grace is not merely bestowed when we pray for it, but grace itself causes us to pray for it; the disposition to believe is effected by grace; the free-will, weakened in Adam, can only be restored through the grace of baptism; when man sins, he does his own will; when he does good he executes the will of God, yet voluntarily; through the grace of God all may save their souls; none are predestinated to sin; without prevenient grace none can love God."

These articles of Orange, though so mildly expressed, are intended to antagonize the orthodox synergism of the Eastern Church, and of the whole Church before Augustine. Their fatal unorthodox point is the dynamic character of grace: prevenient grace is the *cause* of faith.

It was but a momentary victory. The milder views of Cas-

sian and Faustus—the same as those of Chrysostom—maintained their position, and were, in fact, the faith of the subsequent centuries. Let us now follow the course of catholic thought down to the next Augustinian disturbance in the Gottschalk controversy of the ninth century.

Under the influence of Faustus the innovations of Augustine had been condemned at two provincial synods—at Arles, in 472, and at Lyons, in 475. In the wake of these synods followed a succession of able theologians—Arnobius, Gennadius, Ennodius, Vincent of Lerinum—who maintained the orthodox synergism of the earlier Church.

The most prominent name in the following century is Gregory the Great, *ob.* 604. His system is partially Augustinian, but it contains elements which imply synergism. Among his positions are these: The good which we do is a joint product of grace and of the freed will: “Bonum quod agimus et Dei est, et nostrum: Dei, per praevenientem gratiam; nostrum, per obsequentem liberam voluntatem.” Grace can be lost. There is no absolute decree. Grace is prevenient and also subsequent. Prevenient grace operates, but also co-operates. Subsequent grace *helps* us to succeed—“ne inaniter velimus, sed possimus implese.” Wesleyan synergism is but a repetition of these sentiments.

In the path of Gregory followed Isidore of Seville, *ob.* 636. He holds thus: Prevenient grace makes the new life possible. “Before the gift of grace there is in man a free-will, but not a will efficient to good.” But Isidore’s system is not self-consistent.

How little the Latin Church held to the Augustinian innovations upon the old orthodoxy is evident from the suddenness with which the fatalistic predestinarian views of Gottschalk disappeared after his death. Gottschalk (*ob.* 868) taught as follows: There is a twofold predestination: “Gemina est prae-destinatio, sive electorum ad requiem, sive reproborum ad mortem.” Christ did not die for all. Baptism washes out depravity: but only the elect among the baptized will really be saved. The fall of man did not come about by man’s free-will, but was a part of God’s absolute decree, by which the whole drama of history was arranged beforehand.

These views of Gottschalk raised a storm of opposition.

They violated the catholic Christian consciousness. They were at once opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mayence, (*ob.* 856,) who affirmed that predestination was based on foreknowledge, that Christ died for all men, and that God would that all should be saved. How repulsive to the Christian public the views of Gottschalk were is plain from this statement of Rabanus to Hincmar, (see Hagenbach, ii, 57 :) "Notum sit dilectioni vestrae, quod quidem gyrovagus monachus; nomine Gotescale, qui se asserit sacerdotem in nostra parochia ordinatum, de Italia venit ad nos Moguntiam, novas superstitiones et noxiam doctrinam de praedestinatione Dei introducens et populos in errorem mittens; dicens quod praedestinatio Dei, sicut in bono, sic ita et in malo, at tales sint in hoc mundo quidam, qui propter praedestinationem Dei, quae eos cogat in mortem ire, non possint ab errore et peccato se corrigere, quasi Deus eos fecisset ab initio incorrigibilis esse, et poenae obnoxios in interitum ire."

Gottschalk's views were condemned by the Synod of Mayence in 848, and by that of Quiercy in 849. By the influence of Hincmar a second synod of Quiercy in 853 affirmed that election is conditioned upon foreknowledge, that the freedom of will lost in Adam is restored in Christ, that Christ died for all, and that God willed the salvation of all.

A few dissident bishops in vain opposed these positions in synods at Valence and at Langres, (859.) The revival of Augustinianism was but of spasmodic duration. The catholic consciousness would not, and never did, give up these sentiments, (affirmed at Quiercy in 853.) to wit: "Homo libero arbitrio male utens peccavit et cecidit. Deus elegit secundum praescientiam suam. Perituros non praedestinavit ut perirent. Libertatem arbitrii quam in primo homine perdidimus, per Christum recepimus. Et habemus liberum arbitrium ad bonum, praeventum et adjutum gratia; et habemus liberum arbitrium ad malum, desertum gratia. Deus omnes homines sine exceptione vult salvos fieri, licet non omnes salventur."

From Hincmar we pass now to the next great exponent of catholicity, Peter Lombard, *ob. cir.* 1160. Lombard is an earnest defender of the *ethical* nature of the religious life. He holds that faith, though assisted by prevenient grace, is an act not of God but of man, and that this act is pleasing to

God, and is rewarded by God by richer gifts of grace. He says, (*Sent., lib. ii, d. 27*;) "Actus nostri sunt meritorii in quantum procedunt ex libero arbitrio moto a Deo per gratiam. Unde omnis actus humanus, qui subicitur libero arbitrio, si sit relatus in Deum, potest meritorius esse. Ipsum autem credere est actus intellectus assentientis veritati divinae ex imperio voluntatis a Deo motae per gratiam: et sic subjacet libero arbitrio in ordine ad Deum: unde actus fidei potest esse meritorius—si tamen adsit caritas."

In Anselm (*ob. 1109*) there is a partial leaning toward Augustine. Nevertheless, he held it as absurd to say that man is free to evil but not free to good, ("non esse liberum arbitrium nisi ad mala.") He endeavored to maintain freedom of will without giving up predestination. The beginning of a holy life presupposes *prevenient* grace; its continuance, *attending* grace. Anselm makes no use of merely formal freedom, therein agreeing with Augustine.

Bernard (*ob. 1153*) taught that freedom of will remains after the fall. It is real, though feeble—"etsi miserum, tamen integrum." To will (*velle*) is present, but to accomplish (*posse*) is lacking. Here is the need of grace. In this Bernard agrees with Lombard, who says: "Dei gratiam non advocat hominis voluntas vel operatio, sed ipsa gratia voluntatem praevenit praeparando ut velit bonum, et praeparatam adjuvat ut perficiat." Thus, though man is free, yet without grace he cannot free himself from the bondage of depravity. This brings us back to the true catholic view, which has prevailed, on the whole, from the beginning.

The slightly wavering course of Anselm was followed by Hugo, St. Victor, Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and some others. These all insist, however, on the moral autonomy of man, and thus defend the original and permanent catholic view in a manner which Augustine would have condemned; but yet they retained the use of the Augustinian phraseology on the subject of foreknowledge and predestination, and vainly endeavored to explain the latter into consistency with the former.

St. Victor (*ob. 1141*) says: "We must distinguish from each other the act of willing in itself and the direction of the will to a particular object. Willing in itself is purely the act of

man; but as soon as it directs itself to particular objects it finds itself limited by the divine order of the world, so that it can take only the direction where the way has been left open for it by the latter." Before his fall man was equally able to sin or not to sin, "*posse peccare et posse non peccare.*" After the fall, and without grace, he can only sin, "*posse peccare et non posse non peccare.*" By the aid of prevenient grace he can sin or not sin, "*posse peccare et posse non peccare.*" In the state of Christian sanctification he has risen above the liability to sin, "*posse non peccare et non posse peccare.*" With such essentially catholic synergistic views the retention of predestination could manifestly be but an empty phraseology.

Alexander Hales (*ob.* 1245) says: "God's foreknowledge is all-embracing, and yet man's acts are truly free and contingent. Free-will and destination stand in no contradiction to each other: *Ipsium liberum nostrum arbitrium est una causarum secundum ejus ordinationem ad suos effectus currit series fati.*" With these views of Hales Albertus Magnus fully coincides. He distinctly holds that human volition is a true *cause*.

Thomas Aquinas, (*ob.* 1274,) though seriously entangled in the innovations of Augustine, yet constantly repels the unethical consequences of that system. He assigns a positive value to the free-will of man. Says Shedd, (ii, 312 :) Aquinas "teaches that the remission of sin depends to a certain extent upon the character and conduct of the individual." Thus Aquinas is a synergist.

Bonaventura (*ob.* 1274) speaks of predestination, but bases it in God's foreknowledge of the free conduct of man: "*Praesentia includit in cognitione liberum arbitrium et ejus co-operationem et vertibilitatem.*" This is the uniform catholic view.

Duns Scotus (*ob.* 1308) is no longer hampered by the novelties of Augustine. He thoroughly safeguards man's moral autonomy. In the will we are to distinguish between *potentia* and *habitus*, between formal freedom and determined freedom. The latter is generated by the action of the former, and not the converse, as Augustine taught; otherwise, freedom would be compromised. Conformity to the will of God, as effected by man in co-operation with grace, constitutes a fitness for

heavenly reward. Predestination is contingent. It in no way binds the freedom of man.

The tendency of Duns Scotus in respect to man's moral autonomy was the prevailing one in the following centuries.

We pass at once to the last of the scholastics, Gabriel Biel, *ob.* 1495. Biel taught that inherited depravity is not *per se* positive, damnable sin. It is a defect, ("carentia justitiae originalis.") Man, though free, is yet unable without assisting grace ("gratia gratum faciens") to lead a God-pleasing life. It is only by the co-operation of grace and our own moral nature that rewardable virtue ("bonum meritorium") is possible. Biel went so far as to hold that as man possesses real, not seeming, moral freedom, hence he is abstractly able to avoid sin; but that, nevertheless, in the concrete reality of life this abstract possibility is never realized. A holy life is never realized without grace. Such is the extent of Biel's much-decried Pelagianism.

But the uncatholic fatalism of Augustine was not entirely lost sight of. Occasionally an isolated mind, charmed with its seeming high appreciation of grace, raised a feeble voice in its behalf. Thus Thomas Bradwardine (*ob.* 1349) proclaimed the most absolute fatalism. In order to exalt God and abase man he held that God is the sole, direct, absolute cause of all that takes place in time. Hence there is no ground for a distinction between foreordination and foreknowledge. Predestination does not depend on foreknowledge — "quod nulla scientia Dei causatur a posterioribus rebus scitis." Even sin is, in a certain sense, willed by God. Man's will is a mere form in which God's will operates. God's will and grace are irresistible and unconditioned.

It was only by such uncatholic, unscriptural, fatalistic, and pantheistic errors that earnest though narrow men like Gottschalk and Bradwardine undertook to counteract the over-emphasizing of human ability which had practically, not theoretically, been occasionally exhibited by official orthodoxy. It is but the uniform phenomenon of human weakness. "Similia similibus curantur." One error is thought to be cured by another. But the matter is worse than that in this case. For a merely practical error is thought to be cured by committing a grave theological one. Human autonomy, moral liberty, is

thought to be kept within due limits by suppressing it altogether. Divine co-operating grace is thought to be honored by making it all-operative, and by changing it from an ethical to a magico-dynamic character.

The earnest Wiclif (*ob.* 1384) fell into this fatalistic departure from catholicity. In the footsteps of Bradwardine he held that God's causative action is the sole cause of all that *is*. And he avoided making God the direct cause of sin only by denying all positive character to sin. Sin is not an actuality, but simply a *non ens*. So far as sin exists, it is willed by God: "Deus necessitat creaturas singulas activas ad quemlibet actum suum." This manifestly annihilates all possibility of human freedom. And yet Wiclif stands aghast at this consequence, and endeavors by subtleties to avoid it. Thus his moral consciousness is synergistic and catholic, while his speculations are Augustinian and Gottschalkian.

It is by a curious though entirely unessential connection of things that the Reformation of the sixteenth century—that intense virtualization of man's moral autonomy, (*αὐτ-εξούσιον*), that highest proof of the reality of man's individual initiative power—becoming outwardly associated with an unorthodox form of doctrine, theoretically annihilated that very autonomy of which it was itself the intensest exemplification. That this association of a revived Christian life in Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin with uncatholic and unorthodox notions of an unconditional predestination and of the irresistibility of grace, was not essential but simply incidental, is evident (to cite but a single reason) from the entire absence of these notions from the great Wesleyan revival of the eighteenth century. What more thorough, spiritual, and lasting reformation than this can be cited in the whole history of the Church? And who denies its thoroughly synergistic character?

But the alliance of the Reformation with an uncatholic speculative theology is readily accounted for on historical grounds. By the time of the Reformation it had become a long-standing tradition that opposition to the official orthodoxy should assume the form of an exaggerated Augustinianism. In the first place the predestinarian innovations of Augustine himself had been officially condemned. Then, in the ninth century, when the wandering monk, Gottschalk, put himself

into antagonism to the Church of the age, it was in the name of an extreme supralapsarian predestination that he appeared. Gottschalk was rewarded for his zeal by being harassed and vexed to death. Thus his earnest, persecuted life and his high predestinarianism became historically closely associated. Four centuries later Bradwardine revived the fatalistic views of Gottschalk. He escaped persecution only by dying before official attention became fixed upon him. Wiclif took up the views of Bradwardine, and was condemned and persecuted. Huss, whose theology was but an echo of that of Wiclif, was condemned, and his followers were put down by fire and sword. Thus it had become traditional that earnest protests against the practical irreligion of the priesthood were allied with an uncatholic theology. And thus it was *a priori* almost certain that any future assaults upon the religious abuses of the official Church would be associated with an unorthodox predestinationism. And this merely incidental historical association constituted in fact the mold by which, a century later, the theoretical systems of Luther and Calvin were actually shaped.

Before noticing the peculiar doctrines of Luther and Calvin, it will be well to trace the current of Latin orthodoxy down to its latest utterances on the question before us.

Wimpina (*ob.* 1531) charged Luther with teaching direct fatalism. To this he opposed the catholic doctrine thus: If even the heathen, (Rom. i, 14,) who have but the "lex naturae," can by preventing grace ("solo auxilio divino praeventi") do works "moraliter bona," how much more is this the case with those who have the "lex scripta" and the help of special grace!—"auxilium gratuito movens!" Grace is not irresistible—"hominem non cogit ad bene operandum." It simply works with the will—"assistat et juvet arbitrium." We are synergists with God: "Dei sumus adiutores, quod alii synergos, id est, co-operatores appellarunt." The "libertas arbitrii" is annulled neither by preventing grace ("generalis influentia") nor by the grace of special awakening, ("auxilium gratuito voluntatem movens;") but it is simply helped. The ground of predestination is the foreseen good or bad conduct of the subject. Without grace men cannot turn to God—"non possunt sese praeeparare."

The notorious Eck (*ob.* 1543) pleaded boldly for orthodoxy against the early fatalism of Melancthon: "Quia omnia de necessitate absoluta eveniunt, nulla est arbitrii libertas." Against this he had but to exclaim: "What need, then, for *preces, consilia, praemia virtutum, poenae, leges, statuta!* Though we owe to God all that we have, yet this does not exclude the "activitas liberi arbitrii." Though without grace a holy life is impossible, yet the action of grace is not of a physico-dynamic character; it does not *force*, but it *co-operates with* the will."

Erasmus (*ob.* 1536) stood firm against the revival of the errors of Augustine. He held thus: Freedom of will in man in general still exists, otherwise sin would not be sin. Our good lives are the joint products of divine grace and human freedom. Awakening grace is universal; no one is without it.

The Council of Trent (1546) in its philosophy of regeneration formulated what had been essentially the voice of orthodoxy from the beginning. It held thus: By the fall of Adam all men have so become the servants of sin that they are unable ("non possunt") by the law of nature to be liberated ("liberari") therefrom. Nevertheless, free-will is not extinct. The beginning of the regenerated life is from the prevenient grace of God. This grace becomes effective by man's freely assenting to and co-operating with it, ("gratiae libere assentiendo et cooperando.") Though man is able to reject grace, yet he is unable by his own free-will ("libera sua voluntate") to turn to holiness. "If any one saith that man's free-will, moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co-operates toward disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification, and that it cannot refuse its consent if it would, but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever, and is merely passive: let him be anathema." So reads Canon IV, on Justification. And Canon V is equally explicit: "If any one saith that since Adam's sin the free-will of man is lost and extinguished; or, that it is a thing with only a name; yea, a name without a reality, a figment, in fine, introduced into the Church by Satan: let him be anathema." And the unorthodox notion of the physico-dynamic action of grace is thus condemned in Canon XXIII: "If any one saith that a man once justified can sin

no more, nor lose grace, and that therefore he that falls and sins was never truly justified, . . . let him be anathema."

In these positions the Council of Trent did but re-affirm that which had been catholic doctrine from the beginning. Its voice on these points is the voice of the whole orthodox Church of the Orient. And, aside from the individualistic novelties of Augustine, it is essentially the voice of the whole series of great theologians of the West. And these definitions are final and authoritative in the whole Latin Church to this day.

Thus it appears that of the 370,000,000 of Christians in the world at the present time nearly three fourths (Schaff gives 190,000,000 of Latins, 80,000,000 of Greeks, and 100,000,000 of Protestants) teach essentially the synergism which has prevailed in the Church catholic from the beginning.

When we now turn to the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century we are confronted at once by the curious fact that the three great founders of Protestantism—Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin—were decidedly uncatholic and unorthodox on the subject of the relation of divine grace to the action of the human will. They all became entangled in a physico-dynamic conception of the action of God on the souls of men. From this resulted necessarily the *irresistibility of grace*: grace being a dynamic, an efficient cause *per se*, it always produces its intended effect. This led to a *partial atonement*: Christ did not die for all, otherwise all would be saved: for grace can never be defeated. And this gives rise to the invention of two *unscriptural decrees* of election and of reprobation. But it was impossible to deny that the Bible proclaims a ready salvation for all men. How is the force of that to be evaded? By the monstrous invention of a *dualistic will in God*—a *revealed* will which offers salvation to *all* men, and a *secret* will which nullifies and defeats the revealed will!

Such was the immense ballast of uncatholic error with which Protestantism was hampered from its very infancy. Why did not the young Church sink under the burden? Simply because these errors are of such a nature that it is impossible *practically to believe them*. They imply that salvation is exclusively from God, that God saves just *whom*, and *when*, and *how* he pleases, and that all the efforts of man are incapable either of preparing, or hastening, or *in any way contributing one iota*

thereto. Now, the logical tendency of such a belief would be to paralyze all human effort and concern about our ultimate salvation. But the dogma is so contradictory to our moral consciousness that it cannot be fully believed and acted upon. Its reflex, its *indirect*, effect is to awaken in us a very strong, trembling desire that "we individually might also be among the happy number of God's elect." Now, *this desire itself* is already *essentially* a humble petition for salvation. It is a thirsting for salvation. It is really a very strong virtualization of man's moral autonomy or ethical freedom of will. It is an actual co-operating with that grace which is the congenital heritage of every child of Adam. And this right use of present ability conditions, sooner or later, a richer presence of God in the heart—the normal result of all which is a true, orthodox, catholic, synergistic conversion, such as had been taking place in the Church from the beginning.

Thus the erroneous theories of the young Protestant Church were of such a nature as to be simply hinderances, but not entire barriers, to spiritual reformation. They only retarded, but could not defeat the efforts of good and holy men. Providence uses imperfect instruments. Essentially good movements are often enwrapped in very erroneous speculations. But our healthy intuitional subjectivism will not heed our speculative abstractions, and often arrives at its goal in spite of them.

But that the predestinarian fatalism of the early Reformers was an immense misfortune to the new Church is clearly manifest from two considerations: 1. The cause of God does not need the assistance of theological and anthropological error. And surely the unvarying testimony of orthodox catholicity against an unconditional predestination justifies us in regarding such predestination as an error until it proves itself to be true. 2. The whole history of Protestant theological thought for now three and a half centuries has consisted *partly* in a vain endeavor to explain unconditional predestination into consistency with our moral intuitions, but *chiefly* in the work of eliminating and casting it off. Bright names in this great movement of Protestant emancipation and of return to orthodox catholicity are Melancthon, Arminius, Wesley. The essence of this movement has consisted in simply the self-assertion of the healthy Christian consciousness.

The final result is, that of the 100,000,000 of Protestants now existing the very large majority have long since found their way back to the simple synergistic doctrine of œcumenical orthodoxy, while with the remnant the Augustinian errors are held more as a matter of official symbolic thralldom than from hearty youthful conviction. They lurk rather in the scholastic seminaries than in the evangelical pulpit.

We conclude, therefore, by the emphatic re-assertion of our thesis, to wit, that the synergism which was taught by Mr. Wesley is an essential of orthodox catholicity, and, by consequence, that the monergism of Augustine, Luther, and Calvin is an individualistic innovation, destined ultimately to be entirely sloughed off.

ART. II.—IGNATIUS AND HIS EPISTLES.

I. PERSONAL HISTORY.

OF the personal history of Ignatius, as of the personal history of the great majority of the Apostolical Fathers, little is known; and this little cannot be accepted with full faith in its trustworthiness. Tradition relates that he was the child whom Christ placed before his disciples as the model of humility, (Matt. xviii, 2-4; Mark ix, 36;) and as the Saviour took the child in his arms, Ignatius was consequently surnamed Theophorus, "Borne or carried by God."* The chief authority for his personal history is the *Martyrium Ignatii*, a brief narrative professing to be written by those who accompanied him on his voyage to Rome and witnessed his death. Though its genuineness has been questioned by Daillé (Dallæus) and others, it has been regarded by most scholars as the work of Philo, Agathopus, and perhaps Crocus, whom Ignatius mentions as his traveling companions.† Accepting the genuineness and authenticity of the narrative, we learn that Ignatius was bishop of the Church at Antioch at the close of the first and beginning of the

* In the "Martyrdom" (ii) this term is explained as meaning, "He who has Christ within his breast."

† Epist. to Smyr., x; to Phila., xi; to Rom., x.

second century; * that he presented himself as a Christian before Trajan's tribunal on the occasion of that emperor's expedition against Armenia and the Parthians; † that he was condemned to suffer death at Rome; that he journeyed to that city and wrote letters to the Churches on the way; and that on his arrival he was consigned to the wild beasts in the Coliseum. These are the prominent facts in the life of Ignatius. But of his personal characteristics, accepting provisionally the genuineness of his seven epistles, a more full exhibit can be made. As from the footprints on the shore Cuvier or Agassiz determined the species and size of the animal, so from the epistles of Ignatius may be learned his character by means of the impressions which he stamped upon them.

The most prominent characteristic of the author of these letters is courage. Fear is unknown to him. He is bold to apparent rashness. He is eager for a martyr's crown. "I am," he writes, "the wheat of God, and let me be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ." ‡ "Entice the wild beasts," he begs his friends, "that they may become my tomb." "May I enjoy the wild beasts." "I am eager to die." Courage, bravery, fearlessness, is the conspicuous element in the character of Ignatius.

The examination of the cause of his courage reveals a second fundamental characteristic—his love of Christ. His affection for the incarnate Lord is burning and impulsive. It is as intense, to compare human things with divine, as the emotion of Abelard toward Heloise, or as self-sacrificing as the love of David for Absalom. Rejoicing in his sentence of death, he sings, "I thank thee, O Lord, that thou hast vouchsafed to honor me with a perfect love toward thee, and hast made to be bound with iron chains like thy apostle Paul." "Let," he

* Traditions differ concerning the episcopal succession. He was probably either the first or second successor of Peter.

† It is uncertain whether this expedition occurred in 106-107 or in 114-115. Coins and documents represent that Trajan did not come to Antioch on his Parthian expedition till 114 or 115. The text of the "Martyrium" upon this point is doubtful. It is either "ninth" or "nineteenth." The supposition of Tillemont, of two expeditions, is untenable.

‡ The translations are taken from the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," edited by Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL.D. Vol. i. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1867.

exclaims, in the divine aspiration of his soul, "let fire and the cross, let the crowds of wild beasts, . . . let all the shatterings of the whole body, let all the torments of the devil, come upon me; only let me attain Jesus Christ." Why, he asks, does he surrender himself to death, to fire, to the sword, to wild beasts? Because he who is near to the sword is near to God, and he who is among the wild beasts is in company with God, provided only he be so in the name of Jesus Christ. Ignatius is, as Novalis says of Spinoza, "God-intoxicated;" but, unlike the great pantheist, his spirit is aflame with love for the personal, living, dying, and ever-living Christ. In the strength of the incarnate God he is strong. Of his faith in the God-man is born his Pauline courage.

Flowing from his courage and Christian faith is a third element in the author's character—enthusiasm. His beliefs, his thoughts, glow with the white heat of the intensest emotions. They are not cold intellections; they flash with the furnace-fire of the feelings. The strongest metaphors quiver with the agitation which he throws into them. "It is better for me to die in behalf of Jesus Christ than to reign over all the ends of the earth," he confesses. "Suffer me to obtain pure light," he begs. "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God," he commands. His enthusiasm impels to Trajan's tribunal; it hurries him across the seas to his martyrdom.

But through the warp and woof of this courage, Godward love, and enthusiasm, runs a thread of spiritual pride. In the whirl of his emotions, in the sportings of his imagination, in the extravagance of his exclamations, is discernible a hauteur neither Christ-like nor Pauline. The excesses of his wild metaphors are very unlike the calm assurance of "I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith." Their intensity breathes not only a sublime faith in the incarnate God, but also a consciousness of nobler experiences than those to which Roman or Ephesian Christian has attained. "I have," he writes, "great knowledge in God," and lest he perish through boasting a constant restraint curbs his words. His Epistle to Polycarp is colored with emotions which hardly deserve a milder term than spiritual conceit. He addresses the disciple of St. John not as an equal, but as a pupil. He implores him to give himself to prayer without ceasing. He

beseeches him to stand firm as an anvil when it is beaten. He exhorts him to be wise and to flee the arts of the devil. He commands him to be watchful and possess a sleepless spirit. A consciousness of his superiority to his brother bishop and other Christians flows through his letters. The heir of a salvation toward which he so rapidly journeys, he forgets that others are pressing toward the mark for the prize of the same high calling.

Allied with his pride in his Christian virtues is his respect for the authority and institutions of the Church. On his pages first appears the term the "Catholic Church"—*καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*, (*Smyrnius*, chap. viii.) His pen is the first and the ablest of the early Fathers to advocate the most comprehensive unity of its organization and purity of its doctrine. To the bishop respect should be paid, he argues, as to Christ, since the one whom the master sends to be over his household should be respected as the master himself. With a similar sacredness he invests the presbyter. The presbyter is made the disciple of the bishop, as John and Peter were of Christ. In his pages not only have "the glorious company of the apostles" and "the goodly fellowship of the prophets" been endowed with divine rights, but also the holy Church throughout all the world has become the vicegerent of the King of kings.

The sixth and last element in the character of the author of the Ignatian letters which we shall examine is his tenderness toward others, or his courtesy. Occasionally this tenderness is manifested in a propensity to flatter. He tells the members of the Magnesian Church that they are "full of God," and that his Christian experience is not worthy to be compared with that of any of their number.

This courtesy of disposition is also exhibited in his treatment of those whom he deems heretics. Though pleading with earnestness for the unity of the Church, the shafts of his arguments directed against schismatics are poisoned with neither bitterness nor hate. A kindly charity breathes in his words. "Evil offshoots will produce death-bearing fruits," are the harshest terms which he discovers for the errors of the Docetæ. His severest denunciation of heretics is the plain statement that they are of this world, and shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But at the same time he urges prayer for their re-

pentance. His opponents in Christian doctrine and Church organization he treats with a civility which indicates the courtesy of his nature. This courtesy, however, is more frequently manifested in care and anxiety for the welfare of his fellow-Christians. He is a most diligent pastor. He constantly warns his flock of the wolves who would carry captive the sheep of the divine Shepherd.

II. EPISTLES.

No less than fifteen epistles are extant bearing the name of Ignatius. Two are addressed to the apostle John, and one each to the Virgin Mary, to Mary of Cassobolis, to the Tarsians, to the Antiochians, to Hero, (a deacon of the Church at Antioch,) and to the Philippians; also to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp, a single letter each is inscribed. These epistles are represented by several MSS. written in several languages. (1) Two Greek MSS. contain all the letters with the exception of the two to John and the one to the Virgin. MSS. in Latin corresponding to the text of the Greek are also extant. (2) A Greek MS. ascribed to the eleventh century contains at least nine epistles: * the epistle to the Smyrnæans, to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Philadelphians, to the Trallians, Mary of Cassobolis to Ignatius, Ignatius to Mary of Cassobolis, and a part of the epistle to the Tarsians.† To this MS. also corresponds a Latin version which is supposed to belong to the fourteenth century. An Armenian version, said to be as early as the fifth century, contains thirteen epistles. (3) Three MSS. in Syriac contain the epistle to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans. The discovery of these MSS. forms an era in the discussion of the Ignatian literature. In the years 1838, 1839, and 1842, Archdeacon Tattam, of England, visited the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, in the desert of Nisria, in Egypt. From that monastery he obtained a large number of ancient Syriac MSS. They were deposited in the British Museum, and, on an examination by the distinguished Oriental scholar, the late Dr. William

* It is mutilated at the end, and, therefore, the exact number originally contained in it cannot be ascertained.

† See "Quarterly Review" for 1851, "Ignatian Epistles," for excellent summaries, pp. 73 seq.

Cureton, were found to contain the three epistles just named. The principal question discussed since the discovery of these Syriac MSS. respecting this literature is, Does the Greek or the Syriac version more exactly represent the original Ignatius? It is, of course, granted that the MSS. now existing were not themselves written by the martyr. Dr. Cureton even considers that the Syriac MS. of the epistle to Polycarp belongs to the middle of the sixth century.

Before entering upon the consideration of the genuineness of these different versions we believe we cannot be of greater aid to the reader than by placing before him the translation of the Epistle to the Romans as found in the Syriac. This epistle fairly represents the author's style and method of thought, and conveys an accurate idea of the discussion as conducted in the other letters.

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

Ignatius, who is [also called] Theophorus, to the Church which has received grace through the greatness of the Father Most High; to her who presideth in the place of the region of the Romans, who is worthy of God, and worthy of life, and happiness, and praise, and remembrance, and is worthy of prosperity, and presideth in love, and is perfected in the law of Christ unblamable: [wishes] abundance of peace.

I. From of old have I prayed to God that I might be counted worthy to behold your faces which are worthy of God; now, therefore, being bound in Jesus Christ, I hope to meet you and salute you, if it be the will [of God] that I should be accounted worthy to the end. For the beginning is well arranged, if I be counted worthy to attain unto the end, that I may receive my portion without hinderance, through suffering. For I am in fear of your love, lest it should injure me. As to you, indeed, it is easy for you to do whatsoever ye wish; but as for me, it is difficult for me to be accounted worthy of God, if indeed ye spare me not.

II. For there is no other time such as this that I should be accounted worthy of God; neither will ye, if ye be silent, [ever] be found in a better work than this. If ye let me alone, I shall be the word of God; but if ye love my flesh, again am I [only] to myself a voice. Ye cannot give me any thing more precious than this, that I should be sacrificed to God while the altar is ready; that ye may be in one concord in love, and may praise God the Father through Jesus Christ our Lord, because he has deemed a bishop worthy to be God's, having called him from the East to the West. It is good that I should set from the world in God, that I may rise in him to life.

III. Ye have never envied any man. Ye have taught others.



Only pray ye for strength to be given to me from within and from without, that I may not only speak, but also may be willing, and that I may not merely be called a Christian, but also may be found to be [one]; for if I am found to be [so], I may then also be called [so]. Then [indeed] shall I be faithful, when I am no longer seen in the world. For there is nothing visible that is good. The work is not [a matter] of persuasion; but Christianity is great when the world hateth it.

IV. I write to all the Churches, and declare to all men, that I willingly die for the sake of God, if so be that ye hinder me not. I entreat of you not to be [affected] toward me with a love which is unseasonable. Leave me to become [the prey of] the wild beasts, that by their means I may be accounted worthy of God. I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of the beasts shall I be ground, that I may be found the pure bread of God. Provoke ye greatly the wild beasts, that they may be for me a grave, and may leave nothing of my body, in order that when I have fallen asleep I may not be a burden to any one. Then shall I be a disciple of Jesus Christ, when the world seeth not even my body. Entreat of our Lord in my behalf, that through these instruments I may be found a sacrifice to God. I do not, like Peter and Paul, issue orders unto you. They are apostles, but I am one condemned; they indeed are free, but I am a slave, even until now. But if I suffer I shall be the freedman of Jesus Christ, and I shall rise in him from the dead, free. And now, being in bonds, I learn to desire nothing.

V. From Syria, and even unto Rome, I am cast among wild beasts, by sea and by land, by night and by day, being bound between ten leopards, which are the bonds of soldiers, who, even when I do good to them, all the more do evil unto me. I, however, am the rather instructed by their injurious treatment; but not on this account am I justified to myself. I rejoice in the beasts which are prepared for me, and I pray that they may in haste be found for me; and I will provoke them speedily to devour me, and not be as those which are afraid of some other men, and I will not approach them; even should they not be willing to approach me, I will go with violence against them. Know me from myself what is expedient for me. Let no one envy me of those things which are seen and which are not seen, that I should be accounted worthy of Jesus Christ. Fire, and the cross, and the beasts that are prepared, cutting off of the limbs, and scattering of the bones, and crushing of the whole body, harsh torments of the devil—let these come upon me, but only let me be accounted worthy of Jesus Christ.

VI. The pains of the birth stand over against me.

VII. And my love is crucified, and there is no fire in me for another love. I do not desire the food of corruption, neither the lusts of this world. I seek the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ; and I seek his blood, a drink which is love incorruptible.

IX.* My spirit saluteth you, and the love of the Churches which received me as the name of Jesus Christ ; for those also who were near to [my] way in the flesh preceded me in every city. Now,† therefore, being about to arrive shortly in Rome, I know many things in God ; but I keep myself within measure, that I may not perish through boasting, for now it is needful for me to bear the more, and not to pay regard to those who puff me up. For they who say such things to me scourge me ; for I desire to suffer, but I do not know if I am worthy. For zeal is not visible to many, but with me it has war. I have need, therefore, of meekness, by which the prince of this world is destroyed. I am able to write to you of heavenly things, but I fear lest I should do you an injury. Know me from myself. For I am cautious lest ye should not be able to receive [such knowledge,] and should be perplexed. For even I, not because I am in bonds, and am able to know heavenly things, and the places of angels and the stations of the powers that are seen and that are not seen, am on this account a disciple ; for I am far short of the perfection which is worthy of God. Be ye perfectly strong in the patience of Jesus Christ our God.‡

Although few in number, some scholars regard the whole body of the Ignatian literature as spurious. Baur, following out the principles of the Tübingen school in relation to the earliest patristic writings, considers it a fiction of the later half of the second century. Dr. W. D. Killen, too, declares them to be forgeries.§ The principal reasons, based upon internal evidence, which Dr. Killen applies specially to the Syriac epistles, are applicable to all the letters. If the Syriac version is spurious, *a fortiori* is the Greek.

"1. The way in which the word of God is ignored in these epistles argues strongly for their spuriousness. Every one acquainted with the early Fathers must have observed their frequent use of the sacred records. A considerable portion of a chapter is sometimes introduced in a quotation. Hence it has been remarked that were all the copies of the Bible lost, and the writings of these Fathers preserved, a large share of the holy volume might thus be recovered. But Ignatius would contribute nothing to the work of restoration ; as, in the whole

* Chap. viii of the Greek is not contained in the Syriac version.

† The remainder is also found substantially in Trallians iv, v.

‡ "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," vol. i, pp. 281-285.

§ See "The Ancient Church : Its History, Doctrine, Worship, and Constitution Traced for the First Three Hundred Years," by W. D. Killen, D.D. London. 1859. Pp. 414-428.

of the three letters, not a single verse of Scripture is given at length.

"2. The chronological blunders prove their spurious character.

"3. Various words are employed in a meaning which they did not acquire till a time long after the death of Ignatius. 'Purity' or 'chastity' and 'bishop' are such terms.

"4. The puerilities, vamping, and mysticism of these letters proclaim their forgery.

"5. The unhallowed and insane desire and anxiety for martyrdom which appears throughout these letters is another decisive proof of fabrication."

But in favor of the genuineness of at least a certain part of the Ignatian literature several arguments are presented, the evidence of which, controverting the points just cited, amounts to hardly less than positive proof. It may here be remarked that the most strenuous defenders of this literature do not at the present day claim genuineness for other than the seven epistles to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, to the Romans, to the Philadelphians, to the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp. The following arguments are limited in their application to these seven letters.

1. The testimony of the Fathers. In the epistle of Polycarp to the Church at Philippi, written probably in the first quarter of the second century, the author remarks: "The epistles of Ignatius which he wrote unto us, together with his other letters which have come to our hands, we have sent to you according to your order, subjoined to this epistle; and ye may be greatly profited by them, for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the Lord Jesus." Eusebius, in his "Ecclesiastical History," informs us that these letters of Ignatius, alluded to by Polycarp, were quoted by Irenæus. In the third century, Origen twice cites Ignatius by name. But the most important testimony is that of Eusebius, which is remarkably full and exact:—

Ignatius, who is celebrated among many, even to the present time, had obtained the episcopate, being secured in the succession from Peter at Antioch. Of whom it is related that being sent from Syria to the city of Rome, he was devoured by wild beasts on account of his confession of Christ. And passing through Asia under the vigilant guard of his keepers, confirming the dioceses, as he stayed at each city, by verbal discourses and exhorta-

tions, he charged them most especially to beware of the heresies then springing up and beginning to abound, and exhorted them to maintain resolutely the tradition of the apostles, which for the more security he thought it necessary to set forth in writing also, thus confirming it by his own testimony. Having, therefore, arrived at Smyrna, where Polycarp was, he writes one epistle to the Church at Ephesus, mentioning its pastor, Onesimus; another to that at Magnesia on the Mæander, in which again he makes mention of their bishop, Damas; and another to that in Tralles, mentioning Polybius as then being its ruler. Besides these, he writes to the Church of the Romans; to whom he addresses an entreaty that they would not disappoint him of his hope and desire by interceding for the remission of his sentence. [Here follows the narrative found in Romans v, as quoted.] After he had set forth from Smyrna he wrote again from Troas to the Philadelphians and to the Church of the Smyrnæans, and particularly to Polycarp, its president, to whom—forasmuch as he well knew him to be an apostolical man—like a true and good shepherd he committed his flock at Antioch, entreating him diligently to take the charge of it. Moreover, in his epistle to the Smyrnæans he reports a saying, I know not whence derived, speaking in this manner concerning Christ: But I know and believe him to have been in the flesh, even after his resurrection. And when he came to Peter and the rest, he said unto them: Take hold, handle me, and see that I am not a spirit without body.

2. The vigor and freshness of their style also indicate the genuineness of these letters. These qualities are exemplified in the liberal quotations we have made, and are not such as a forger could easily counterfeit.

3. The quotations from the New Testament are very few. This proves that they were written at a time when the MSS. of the New Testament were difficult to obtain; that is, in the sub-apostolic age.

4. The directness and simplicity of its method of opposing the principal heresies of the early Church, particularly Gnosticism, show that these errors were in the first stage of development.

5. Though episcopacy is lauded,* the primacy of Rome is not recognized even in the epistle to the Romans.† This fact, though allowing no inference as to a definite date, indicates that the letters were composed not later than the third century.

The question, however, still remains for consideration, Does the Syriac or the shorter Greek recension more accurately represent the original Ignatius? That the longer Greek recension

* See Tral., vii, *et alia*s.

† Schaff's "History," i, 470.

was formed by interpolations in the shorter is now granted by the common consent of scholarship. Respecting the genuineness of the Syriac or of the shorter Greek version, we incline toward the belief that the Greek more correctly represents the epistles as they were written by the martyr. The following reasons appear to us conclusive:—

1. The testimony of Eusebius, of the fourth century, proves the existence of the seven epistles which we now have in Greek. But, according to Dr. Cureton, the MS. of the Syriac version is not earlier than the sixth or seventh century, two or three centuries later than the date of Eusebius' "History," when the Greek version was circulating through the East.

2. The Greek version agrees with the citations made by the Fathers, not only of the first three centuries, but also with those of the fourth, fifth, and sixth, with an accuracy similar to that which is observed in the patristic quotations of the Scriptures.

3. The Syriac version is in places obscure for the lack of words which the Greek text supplies.

4. The translation and abridgment of Greek MSS. into Syriac was not uncommon in the first centuries of the Christian era.

5. A careful scrutiny and comparison of the Syriac and the Greek text indicates that the former is an abridgment of the latter. Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Uhlhorn, after a most minute examination of the two versions, arrived at this conclusion.*

6. The sixth and last argument that we present for the genuineness of the Greek text is derived from the personal characteristics of the author which are impressed upon the writings. These characteristics, it will be remembered, we found to be in the first division of the paper, courage, spirituality, enthusiasm, spiritual pride, extreme loyalty to the Church, and courtesy. These personal qualities, it must be observed, could not be inferred from the Syriac version.

The introduction of those personal elements into the problem of the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles materially aids its solution. The first question to be considered in relation to them is, Are these the characteristics which would be demanded in the bishop of the Church at Antioch, and which would be disciplined by the duties of that office. If they are, a strong argument follows for the genuineness of the letters; if they

* See "Quarterly Review" for 1851, pp. 97, 98; Schaff's "History," i, p. 471.

are not, a corresponding presumption is established in behalf of their forged character.

Antioch was the metropolis of Syria. It had been the residence of the Syrian kings. It was, under the early emperors, the capital city of the East. Art and architecture had made it a Syrian Athens. Wealth had been so profusely lavished in its adornment that it was known as "the golden." In its cypress groves the Daphnean pleasures were celebrated with more than oriental luxuriance and exquisiteness. This city of architectural magnificence, profuse wealth, and pagan wickedness, was for the first centuries the center of Gentile Christianity. Here the disciples were first called Christians. Here Paul labored, and from the city's gates he set forth on his first missionary journey. Its bishops, headed, tradition relates, by Peter, ranked *in ordine dignitatis* after those of Rome and Alexandria. Its Christians numbered, in Chrysostom's day, 100,000, and its Church ministered to the needs of 3,000 of its poor. Antioch was, therefore, the Syrian Jerusalem. What, then, were the qualities needed in a bishop of such a Church of such a city in the last years of the first and the first years of the second century? Courage, that persecution may be endured without disruption of membership. Spirituality, love to Christ, that doctrine may be kept pure, that the allurements of pleasure may not beguile. Pride, that the consciousness of divine duties may repel the Christian from the degradations of heathenism. A loyalty to the Church, that neither imperial edict may cause dismay nor internal jealousies create disunion. And courtesy, that the charity of which the apostles who abode in the city wrote may blossom in all its life. The qualities which are demanded in the Antiochan bishop, and which were disciplined by the episcopal office, are precisely the qualities which are impressed upon the Ignatian epistles. The agreement is obvious. Ignatius was bishop of the Church at Antioch, and the characteristics of his reputed letters are the characteristics which were needed in and disciplined by that office.

The second consideration in the solution of the problem relates to the consistency of these characteristics. Do they contradict each other? Are they natural, or, to use Dr. Whateley's word, are they plausible? If they are, the inference is strongly in favor of the genuineness of the letters from whose contents

they are deduced. The courage manifested in the Ignatian literature is of a most impulsive type. It bursts into hyperbole. It riots in extravagance of simile. It should not, however, for this reason be condemned as unreal. It is no more peculiar than the bravery of the Scottish Wishart, who, as he is bound to the stake, exclaims, "You shall not see me change my countenance. I fear not the fire." The courage of the martyr described in the letters is of that intense type befitting a follower of Stephen. Of the same strong cast, too, are his love to Christ and his enthusiasm. His spiritual pride, moreover, is the natural result of his courage, combined with a consciousness of the responsibilities with which he is clothed. His loyalty to the Church flows from his loyalty to his God, whose visible body is in peril of being torn asunder by schismatics. And his tenderness toward others is the obedience to his Master's command of loving his neighbor as himself. These characteristics are natural, plausible, consistent. They are colored with the intensest reality. The inference is, therefore, allowable that the writings whence they are drawn are neither forgeries nor the patch-work of fabricators, but that they are the genuine productions of the pen of him whose name they bear.

The conclusion, therefore, which this protracted examination necessitates favors the genuineness of the shorter Greek recension. This is the conclusion now generally adopted by the best scholars, and one that has recently been fortified by the work of Zahn. Until, therefore, more light is shed upon the question in consequence of new comparisons of the text or by the discovery of new MSS., critical opinion must incline toward the position that the Greek version more accurately represents the original Ignatius than the Syriac.

The teaching of these epistles, whose genuineness we have endeavored to prove, should be exhibited more fully than the previous drift of our discussion has permitted. Two points deserve consideration.

1. *Christology.* The representations of the letters respecting the divinity and humanity of Christ are remarkably full and positive. God was manifested by Jesus Christ his Son, who is the Word, not spoken, but essential.* Of himself he can do nothing.† He was begotten by the Father before the beginning

* Mag., viii.

† Ibid., vii; John v, 30.

of time; the only-begotten Son, he remains the same forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.* The prophets foresaw him by the Spirit, and waited for him as their teacher, and expected him as their Lord and Saviour, saying, "He will come and save us."† But he was truly man as well as truly God. He possessed all the faculties of a human being. He ate, and drank, and slept.‡ He was born of a virgin, baptized by John, and crucified by Pilate. He lived a

Holy life, and healed every kind of sickness and disease among the people, and wrought signs and wonders for the benefit of men; and to those who had fallen into the error of polytheism he made known the one and only true God, his Father, and underwent the passion, and endured the cross at the hands of the Christ-killing Jews, under Pontius Pilate the governor and Herod the king. He also died, and rose again, and ascended into the heavens to him that sent him, and is sat down at his right hand, and shall come at the end of the world, with his Father's glory, to judge the living and the dead, and to render to every one according to his works.§

2. *The Church.* The teaching of the letters regarding the Church, the bishop, and the sacraments, is exhibited in the following extract:—

See that ye all follow the bishop, even as Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the apostles. Do ye also reverence the deacons, as those that carry out [through their office] the appointment of God. Let no man do any thing connected with the Church without the bishop. Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is [administered] either by the bishop or by one to whom he has intrusted it. Wherever the bishop shall appear there let the multitude [of the people] also be; even as where Christ is, there does all the heavenly host stand by, waiting upon him as the chief captain of the Lord's might, and the governor of every intelligent nature. It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to offer, or to present sacrifice, or to celebrate a love-feast.¶ But that which seems good to him is also well-pleasing to God, that every thing ye do may be secure and valid. ¶

In conclusion, it only remains to present a brief review of the Ignatian controversy. Since the publication of the longer Greek recension by Pacæus in 1557 and by Gessner in 1559, and of the shorter Greek by Archbishop Usher in 1644, down

* Mag., vi; Dan. ii, 44; vii, 14, 27.

† Tral., x.

‡ Some refer this to the Lord's Supper.

† Mag., ix; Isa. xxxv, 4.

§ Mag., xi.

¶ Smyr., viii.

to the discovery of the Syriac version, criticism vacillated in its adherence to these two texts. The longer Greek was defended by Whiston (1710-11) and by C. Meier, (1836.) Daillé (Dalléus) (1666) refused to acknowledge the authenticity of either version; but the *Vindiciæ* of Bishop Pearson, (1672,) in reply to Daillé, inclined critical opinion toward the acceptance of the shorter Greek. In 1743 Lardner, ("Credibility of Gospel History,") though favoring the views of Pearson, acknowledged that, "whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side," he had "found it a very difficult question." Similar expressions of doubt were made by Justin, (1751,) Mosheim, (1765,) Griesbach, (1768,) Rosenmüller, (1795,) Neander, (1826,) and by other scholars. The discovery of the Syriac MSS. reopened the discussion. In 1846 Dr. Cureton published his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, and three years later his *Corpus Ignatianum*, defending the Syriac version. His view was accepted by Lee, (1846,) Chev. Bunsen, (1847,) Ritschl, (1851, and later in 1857,) Weiss, (1852,) and by Lipsius, (1856;) and rejected by Jacobson, by Hefele in his third edition of the "Apostolic Fathers," by Dewzinger, (1849,) Petermann, (1849,) Uhlhorn, (1851 and 1856,) Rothe, (1837,) Huther, (1841,) and by Düsterdieck, (1843.) Dorner, (1845,) before the publication of the Syriac MSS., accepted the shorter Greek recension.

ART. III.—ISAIAH'S VISION OF THE CROSS.

PRE-EMINENT among all Messianic prophecies, unsurpassed in the grandeur and solemnity of its poetic diction, profound in its divine teachings beyond most other Scriptures, and full of inimitable pathos, stands the inexhaustible Fifty-third of Isaiah. It is the ancient *Ecce Homo* of an inspired man of God, an Old Testament Psalm of the Cross, setting forth in rhythmic form a prophetic picture of Vicarious Atonement. To be appreciated by the English reader it should be presented to his eye in poetic form, and our language affords no better measure than that of the heroic blank verse in which to set this matchless jewel of Hebrew poetry.

RHYTHMIC VERSION OF ISAIAH LII, 13—LIII, 12.

- 13 Behold, with wisdom shall my servant act;
 He shall rise, and be lifted and become
 Exceeding high. (14) As wonderstruck on thee
 Multitudes gazed, (so marred from man his form,
 And his appearance from the sons of men,)
- 15 So shall he sprinkle nations, multitudes.
 O'er him shut kings their mouths; for what was not
 Told them they saw, and what they had not heard
 (LIII.) They have been meditating. (1) Who believed
 What we heard? And Jehovah's arm, on whom
 Was it uncovered? (2) And he shall grow up
 Like a young shoot before him; like a root
 From the dry earth. No graceful form was his,
 Nor ornamental splendor; and we looked,
 And not a sight that we could wish for him!
- 3 Dishonored and forsaken of mankind,
 A man of sorrows, knowing sickness well,
 He was like one who hides the face from us,
 Dishonored, and we valued not his worth.
- 4 Surely, our sicknesses he lifted up;
 Our sorrows, he bore them; and we supposed
 That he was stricken with a penal curse,
 Smitten of God, and pained! (5) And he was pierced
 For our transgressions; crushed down for our sins;
 The chastisement of our peace upon him,
 And by his stripes came healing unto us!
- 6 All we like sheep have gone astray; each man
 To his own way we turned us, and Jehovah
 Mediated in him the sin of all of us.
- 7 Harassed was he, and he was sunken low
 In anguish, but he opened not his mouth.
 As a sheep to the slaughter he was led,
 And as a ewe before her shearers, dumb
 With silence, and he opened not his mouth.
- 8 From suffering and from judgment he was seized,
 And in his generation who will tell
 That he was cut off from the land of life
 Because of the transgression of my people,—
 A curse for them? (9) And he shall give the unjust
 His sepulcher, and the rich man in his death,

- Although no act of violence wrought he,
 And there was no deception in his mouth.
- 10 Thus was Jehovah pleased to crush him down ;
 He made him sick. If thou set forth his soul
 An offering for sin, he shall see seed ;
 He shall prolong his days, and in his hand
 The pleasure of Jehovah shall prevail.
- 11 Of the laborious travail of his soul
 Shall he see ; he shall be well satisfied.
 In his superior knowledge will he bring,
 The righteous one, my servant, righteousness
 To multitudes, and their sins he will bear.
- 12 Therefore will I apportion him a lot
 With many, and among the mighty ones
 Will he divide the spoil. Because he bared
 To death his soul, and was with sinners numbered.
 And he the sin of many took away,
 And for the sinners ever intercedes.

CRITICAL NOTES.

Chap. lii, 13. In harmony with all the ancient versions, (Chaldee excepted,) we translate חָכָמָה, *shall act with wisdom*. Deut. xxix, 8 ; Josh. i, 7, 8 ; Prov. xvii, 8 ; and Jer. x, 21, are cited by some scholars as instances where the word is equivalent to פָּרַח, *to prosper*, which is the reading of the Chaldee ; but in all these cases the primary and acknowledged meaning, *to act wisely*, suits the context as well, if not better. Nor does Hebrew parallelism require, as some critics have assumed, that the several members must closely correspond in thought. It is the wise action of Jehovah's servant that contributes as a means to his great exaltation. *And be lifted*—Not *extolled*, as the common version here renders נִשָּׂא. It is doubtful if נִשָּׂא ever has that meaning. The literal and common signification of the passive form, (Niphal,) *to be lifted*, best conveys the thought, which Jesus also utters in John xii, 32 ; and Paul in Phil. ii, 9. See a thorough and exhaustive discussion of this word, especially in its relation to the doctrine of Atonement, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1873 ; pp. 422-464.

Verse 14. *Wonderstruck*—The word נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה includes in its signification mingled surprise, horror, astonishment, and awe.

It often requires several English words to present the full force of a single Oriental term. *To gaze in wondering astonishment* is all implied in the single Hebrew word here used. *Marred*—The word מַרְבֵּי is really a noun meaning *defacement* or *deformity*; from מָרַב, *to destroy*. But in this construction it is best rendered as a passive participle. *Marred from man*—ן here has the meaning and force of *separation and distinction from*; which makes it more specific than a mere comparative, “more than any man.” His form was so marred as to be different from the ordinary appearance of a man.

Verse 15. *Sprinkle*—Such is elsewhere the only meaning of the word הִזָּק. But it is usually construed with עַל, or לָ, and with mention of that which was sprinkled. Hence several eminent scholars have suspected a corruption of the text, and proposed other readings. The Septuagint has θαυμάζονται, *wonder at*; and Le Clerc, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig and Knobel adopt in substance this meaning, though with various slight modifications. Gesenius (*Lex.*) renders, *So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself*. But we may safely dismiss the proposed emendations as far-fetched and needless, and the Septuagint version, with all its modifications by these later critics, as unsustained by any thing analogous in the language. The absence of the particle עַל or לָ is no sufficient reason for giving the word הִזָּק an entirely new and different meaning, and it is reasonable to assume that the prophet purposely avoided a direct and particular specification of the substance to be sprinkled. He uses an incomplete but pregnant expression, and leaves his readers to gather his meaning from the ordinary hallowed associations of the word. See an able exposition of this passage by Professor Tayler Lewis, *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1873. *O'er him kings shut their mouths*—יִבְּטְאוּ, *over him*; that is, *on account of him*; or, more precisely, as they look upon him and ponder over him. Nägelsbach well observes, “On account of his surprisingly imposing appearance, they are dumb.” Gesenius, after the Septuagint, construes יִבְּטְאוּ with what precedes, but contrary to the Masoretic pointing and the better meaning of the passage.

Chap. liii, 1. *What we heard*—Heb., שָׁמְעוּ. Eng. ver., *our*

report. Allusion to לֹא שָׁמְעוּ, *what they had not heard*, in the preceding verse.

Verse 2. *Graceful form*—הָאֵר, says Nägelsbach, is like the Latin *forma*, with the special meaning of *beautiful form*. Comp. Jer. xi, 16; 1 Sam. xvi, 18. The word הָרַר is another one of those pregnant Hebrew expressions which mean more than any one English word fully conveys. It implies *glory, honor, beauty, and magnificence*, all blended into one splendid ideal, which the common version, *comeliness*, does not fully express. We render by the words *ornamental splendor*.

Verse 3. נִכְוָה, *dishonored*, in the sense of being treated with contempt; despised. *Forsaken of mankind*—Hengstenberg and Nägelsbach take חָרַל in an active intransitive sense, as *ceasing from among men, or ceasing to be regarded as a man*. The Septuagint reads: *his form was despised* and ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους, *defective above all men*. Symmachus: ἐλάχιστος ἀνδρῶν, *least of men*. Vulgate: *novissimum virorum, newest or last of men*; or, as Hengstenberg explains, “most abject of men.” This variety shows what uncertainty as to the exact meaning prevails among interpreters. The passive sense, *forsaken of men*, which we have adopted as the simplest and most obvious, is sanctioned by many of the best critics, as Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig and Alexander, and finds support in Job xix, 14. *Knowing sickness*—Thus the Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate versions give יָרַי, which is the passive participle, an active signification. Hence some suppose the true reading to have been originally יָרַי, *knowing*, and such is indeed the reading in eight MSS. But the passive participle is allowed by the best critics to signify *acquainted with*, and this sense our version gives, though expressed in the active form. The Septuagint has: *knowing how to bear μαλακταν, weakness*. Symmachus: γνωστός νόσῳ, *known by disease*. Vulgate: *scientem infirmitatem, knowing infirmity*. There is no need of departing from the usual meaning of the word יָרַי, *sickness; disease*. It occurs again in the plural in the next verse, and its root in verse 10. The Messiah was acquainted with sickness in all its forms. See the exposition below. *Like one who hides the face from us*—That is, like a leper, (Lev. xiii, 45,) or a mourn-

er, (2 Sam. xv, 30.) כִּכְתֵּר may be taken as the shortened form of the Hiphil participle of כָּתַר, *to hide*. Four MSS. read כִּכְתֵּר. Some take כִּכְתֵּר as a noun, and render as the margin of the Eng. version: *as a hiding of faces*. Hence arose the explanation that others hid their faces from him. כִּכְתֵּר may mean either *from us*, or *from him*. The English version adopts the latter sense, and renders the whole passage: "We hid as it were our faces from him." Haln, however, understands that Jehovah's face was hidden from him. But in the absence of any new subject expressed, it seems far simpler and more natural to construe כִּכְתֵּר with the main subject of the entire verse. We thus preserve a natural order and harmony of thought and sentiment, and have a striking portraiture of the despised and rejected Messiah.

Verse 4. *He bore them*—סָבַל־ם. Nearly all versions and interpreters neglect the pronominal suffix ם— in this word, which gives a noticeable emphasis to the thought: Not only did he lift our sicknesses, but our sorrows, he bore *them too*. The expression, *stricken with a penal curse*, is all involved and implied in the single word נָגַע. The noun נָגַע is the common term used for the plague of leprosy, considered as a judgment stroke.

Verse 5. *Crushed down*—כָּרַעַ. Compare also this word in verse 10. It implies more than *bruised* of the English and most versions. It involves also the idea of being trampled down and broken to pieces. Compare chap. xix, 10; Job iv, 19; Psa. lxxii, 4; Lam. iii, 34. *Came healing*—Henderson regards יִרְפָּא as a noun, but it is better to take it as the Niphil form of רָפָא, used impersonally: *it was healed*, or, *there came healing*.

Verse 6. *Mediated in him*—וְהִפְגִּיעַ בּוֹ, *caused to meet in him*. Thus the profound thought of atoning satisfaction, or vicarious mediation, seems most fittingly expressed. The English version, *laid on him*, is too weak; the Septuagint, *The Lord delivered him for our sins*, is too general and vague, entirely missing the exact and peculiar expression of the Hebrew. The Vulgate, *The Lord placed in him the iniquity of us all*, is better, but still is defective. Symmachus is most

exact: κύριος κατανήσαι ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὴν ἀνομίαν πάντων ἡμῶν, *The Lord made to come into him the iniquity of all of us.* The Hiphil of פָּגַע means *to cause any thing to meet or strike with violence*; and it was in the soul of Jesus that the violent vicarious stroke was felt, and met, and sustained. Let it be observed, also, how prominent is the thought of *mediation* and *intercession* conveyed by this word wherever it is used in the Hiphil form. See verse 12, and chap. lix, 16; Jer. xv, 11; xxxvi, 25; Job xxxvi, 32.

Verse 7. אֵימָה is not properly *a lamb*, (as rendered in Septuagint, Vulgate, English versions, etc.) for lambs are not wont to be shorn; but *a ewe*, a grown female sheep.

Verse 8. Many and various have been the expositions of the different parts of this verse. The Septuagint is quoted in Acts viii, 33, and is there properly rendered in the English version: "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away; and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth." But of this translation there are several different interpretations, and its citation by the Evangelist is no evidence that the Septuagint gives the true sense of the Hebrew. Clearly the Septuagint is not an accurate translation of our present Hebrew text. The English version is, *He was taken from prison and from judgment*; margin, *He was taken away by distress and judgment*; Lowth translates, *By an oppressive judgment he was taken off*; Noyes, *By oppression and punishment he was taken away*; Barnes, *From confinement and a judicial sentence he was taken*, [to death.] Several of these interpretations are possible, and it seems bootless to argue *in extenso* in favor of one or against another. The calm and impartial judgment, after repeated examination and comparison of views, will incline to that which appears most faithful to the Hebrew text, and yields the clearest and most natural sense. But it is very possible that the critical taste will decide differently for different minds, and out of several allowable interpretations one will adopt one version, another a different one, according to subjective feelings and habits of thought. With the Vulgate, (*de angustia et de judicio sublatus est*.) most of the older expositors, and many moderns, we understand the first line of the taking of the Messiah from his suffering and judgment up to the throne of God, as the man-

child of Rev. xii, 5. The *שָׁפֵט*, *judgment*, we understand of the mock judicial process through which Jesus was put, and all the suffering it involved. *His generation* (*דּוֹר*) is not his unending life, (Luther, Calvin,) nor his manner of life, (Le Clerc, Lowth,) nor his posterity, (Hengstenberg, Barnes, Nägelsbach,) but his contemporaneous generation, the primary and usual meaning of the word. So Gesenius, Ewald, Rosenmüller, and Alexander. The last named renders the whole verse thus: "From distress and from judgment he was taken; and in his generation who will think that he was cut off from the land of the living for the transgression of my people, (as a curse for them?" The words *נָגַע לָוִי* mean literally *a stroke for them*. Compare the word *נָגַע* in verse 4, and our note there. We translate and construe the words here as epexegetical of the two lines immediately preceding. To take *לָוִי* as a singular is scarcely allowable, and the version, *a stroke was to him*, or *he was stricken*, (as English version,) is inexact. Nor does the plural, as we translate it, favor the views of those critics who urge that the suffering servant of Jehovah is not an individual, but the collective body, or people. On the contrary, for them, the many, he is made a curse. Gal. iii, 13.

Verse 9. The subject of the verb *נָתַן* is not easy to determine. Some understand *וַי*, *my people*, from the preceding verse, and others make the verb indefinite and impersonal, *they gave*, or *there shall be given*. But as Jehovah is so uniformly represented through all this chapter as overruling and directing the sufferings and humiliation of his servant, it seems better here to understand Jehovah as the subject of the verb. The sense, then, is, that God gave or assigned him his grave with the wicked, and yet arranged that in his death (that is, while dead) his body should rest in the grave of a rich man. This he permitted, although there was no crime or falsehood in the sufferer. In accordance with this view, Jehovah is said, at the beginning of the next verse, to be pleased to crush him down and afflict him. We therefore render the *ו*, *and*, at the beginning of verse 10, by *thus*, as best setting forth in English the continuity of thought.

Verse 10. *If thou set forth his soul*—*כִּי* is generally taken here as a particle of time, as in the English version, *when thou*

shall make, etc. But its common and almost uniform meaning, *if*, suits the context as well, and better preserves the emotional element in the language. Most interpreters make נִפְסוֹ the subject of הִשָּׁח, *if his soul shall make an offering*; but such a mode of expression is unusual and awkward. Usage requires that שׁוּ be followed by an object expressed. The sudden change of person is no more difficult to explain here than in chap. lii, 14, 15. After having said, in verse 6, that Jehovah mediated in him our sin, and having commenced this verse with the statement that Jehovah was pleased to crush him down and make him sick, he appropriately turns in direct address to Jehovah, and says with prophetic confidence, *If THOU set forth his soul*, etc.

Verse 11. *In his superior knowledge*—This rendering brings out the deep thought of נִדְרָתוֹ better than the weaker expression of the common version, *by his knowledge*. It is in the profound depth and power of divine wisdom that the Messiah finds wherewith to bring in righteousness to fallen, sinful man. So רַעַת is a counterpart of יִשְׁבֵּל in chap. lii, 13. The words *the righteous one, my servant*, are emphatic, and need to be placed in the order we have put them to exhibit the peculiarity and force of the Hebrew idiom. The verb יִצְרִיק is the future Hiphil of צָרַק, and, followed by ל, properly means *will bring righteousness to*. There is a play on the Hebrew words which we have sought to retain in our translation.

Verse 12. *Among the mighty ones*—This seems to be the real meaning of the passage, and is the rather required by the use of מ in גִּבּוֹרִים, in the first member of the parallelism. But the accusative sign in אֶת־הַגִּבּוֹרִים gives some warrant for Lowth's version:

Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion,
And the mighty people shall he share for his spoil.

The literal meaning of הִיָּרָה, Hiphil of יָרָה, *to make bare, or naked*, is better than the less frequent and doubtful meaning *poured out*, of the English version. We translate the future Hiphil form יִפְנִיעַ by *ever intercedes*. The past tense of the same verb in verse 6 we translate *mediated*. There the past tense points rather to the sacrifice "*one*" offered to bear the

sins of many." Heb. vii, 27; ix, 12, 26, 28; x, 12. Here the future points rather to the everlasting intercession. Heb. vii, 25, 28.

EXPOSITION.

These fifteen verses form a clearly defined section by themselves, but they must not be severed from their context, or treated as if they had not a vital connection with what precedes and what follows after. Alexander justly condemns "the radical error of supposing that the book is susceptible of distribution into detached and independent parts." It has its divisions more or less clearly defined, but they cling to each other, and are interwoven with each other, and form a living whole. It is beautifully observed by Nägelsbach that "chapters xlix-lvii are like a wreath of glorious flowers intertwined with black ribbon; or like a song of triumph, through whose muffled tone there courses the melody of a dirge, yet so that gradually the mournful chords merge into the melody of the song of triumph. And at the same time the discourse of the prophet is arranged with so much art that the mourning ribbon ties into a great bow exactly in the middle. For chapter liii forms the middle of the entire prophetic cycle of chapters xl-lxvi."

The immediate connection with what precedes may be thus seen: In lii, 1-12, the future salvation of Israel is glowingly depicted as a restoration more glorious than that from the bondage of Egypt or from Assyrian exile. Jerusalem awakes and rises from the dust of ruin; the captive is released from fetters; the feet of fleet messengers speed with good tidings, and the watchmen take up the glad report, and sound the cry of redemption. And then (verse 11) an exhortation is sounded to depart from all pollution and bondage, and the sublime exodus is contrasted (verse 12) with the hasty flight from Egypt, but with the assurance that, as of old, Jehovah would still be as the pillar of cloud and fire before them and behind them. At this our passage begins, and the thought naturally turns to the great Leader of this spiritual exodus—a greater than Moses, even though that ancient servant of Jehovah was faithful in all his house. Num. xii, 7. Our prophet proceeds to delineate Him whose sufferings and sorrows for the transgressions of his people far transcended those of Moses, and whose final triumph

through the fruit of the travail of his soul shall be also infinitely greater.

Verse 13. In profound spiritual emotion, and in order to intensify in others the vivid conception he himself has of Messiah, the prophet writes, *Behold!* He himself sees, and he expects his readers to see, the wondrous personage who fills the vision of his soul. But his spirit is so seized and borne along (*φερόμενος*, 2 Pet. i, 21) by the Spirit of Jehovah that he speaks in the Divine Name, and says, *Behold MY servant!* (Compare chap. xliii, 1.) Though his goings forth have been from everlasting, (Mic. v, 2,) and he dwelt in the glory of the Father before the world was, (John xvii, 5;) though in the form of God, and holding an equality with God; he emptied himself of this glory, and took the form of a *servant*. Phil. ii, 6, 7. Thus he became the *sent* of God, (John v, 36, 37; Rom. viii, 3; 1 John iv, 9, 10;) the *apostle* of our profession. Heb. iii, 1. And like a faithful servant he says: "Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God." Psalm xl, 7, 8; compare Heb. x, 5-10. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." John iv, 34. But the first thing to which our attention is called is the consummate wisdom with which this servant acts. The great wisdom of God's ancient servant Moses was honored and utilized in training Israel, in saving them from numerous enemies and calamities, and in giving them a code of laws the most ennobling ever given to man. And when Moses handed over his work to Joshua and the elders he repeatedly admonished them to *act wisely*. Deut. xxix, 9; Josh. i, 7, 8. But in this greater prophet are "hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Col. ii, 3. He is the embodiment and representative of the wisdom of God, (1 Cor. i, 24;) and by this wisdom he rose through suffering and blood until he became *exceeding high*. Near the close of this section (liii, 11) we are again reminded that it is by his *superior knowledge* that he atones for sin, and brings righteousness to the guilty. So in the suffering Christ the redeemed will ever behold "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God." Rom. xi, 33. Observe also the climax in the three verbs here used. First, *he shall rise*, appear among men and become eminent and famous; then he shall be *lifted up* even "as Moses lifted up the serpent in

the wilderness." John iii, 14; viii, 28; xii, 32. The cross was a necessary part of this exaltation, "for it became Him, for whom are all things and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." Heb. ii, 10. But this lifting on the cross leads to a higher elevation. "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor." Heb. ii, 9. For God has highly exalted him, (Phil. ii, 9,) and set him at his own right hand, (Acts ii, 33,) and given him a name which is above every name. Wherefore he has *become exceeding high*.

Verses 14, 15. From the thought of his lofty elevation we are turned to his deep humiliation, and the one is compared and contrasted with the other. Verse 14 is the *protasis*, and the first part of verse 15 is the *apodosis* of one connected sentence. The words in parentheses give the reason why multitudes gazed on him in wonderstruck amazement. The comparison begins with a direct address to the sufferer, *on thee*, for the spectacle was intensely vivid in the prophet's eye; but as the words in parentheses go on in a double parallelism to explain the use of the strong expression, *gazed wonderstruck*, and naturally fall in the third person, verse 15 proceeds in the use of the same person, as by attraction. Then, too, the sufferer was vividly prominent, but the sprinkling of many nations was comparatively distant and far future. The shocking disfiguration of Jehovah's servant is to be understood of the effect on the appearance of Christ of the agony in the garden, the indignity and scourging of the mock trial, the fainting and sinking beneath the weight of the cross, and the tortures of crucifixion. But, having once risen from his humiliation, *he shall sprinkle many nations*. And with the word *sprinkle* we are to associate all the ideas of *purification, sanctification, and consecration* which the word holds in connection with the symbolic ceremonials of Israel. The prophet does not linger to particularize or define the process or methods of the sprinkling. Whether he shall sprinkle with blood, or water, or oil, with or without hyssop branch, he does not say. The variety and completeness of his purification and consecration we may elsewhere learn. In the *protasis*, *multitudes* may refer to individuals, but in the *apodosis* it qualifies *nations*. Multitudes of

people (individuals) gazed wonderstruck on the suffering Christ, but they were mostly of one nation, the Jews; but the exalted Christ shall sprinkle *many nations*. So exalted and honored shall he become, that even kings, as they look upon and diligently consider him, shall show their self-humiliation and awe by the well-known sign of covering their mouths with their hands. Comp. Job xxix, 9; xl, 4; Micah vii, 16. These kings are the rulers of Gentile nations, who had not, like the chosen people, been *told* of Christ, nor *had heard* of him till he was preached to them as the divine Prince and Saviour. Compare the apostle's use of this text as denoting the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. Rom. xv, 21. Many of the kings and potentates of the nations since the days of Constantine have seen the salvation of Christ, and meditated diligently on his power and work. And this shall be more and more the case as the nations become evangelized; for the Lord Christ will be seen to be mightier than the kings of the earth.

Chap. liii, 1. We have seen above (verse 13) how the inspired prophet speaks in Jehovah's name, as in some sense identified with him. But he is myriad-souled, and now, identifying himself with his own people, Israel, he speaks in their name, and asks abruptly: *Who believed what we heard?* Who of us Israelites comprehended the Messianic prophecies so as to accept and acknowledge their fulfillment? The heathen saw and duly considered the Christ, of whom they had not previously heard; but how unbelieving was favored Israel! The prophet proceeds in the next sentence to put the question in a still stronger form, which we may thus paraphrase: Who that saw Messiah's humble birth, and rise, and reproach, and suffering, and death, discerned in it all a revelation of Jehovah's saving power? The *arm* is representative or symbolic of strength, power; and the Gospel, including all the revelations, and means of grace, is the power of God unto salvation to the believer. Rom. i, 16. *On whom* (not *to whom*) is emphatic, and denotes that Jehovah's power is revealed from on high, and in its working comes down *upon* the soul.

Verses 2, 3. Still speaking in the name of Israel, the prophet proceeds to give reasons why they would not believe. The outward appearance of this Servant of Jehovah would not conform to their ideas of Messianic grace and glory. He would

grow up before Jehovah like a tender shoot, or sucker, of a plant or tree; or, to put the image more strikingly, like a root buried in the dry and barren earth, sending forth its sprout where there was little or no probability of its ever showing signs of life again; and, even if it did sprout, no probability of its ever attaining any considerable growth. Comp. Isa. xi, 10. Also, his personal appearance lacked the gracefulness and pompous grandeur which Israel expected to see in the coming Messiah. They looked, and, instead of a graceful and athletic David, adorned with all the magnificence of Solomon, behold, a sight far, very far, from their notion and desire! To this suggestive negative it is added, positively, (verse 3,) that this Servant of God was even *dishonored and forsaken of men*; so identified was he with what are regarded as the sorrows and woes and maladies of mankind that he is explicitly called *a man of sorrows*, and thoroughly familiar with *sickness*. Comp. next verse. Nay, more; his appearance suggests the conduct of a despised leper, or lonely and abandoned mourner, who covers his face and withdraws, as if desiring to hide away from those who show him no sympathy and treat him with dishonor. For his people, the prophet confesses, *we valued not his worth*; we did not properly esteem him, but misunderstood the nature of his sufferings.

Verses 4-6. The last statement, namely, that Israel did not properly estimate the Man of sorrows, leads the prophet at once to set forth the vicarious nature of his sufferings. And, first, he reverts to the idea of *sickness* just named, and, enlarging it into the conception of its manifold forms of misery, he uses the plural, and with the particle of strong affirmation says: *Surely our sicknesses he lifted*. We must guard against confounding *sicknesses* with *sorrows*, mentioned in the next line. This is a defect of our common English version, which here has the word *griefs*. But the two words should be taken together, as designed to denote both bodily and spiritual pains. It is no objection that Jesus was never sick in the ordinary sense. We have just been told that he *knew sickness*, (verse 3;) he was acquainted with disease in all its forms and power, and so knew how to lift it off of miserable men. To do this he must needs know something about sickness, and we are assured that he was "touched with the feeling of our infirmities."

Heb. iv, 15. In Matt. viii, 17, our prophet's words are quoted and said to be fulfilled in Jesus' casting out demons and healing all that were sick; and there we have the peculiar reading. "Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." Let us beware how we dilute these words. In working his miracles of mercy there went out a conscious power from the Lord. Mark v, 30. When he stood face to face with the miseries of mortality, he sighed, (Mark vii, 34,) and at the grave of Lazarus his spirit surged with mingled grief and ire, (*ἐμβριμάομαι*.) John xi, 33, 38. His soul was intensely sensitive, and capable of sorrow, even unto death. Matt. xxvi, 38. He entered into the keenest emotion under a sense of other's woes, and he saw in all the forms of sickness so many various ebullitions of sin working wrath and death in human nature. And so healing of the sick was a part of his redeeming and mediating work. In all his miracles of mercy to the sick and the maimed and the blind he literally *lifted* their diseases, lifted them up and bore them away. At times, at least, it made him sick to do it, (verse 10;) and the culmination of all his anguish was in Gethsemane and on the cross. We are to think of him as consciously entering into and grasping a thousand forms of human woe in order to lift and bear away the fearful load. But while the suffering Christ bore all this load, Israel strangely misunderstood him. They looked upon him as they would look upon a leper, and supposed that he suffered under some fearful judgment-stroke of the Almighty. And there was a partial truth in this opinion. He was smitten of God, as verse 5 goes on to show, but not in the sense that Israel imagined. Not for his own sins was he smitten, but *he was pierced for our transgressions, crushed down for our sins*. Here the prophet utters his profoundest oracle, and we are furnished with the most explicit statement of the Messiah's vicarious suffering. The vivid picture may have been helped by the prophet's knowledge of David's crucial psalm. Ps. xxii; comp., especially, verse 16. It would almost seem that he descried afar the crushing violence of the assembly of the wicked that hurried the Christ away to the spot where they pierced his hands and feet and side. But the piercing and the crushing have also a profounder meaning. They are to be understood of all the bitter and unspeakable agonies of the

passion hour. So, too, the words that follow. His sufferings are presented as the scourgings of a *chastisement* by which *our peace* with God is secured. Such chastisement was visited *upon him*; inflicted with many *stripes*, (comp. Matt. xxvii, 26; John xix, 1; Luke xxiii, 16,) and so he has become our peace. Eph. ii, 14-17. O blessed stripes, by which there comes divine healing to the sin-sick soul!

The sinner's waywardness and folly are well compared to the perverse wanderings of a silly sheep, (verse 6,) and here the prophet seems to look beyond any one race, or people, and utters words of universal application: ALL WE *like sheep*. All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and there is imperative need that redemption be provided for all, without exception. And now comes that pregnant and profound expression, *Jehovah mediated in him the sin of all of us*. See on this the critical notes above. In him, in the living, spotless soul of Jesus, Jehovah caused to meet and strike with fearful violence the sin and guiltiness of a wicked world. What language can picture, what thinking spirit comprehend, the awful throes of that mediation! He who knew no sin by any personal transgression in thought, word, or deed, and who never made the slightest deflection from perfect righteousness, took upon himself our nature, and felt the violence of all our woes. As Elisha "stretched himself upon the child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands," (2 Kings iv, 34,) so the Incarnate Word put himself in closest possible contact with all that is human; but, unlike Elisha, who felt not the agony of the child's death, the Lord Jesus seized (*ἐπιλαμβάνω*, Heb. ii, 16) guilty humanity with such a grasp that all its sinfulness and sorrow, like a baleful electric shock, sent nameless pangs of horror and amazement (Mark xiv, 33) through his soul, and prompted on the cross the bitter cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!"

Verse 7 informs us how Jehovah's servant demeaned himself under his sore oppression and trial. Twice over we are told with emphasis, *he opened not his mouth*. He made no struggle to resist his oppressors, though conscious of a power to call in the aid of twelve legions of angels. Matt. xxvi, 53. His inoffensive silence is touchingly set forth by the double

simile of the sheep and the ewe. One has but to read the mockery and contemptuous treatment Jesus quietly received at the hands of the Jews, Herod, Pilate, and the soldiers, until he sank down under the weight of his cross, to have a most lively illustration of the several statements of this verse. Compare, especially, Matt. xxvii, 29-44; Luke xxiii, 11; Heb. xii, 3; 1 Pet. ii, 23.

Verse 8. Having now given the vivid picture of Messiah's sufferings and his meekness under them all, the prophet passes to speak of "the glory that shall follow." 1 Pet. i, 11. But with all his triumph and glory there is constantly associated the memory of his sore travail and sacrificial death. That thought finds expression in every succeeding verse. First, the seer seems to see him snatched away from the *suffering and judgment* which he had portrayed. He is lifted up on the cross, and thence to paradise, and afterward to the throne of God, by his resurrection and ascension. But what most affects the seer is the thought that the generation which should see the Messiah cut off (compare Dan. ix, 26) would not understand, nor be able to tell that he was cut off from the land of the living, not for himself, but for the transgression of Israel. As Balaam's vision penetrated the far future, and caused him in view of wonders to come to exclaim, "Alas, who shall live when God doeth this!" (Num. xxiv, 23,) so our prophet, but with deeper pathos, cries out, partly by question, partly by exclamation, "Who in Messiah's day will tell that he was cut off and made a curse for Israel's sin!" The phrase, *a curse for them*, is another pregnant expression peculiar to Isaiah, and sums up in itself all that has been said before of the vicarious nature of Messiah's sufferings. *The land of life*, or land of the living, is the earth, where dwell all in whom is "the breath of life." Gen. ii, 7. It is thus distinguished from Sheol, or Hades, the dwelling of the dead.

Verse 9. But while the personal and conscious spirit of Messiah is taken away from suffering and from judgment, God still permits his lifeless body to be left, in the eyes of the world, exposed to all the indignities to which crucified criminals were liable. Such were usually cast aside without the rites of decent burial, and left to be devoured by dogs and unclean birds. The Providence, however, that suffered not a

bone of Jesus to be broken, caused his body to be given to a rich man, and deposited, during the period of his death, in a sepulcher hewn in the rock. Matt. xxvii, 57-60. Nevertheless, the death of Jesus and the disposal of his body would ever be associated with a malefactor's end. He was numbered with transgressors, (verse 12,) and the unjust Pilate and his soldiers had the control and disposition of his burial, and only by the Roman governor's consent could Joseph of Arimathea take the body away. All this was a part of the humiliation and indignity heaped upon one who was guilty of no violence or wrong. Compare 1 Pet. ii, 22. The rich man's obtaining the body from Pilate is not to be pressed as a triumph, and set forth as a deliverance of Jesus from the unjust; but only as a noticeable incident in connection with his death.

Verse 10. And now comes the wonderful announcement that *Jehovah was pleased to crush him down* like this. It was no accident; nor were Messiah's sorrows, and painful knowledge of the sicknesses of humanity, and the taking of them on himself, (verses 3, 4.) a penalty or consequence of his own sin, but *God made him sick*. He subjected him to all the humiliation that has been portrayed above, and such was his pleasure. For "thus it behooved Christ to suffer." Luke xxiv, 26, 46; Acts xvii, 3. There was a divine necessity that called for the sacrifice, and the sufferer was not an unwilling victim, but freely "bared his soul to death." Verse 12. And God set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, (Rom. iii, 25,) to manifest his glory, and wisdom, and power, and to bring many sons unto glory. Heb. ii, 10. In every stage and aspect of this atoning work the Eternal Father might well smile, and say, as when Jesus submitted himself to be identified with sinners in the baptism of repentance, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Rising now in his emotion, the prophet addresses Jehovah, and, with an inspiration and revelation like that which once lifted Simon Peter beyond himself, (Matt. xvi, 17,) he says, *If thou set forth his soul* (that is, Messiah's soul) *an offering for sin, he* (Messiah) *shall see seed*, (that is, posterity.) If the All-wise Jehovah make his servant's soul a trespass-offering, (זָבַח,) what immeasurable results are likely to follow! Such expiatory sacrifice will doubtless insure the noblest gains, else would not

the Omniscient make it. To see a numerous and powerful posterity was among the highest hopes of the pious Israelite, (compare Gen. xvii, 5, 6; 1, 23; Job xlii, 16; Psalm cxxvii, 3-5; cxxviii, 6;) and the thought is here used as peculiarly fitted to impress upon the Israelitish mind an ideal of Messiah's after glory. In his spiritual seed would be fulfilled in its grandest form the ancient promise to Abraham, (Gen. xii, 3; xv, 5;) for the justified by faith are the true sons of Abraham, and also sons of him whose day of glory Abraham rejoiced to see. John viii, 39, 56; Rom. ii, 28, 29. In the next sentence we meet a kindred thought, *he shall prolong his days*. In a higher and grander sense than worldlings think, the Messiah has "the power of an endless life." Heb. vii, 16. Length of days in the temporal sense (Exod. xx, 12; Deut. iv, 40; Prov. iii, 2) was not for him who was cut off for Israel's transgression, (verse 8;) but by his voluntary sacrifice of himself, and obedience even unto the death of the cross, he obtained the keys of death and Hades, and is alive for evermore. Rev. i, 18. And so he attains "an unchangeable priesthood," (Heb. vii, 24, 25; compare Psalm xxi, 4;) and abides "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Heb. xiii, 8. And also, having risen to the right hand of God, (Psalm cx, 1,) "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." 1 Cor. xv, 25. In view of all this it is absolutely certain that *the pleasure of Jehovah*, his desire and purpose in the whole plan of redemption, *in his hand* (his servant's hand) shall prosper and prevail. Jehovah was pleased to crush his servant down, (verse 10,) not because he delighted in his or any one's sufferings, but because it was only by his stripes that the leprosy of sin could be healed, (verse 5,) and those results reached in which Jehovah has everlasting delight.

Verse 11. And yet in another form will the rapt prophet set forth the glorious outcome of Messiah's toil. *Of the laborious travail of his soul shall he see*; that excruciating labor, previously described, shall yield rich harvests to his eye, such as will abundantly *satisfy* him. He will see that the "much fruit" resulting from the dying grain is ample recompense for all the sacrifice. John xii, 24, 32. And with this thought he returns to that of the divine wisdom with which he began his lofty strain, (lii, 13;) and as the vision glows before him, and he is

conscious that Jehovah's own word is on his tongue, he again speaks in his name, and calls the wonderful Messiah *my servant*, and says of him: *in his superior knowledge will he bring righteousness to multitudes.* In his wisdom and knowledge are the infinite resources by which Messiah becomes "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. x, 4. He suffers for sins, the just for the unjust, that he may bring us sinners to God. 1 Pet. iii, 18. Thus he maintains and honors divine justice, while at the same time he secures justification to every sinner that believes in Jesus. Rom. iii, 26. Thus is manifested "the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." Rom. iii, 22. In his exalted state his mediation ever continues, (verse 12,) and as truly as he bore our sorrows, (verse 4,) he will ever bear the sins of many.

Verse 12. And now comes the grand conclusion. *Therefore*, says Jehovah through his prophet, in view of all the humiliation and suffering of my servant, and the results that follow, *I will apportion him a lot with many.* I will see that he obtain a reward worthy of a princely conqueror. In leading many sons unto glory he shall share with them an incorruptible inheritance, and the *many*, having become the sons of God, are also heirs, "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Rom. viii, 17. It takes nothing away from the glory of the Messiah that others share it with him. Rather, his glory attains perfection only when his own redeemed rise to be with him in his glory and behold its splendor. John xvii, 24. Nor will the glorified sons of God be unsuitable partners in Messiah's triumph. He himself will recognize them as fellow conquerors, and say: "To him that overcometh will I give to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down on my Father's throne." Rev. iii, 21. Among such will Messiah delight to *divide the spoil*, as a conqueror among many *mighty ones*, and they shall all be "kings and priests unto God." Rev. 1, 6; v, 10; xx, 6; xxii, 5. In that day will the great Spoil-divider say: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. xxv, 34. Thus the vision stretches far beyond the millennial age, even into the new heavens and new earth, in which the saints will reign forever with their immortal Lord.

But the burden of this prophecy is the suffering and sacrifice that yield surpassing glory; and the inspired prophet will not close without once more reminding us that all this glory is possible *because he bared his soul to death*. "For the joy that was set before him he endured the cross, despising the shame." Heb. xii, 2. The words, *with sinners he was numbered*, are cited by Mark (xv, 28) and Luke, (xxii, 37,) as fulfilled in the fact that Jesus was crucified like a transgressor, and between two criminals. The last two lines express the two profoundest facts of Christ's redeeming work; namely, the one efficacious oblation for sin, once offered, and the everlasting intercession. The first "he did once, when he offered up himself." Heb. vii, 27. "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. ix, 26-28. The second is seen in his unchangeable priesthood, whereby "he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." Heb. vii, 25. Compare also Rom. v, 10. So, in the exposition of these verses, we see Messiah set forth in the threefold character of Prophet, Priest, and King.

DISQUISITION.

In the foregoing exposition we have made little or no mention of interpretations differing from our own. If we have set forth the true exposition, all others are superseded, and it would be a needless labor to mention other views merely for the sake of refuting them, or saying that we differ from them. But there are three notable questions involved in this Scripture, which no interpreter has a right to ignore. They have been for centuries the subject of biblical and theological disquisition, and deserve our serious study. The first two are concerning the *Servant of Jehovah*; who he is, and what the *nature of his sufferings*. The other is the question of the *authorship* of this portion of the Book of Isaiah.

I. The first question was long ago put to Philip, the evangelist, by an Ethiopian: "Of whom speaketh the prophet this; of himself, or of some other man?" Acts viii, 34. And we are

told that "Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." This we know to have been the exposition of the apostolic age, and universally maintained in the Christian Church for more than fifteen hundred years. This exposition we have set forth above, and shown how the prophet's words have a well-defined and accurate fulfillment in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of men. The most ancient Jewish exposition, also, as Hengstenberg has abundantly shown in his *Christology*, referred the prophecy to the Messiah. And this exposition, we believe, would never have been abandoned by Judaism but for the fact that in controversy with the Christians it was seen to be otherwise impossible to resist the proof that Jesus was the Christ. Nor does the Messianic view meet opposition outside of Judaism except from those who deny the supernatural element in prophecy. But, having rejected the beautiful and self-consistent Messianic exposition, what do these opposers give us in its stead? There is, first, one class, who understand by Jehovah's servant, not an individual, but a collective body. But these represent at least five different expositions. The most popular is that of the Jewish rabbins Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and Kimchi, according to whom Jehovah's servant is the Jewish people, now scattered abroad among all nations, and exposed to insult and abuse. This view is adopted by many modern Germans, (Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, Hitzig,) who understand, however, the Babylonish exile of the Jews rather than their present dispersion. Besides the numerous difficulties with which this view is beset in explaining particular words and phrases, it is sufficiently refuted by an appeal to this one fact, which all the world knows, that the Jewish people, both in their present dispersion and former exile, suffered for their own, and not for others' sins. And so far from being led like an unresisting sheep to the slaughter, they have been notoriously obstinate and rebellious. Others, however, limit the reference to a portion or class of the Jewish people, as, for example, the pious and more spiritual, (Paulus, Maurer, Ewald, Knobel;) or the prophets, (De Wette, Winer;) or the priesthood. Eckermann understands the nation in the abstract, as distinguished from its individual members. And the Maccabees have also been adduced as meeting the description of the prophet. Each one of

these descriptions is open to particular objections, and they will be seen to refute each other if we take them one by one, and go through the whole passage asking such questions as the following: Did the pious Jews suffer more than others in exile? Did their stripes bring healing to the rest? In what particular sense did the prophets or priests grow up before Jehovah like a root from the dry earth, or lift the sicknesses or bear the sorrows of others? How could the nation be guilty, and its individual members innocent? When were the Maccabees dishonored and despised, and act like lepers hiding their faces in shame? or when and how did they ever take away sin and make intercession for sinners? The attempt to answer these, and many other questions which might be urged, shows the utterly unsatisfactory and conjectural character of the several opinions named.

There is another class of opposers of the Messianic exposition, who seem to see the difficulty of making the striking personal portraiture of the Servant represent a class or collective body, and therefore seek for some other individual, other than Jesus, who may be made to answer the prophet's description. Accordingly, the prophet himself, Uzziah, Hezekiah, Josiah, and Jeremiah have all been taken, by one or another of these interpreters, to be the servant described. But in what sense any one of the persons named sprinkled many nations, or was led as a sheep to the slaughter, or set forth his soul an offering for sin, it is difficult to see. Their utter lack of harmony in fixing on any one individual, and the far-fetched and unnatural interpretation put upon the prophet's words, lead us to think that the only fixed canon of criticism uniformly followed by this class of exegetes is, *any body rather than Jesus!* The inherent difficulties and indefiniteness of these various views are in noticeable contrast with the clear and wonderful fulfillment of every word and phrase in the Messianic exposition. But alas! a veil is on Israel's heart to-day, (2 Cor. iii, 15.) and we may still ask with the prophet, "Jehovah's arm, on whom is it uncovered?" Only by turning to the Lord Christ is the veil taken away.

II. But having satisfied ourselves that the Messianic exposition is the only true one, another question arises as to the nature of Messiah's sufferings. The question leads to a discussion

of one of the fundamental doctrines of Christian theology, the doctrine of *Vicarious Atonement*. But a scientific treatment of this Old Testament prophecy requires us to guard against introducing into it the refined definitions and distinctions of a later age. Let us not put into it what is not there, but let us be studious to draw from it what really is there. We will not forget that we are dealing with a lofty poem, in which we may not insist that every word and expression must have a special significance. But we will, also, bear in mind that all the intense passion of the poet is chastened with a solemn awe, and every strong word and metaphor and simile have been carefully selected; not revealed by flesh and blood. Matt. xvi, 17.

(1.) First, then, the sufferings here portrayed are *vicarious*. The just suffered for the unjust; the innocent for the guilty. No less than seven times is it said in one form or another that he suffered for the sake of others. Thus, he bore others' sorrows, (verse 4,) he was pierced for others' transgressions, crushed down for others' sins, chastised for others' peace, lacerated with stripes for the healing of others, (verse 5,) cut off for others' transgressions, (verse 8,) and made a curse for them. Manifestly, then, the suffering was vicarious, or substitutional, and verse 9 declares that the sufferer himself was guilty of no violence or wrong. His voluntary sufferings were accepted and reckoned as a substitute for penalty.

(2.) But, further, the sufferings and death were *expiatory*. They were, like the sin and trespass-offerings with which the Israelitish mind was familiar, piacular and propitiatory, and designed to atone for the guilt and transgressions of many. They appeased the divine wrath that burned against the sinners, and made satisfaction to the demands of righteousness. All this is clearly involved in such language as the following: "If thou set forth his soul an offering for sin," (verse 10,) "their sins he will bear," (verse 11,) "the sin of many he took away," (verse 12.) The only legitimate explanation of these forms of expression is that which finds abundant illustration in the expiatory sacrifices of the Mosaic system. And all this was strikingly fulfilled in Jesus Christ, who himself, as the Apostle Peter observes, "bore our sins in his own body on the tree." 1 Peter ii, 24.

(3.) To this it may be added, though the idea is really in-

volved in the foregoing observations, these sufferings are *meditational and intercessory*. For proof of this we need only refer the reader to our exposition of verses 6 and 12: "Jehovah mediated in him the sin of all of us," and "he for the sinners ever intercedes." The sufferings of the cross are consecrated into perpetual redeeming efficacy by the everlasting intercession. This Old Testament prophet probably did not comprehend "what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in him did signify," (1 Peter i, 11;) but we are satisfied that the only complete fulfillment of his words in these two verses is to be found in Jesus Christ, considered as the great High-priest who has entered into the heavenly holy of holies, "now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. ix, 24. His obedience, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension are all virtually embodied and represented in his "ever living to make intercession for us;" and only from this lofty exaltation can we see how "he shall sprinkle many nations."

III. Who, now let us ask, was the writer of this profoundest of all prophecies? It is natural for us to desire to know. The unsurpassed grandeur and sublimity of the writing and its deep and wondrous lessons would remain the same, even if the author were utterly unknown; but those who truly prize the matchless prophecy will not be content, without the clearest show of reason, to allow a saintly name, to whom it has been attributed by the unbroken tradition of two thousand years, to be robbed of his honor. Within the last century a large number of critics, chiefly German, have attempted to show that chapters xl-lxvi of the canonical Isaiah were not written by Isaiah the son of Amoz. It is quite generally agreed that these chapters are the work of a single author, and form a united whole, but must have been written later than the age of Isaiah, and during or after the Babylonish exile. And the unknown author has been called the "Pseudo-Isaiah," the "Later Isaiah," "Deutero-Isaiah," and "The Great Unnamed."

It is notable that almost invariably those critics that reject the Messianic exposition of chapter liii reject also the Isaiahan authorship of chapters xl-lxvi. And the great argument for assigning these chapters to a later age than that of Isaiah is the calling of Cyrus by name. Chaps. xlv, 28; xlv, 1. Manifestly this is the great difficulty with the rationalistic critics. They

will not allow a prediction that bears witness to a superhuman origin, and so they settle the whole question in advance by an *a priori* assumption. The ultimate question, therefore, becomes this: Is there a personal God, who at times interferes in supernatural and extraordinary ways with human affairs? If we say No, then must we resort to a naturalistic exposition of this and many other prophecies. But the holy Scriptures, from beginning to end, in one long multifarious answer, proclaim a God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke to the fathers by the prophets. This forenaming of Cyrus is, indeed, extraordinary, and calculated to excite attention. But a careful scrutiny of our prophet's language (xliv, 26; xlv, 1-7) will bring out this issue: Either the writer truly prophesies of future things, or he is guilty of imposture. In calling Cyrus by name he assumes to be uttering a prophecy of a very extraordinary kind. A contemporary of Cyrus, uttering such language, would have exposed himself to contempt and ridicule. But the author's moral tone and sentiment are utterly incompatible with the perpetration of a pious fraud. And yet again and again does he profess to reveal the future. Comp. xli, 4, 22, 23; xlii, 9; xlv, 7, 8.

Other evidences of a post-exile date, it is claimed, are seen in those passages which represent Zion as a captive, and Jerusalem a desolation. Chaps. lii, 2; lviii, 12; lx, 9, 10; lxi, 4; lxii, 8; lxiv, 10, 11. In some of these passages allusion is undoubtedly made to the afflictions of the Babylonish exile, which Isaiah had specially foretold to Hezekiah, (chap. xxxix, 6;) but these allusions, like the prophecy concerning Cyrus, are but a small part of the great prophetic picture of Israel's future. Alexander calls attention to the fact that Babylon is less frequently mentioned than Egypt by Isaiah, and he wisely suggests that the oppressions and desolations described may be Egyptian or Roman as well as Babylonian. The seer has the past and the future of Israel, as the Old Testament Church, mapped out before his eye, and he shows himself familiar with all, as becomes one who speaks in the name of Him who is the First and the Last. Chaps. xli, 4; xlv, 6. If striking allusions to the Babylonish exile are pressed as evidences of late authorship, then may we urge the marvelous portraiture of Jesus of Nazareth in chapter liii, and insist on the same ground that this

must have been written after Jesus had suffered on the cross, and after Paul had expounded the mysteries of redemption.

The argument based on the peculiar style and diction of these chapters is of too uncertain a character to prove any thing. The citation of fancied Chaldaisms and of *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* produce an artificial glare confusing to some minds, but are utterly misleading as evidences of authorship. The subject-matter of these prophecies would naturally beget a tone of peculiar majesty, and Knobel himself admits that their style greatly resembles that of the genuine Isaiah. As for the plea that they contain doctrines and sentiments belonging to an age later than that of Isaiah, it is quite sufficient to reply, Nay, these passages themselves show that such sentiments were current in Isaiah's day?

Over against all these critics we finally posit the unanimous verdict of all Jewish and Christian tradition as far back as there is any trace, and ask the candid reader to weigh it as against the hypothesis of a post-exile authorship and a pseudo-Isaiah. "That a writer confessedly of the highest genius," observes Alexander, "living at one of the most critical junctures in the history of Israel, when the word of God began to be precious and prophetic inspiration rare, should have produced such a series of prophecies as this, with such effects upon the exiles and even upon Cyrus as tradition ascribes to them, and then have left them to the admiration of all future ages, without so much as a trace of his own personality about them, is a phenomenon of literary history compared with which the mystery of Junius is as nothing."

Some critics have urged, as against the traditional authorship of these later chapters, that in the Talmud Isaiah is placed after Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But far back of the Talmud, and two centuries or more before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Sirach wrote of these three great prophets, placing Isaiah first, and calling him "the great prophet, who was also faithful in his vision. By a great spirit," he adds, "he saw the last things, and comforted the mourners in Zion. He showed what should come to pass forever, and secret things before they came to light." Ecclesiasticus xlvi, 22-25. And thus, as prince among the prophets, have all subsequent ages held him. In loftiness of thought, in splendor of diction, and in profound in-

tuition of the yearnings of the human heart, he stands unrivaled, his enemies themselves being judges. And doubtless as the world grows older, mightier and mightier will grow this great evangelical prophet, this comforter of Zion, this winged psalmist of humanity's holiest hopes.

Minstrel sublime! Thy God anointed thee
 Above thy fellow-prophets. All thy words
 Are polished amethysts, and, like the glass
 Of him that revels with the golden stars,
 Bring to our vision worlds unknown before.
 Immortal seer! What glory filled thine eye!
 What myriad melodies possess thy harp,
 That angels linger in their flights to hear
 Thy oracles divine. Sound on, ye hymns
 Prophetic; ages yet to come will hear,
 As ages past heard, in these lofty strains
 The Spirit's voice, and hearing, will believe.
 That Jesus is the very Christ of God.

ART. IV.—HARMAN'S INTRODUCTION.

An Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. By HENRY M. HARMAN, D.D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College. Edited by GEORGE R. CROOKS, D.D., and JOHN F. HURST, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

AROUND any ancient monument the dust of centuries has settled, until its base is buried out of sight. In order to judge of the proportions of such a monument, or to ascertain how securely it stands, we must dig down to its foundations, and bring to light its buried parts. Troy could never have been understood by studying the Iliad only; Dr. Schliemann's pick and shovel must prepare the way for a proper appreciation of the city of Priam.

The same thing is true of any old book. Time works such changes in language, in the manners and customs of the people, and in the relative position of the nations, that in a few centuries a large part of the book becomes buried lore. Almost every author leaves great chasms in his writings to be bridged over by facts and opinions commonly known and accepted. But these facts and opinions in course of time sink out of sight, and others widely different are superimposed. In a few cent-

uries the bridges which connected the headlands of the narrative are all gone, and the new circumstances have either left the chasm with nothing to join its opposite banks, or have filled it up so high with *débris* that it is utterly impassable. The book thus becomes fragmentary, disconnected, and contradictory; nor is it possible to vindicate its integrity and give it a plain and consistent meaning except by reproducing in thought the state of things which existed at the time it was written. But this will require no little digging and delving in the lore of the past, and will necessitate the exhuming of the age in which, and the people among which, the book first made its appearance.

The Bible is the oldest of all authentic books, and for that reason presents many difficulties requiring explanation before it can be thoroughly understood. Moreover, its several parts were written in different ages of the world, and in various countries. And then it was all penned by men of a widely different race from us, having modes of thought and forms of expression peculiar to the East. When we remember that the governments under which these writers lived have perished from off the face of the earth, and that the Hebrew people no longer inhabit the country which then was theirs, we should expect to find more difficulty in interpreting the Bible than in any other book. One half of that old monument is buried beneath the drifting, shifting sands of time, and we can but very imperfectly judge of its symmetry as a whole, or of the strength of its base, by the portion which now remains above ground. It requires more learning and more labor to remove the accumulations of time from the Bible, and lay bare the manners and customs which were contemporaneous with its writers, than are demanded for the elucidation of any other ancient document. If, however, the labor and learning thus spent shall result in discovering that the shaft is a monolith, and that it rests upon the Rock of ages, the reward will be more than commensurate with the toil.

The necessity for a re-examination of the claims and contents of the Bible, for the purpose of directing attention and thought to its sacred truths, is made apparent by the attempt on the part of skeptical scientists to ignore and divert attention from this volume of our faith. Mr. James C. Southall says: "There

is a certain want of ingenuousness among many literary and scientific men with regard to the historical books of the Hebrew Scriptures which is reprehensible, and for which I have little respect. They studiously avoid all mention of these documents, when if they had been discovered in the valley of the Euphrates or the Nile they would receive great attention. I do not recollect that the 'Antiquity of Man' ever recognizes that the book of Genesis is in existence, and yet every one is perfectly conscious that the author has it in mind, and is writing *at it all the time.*"* The testimony of the book no less than that of the rocks requires careful study in order to be understood, and the Church, therefore, ought to put forth as much effort to concentrate thought upon the Bible as the world does to keep the discoveries of physical science ever before the mind. At a time like this, when skepticism is endeavoring to turn the current of thought away from revelation, the publication of an exhaustive "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures" is not only a valuable contribution to sacred literature, but also a priceless boon to all sincere inquirers after the truth.

Henry M. Harman, D.D., Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature in Dickinson College, is the first American scholar who has undertaken this stupendous work. Indeed, we had almost come to think that the time and patience required in the production of such a book were too great for the push and hurry of the American character, and that they could only be matched by the bull-dog perseverance of the English, or the tireless sitting capacity of the German character.

Dr. Nast gave us an admirable "Introduction to the Gospels" a few years since, but that was only a part of the great work that was needed, and, after all, its author was not a native of America, having had his birth in the Fatherland. The appearance, therefore, of Dr. Harman's "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures" within the last year is matter both of Christian gratitude and national pride.

The vast and varied erudition which he brings to this task makes him master of the situation, while his indomitable patience and perseverance never tire in exposing error and in tracking truth to its source. He seems equally at home in all the languages of the East, both ancient and modern. Greek,

* Preface to "The Recent Origin of Man," p. 10.

Hebrew, Egyptian and Assyrian archæology are all at his fingers' ends. The discoveries of science and the testimony of travelers furnish a fund of knowledge on which he draws at will, and his thorough acquaintance with all that has been written by those who have preceded him in this particular department of study makes him quick to profit by the admissions of enemies and to take warning from the errors of friends. Indeed, his stores of antique and curious learning fit him for a task like this almost beyond a rival.

At the very outset of his Introduction he parts company with atheists and with the Tübingen school of critics, demanding in his readers belief in the existence of a God, and in the possibility of a supernatural revelation. He thus states the plan and scope of his work :

It is our purpose, in the present volume, to examine the Genuineness, Credibility, Integrity, Language, Contents, and most important Ancient Versions of the Canonical Books of the Bible. An inquiry of such a nature travels over a long period of human history. We are to consider books extending through a period of more than fifteen hundred years, the earliest of which appeared at the dawn of history, and the last were composed when the Roman Empire and Pagan Civilization were at their zenith of power. In the treatment of such a subject much depends upon the frame of mind with which it is approached. If our speculative system excludes from the universe an ever-living, free, supreme Intelligence, the Creator and Preserver of all that is, and acknowledges nothing but unintelligent physical forces, upon whose play all things depend, we are wholly unfit to deal fairly with the Sacred Canon. For in such a case Revelation, Miracles, and Prophecies are palpable absurdities. But Atheism can never be a positive affirmation; and if the natural phenomena of the world furnished no proof of a personal God, we could yet philosophically admit the evidence which the facts of the Bible give of his existence. No *real Theist* can consistently deny the possibility of revelation, with its accompanying proofs—miracles and prophecies—and hence he is ever ready to listen to the evidence of the genuineness of documents that establish them. Nor will he take offense at a *written* revelation, when he reflects that it is by means of *books*, in the order of Providence, that mankind are instructed in the various affairs of the world.—P. 17.

Granted the existence of God and the possibility of a written revelation, our author sets out to determine what claim our Scriptures have to be regarded as such written revelation from God. In deciding a question like this the stream of inquiry

divides, as we follow it up, into three branches, namely, external, internal, and collateral evidence. These branches, however, flow so close together that, follow which one you will, the other two will always be in sight.

Dr. Harman does not attempt to complete the consideration of either one of these branches of evidence to the exclusion of the other two, but seems to delight in keeping them all constantly before the mind, so that their united force may be felt. He cannot, of course, avoid pursuing separately lines of inquiry which belong to one or the other of these classes of evidence, and for the time being must close his ears to all other voices, but it will not be long before he returns to bring up the other lines abreast with this. His mode of treatment reminds one of a skillful lawyer presenting his evidence to a jury. He does not divide it up into sections and bring all the witnesses who are to testify to any fact upon the stand in immediate succession, but so arranges the order of his witnesses that the testimony of each will serve to explain and confirm that of all the others. He may first bring a witness to identify a document; then he will read the instrument and put it in evidence; next he may call a witness to swear to the signature; then he will prove that the party admitted upon a certain occasion that he had executed such an instrument; then he will show in whose custody it has been kept from the time it was executed; next he will return to the document, and will establish from its orthography and grammar a correspondence with other papers executed by this party; and, finally, he may prove the fact that the party was in the place named at the time the instrument purports to have been executed, and that it was generally reputed to be his act, without any denial on his part.

He will so interweave external, internal, and collateral evidence that each will be supported by the other, and that the case will be sustained by the combined force of the testimony.

In the case of the holy Scriptures the first question which demands an answer is, Whence came the books which make up the Bible? They did not fall from the moon, they were not brought to earth by an angel, they were not revealed by some supernatural light in a cave of the mountain. We hold them to be the word of God; but how came we in possession of them? To answer this question our author proceeds to follow the

stream of revelation up to the several springs whose waters swell the great current. And, just here, I cannot refrain from expressing my gratification that in almost every instance he has gone to original sources for his information, and has given us the original text, either in the body of the book or in copious foot-notes. Nothing new could be said upon this head, for the facts are patent to all; but the disposition and arrangement of the facts, so as to give them their greatest force, is very skillfully made.

Confining his inquiries in the first part of the book to the Old Testament, it becomes of the utmost importance to determine the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. It were manifestly a waste of time and labor to investigate books which never attained to the dignity of sacred writings among the Jews themselves; and so the sacred writings which have come down to us need sifting before we examine their claim to be the word of God. For this purpose our author travels through every ancient catalogue of the Old Testament—from that of Melito to that of St. Jerome. As the last mentioned catalogue is the one on which he bases the canon of the Old Testament, it may not be regarded as out of place to insert it here:

Of all the fathers of the early Church Jerome was the greatest Hebrew scholar, and the best versed in the literature of the Jews. His testimony as to the canon of the Old Testament is, therefore, very valuable. In the preface to his translation of the two Books of Samuel and of the two Books of Kings, he furnishes a catalogue of books of the Old Testament as arranged in the Hebrew Bible, giving both the Hebrew and the Greek or Latin name of each. He gives, first, the five books of Moses, which he says are called TORAH—LAW. The second division, he says, is that of the PROPHETS, and he begins with Joshua the son of Nun. Next comes the Book of Judges, with that of Ruth in the same volume. The third book is that of Samuel, called First and Second Kings with us. The fourth book is that of Kings, contained in the third and fourth volume of Kings; fifth, Isaiah; sixth, Jeremiah; seventh, Ezekiel. Then come the Twelve (Minor) Prophets. The third division, says he, contains the *Ἁγιόγραφα*, HAGIOGRAPHΑ, (*Holy Writings*.) The first book is Job; next, Psalms of David, in one volume; three books of Solomon, namely, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs; First and Second Chronicles; Ezra; and the ninth, Esther. "Thus the books of the ancient law," says he, "are twenty-two: five of Moses, eight of the Prophets, and nine of the Hagiographa; although some often insert Ruth and the Lamentations in the Hagiographa, . . . and thus the books

of the ancient law would be twenty-four." In this catalogue are all the books that we have in our present canon of the Old Testament, and no others; Nehemiah is included in Ezra, and the Lamentations are included in the prophecy of Jeremiah. Jerome remarks on this catalogue: "Whatever is outside of these must be placed among the Apocrypha. Therefore Wisdom, which is commonly inscribed the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' and the Book of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobias, are not in the canon. The First Book of Maccabees I have found in Hebrew. The Second Book is in Greek." He observes, in his preface to Jeremiah, that "The Book of Baruch has no existence among the Hebrews, and the spurious Epistle of Jeremiah I have determined should be by no means commented upon."—P. 30.

From these Christian authorities he turns to Jewish testimony for confirmatory evidence of the Old Testament canon. It so happens that the writings of Josephus and Philo have preserved for us catalogues more or less perfect of the books held as sacred by the Jews in their day. Another is found incorporated in the prologue of the Greek translation of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, while the Talmuds furnish a fourth. These are all forced to bear their testimony to the canonicity of the books of our Old Testament.

Alongside these Jewish and early Christian catalogues he next marshals the ancient manuscripts of the Jewish Scriptures; and after them the many ancient versions—the Septuagint, the Targums, the Peshito, the Itala, the Vulgate, the Egyptian, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Georgian, the Gothic, the Slavonian, and the Arabic—together with the Samaritan Pentateuch and its versions. Early Christian literature is ransacked for information upon this subject, and every passage found bearing upon the canon of the Scriptures is made to take its place in this book. We are compelled to wade knee-deep among old Hebrew MSS., and through tomes of musty translations in all the languages of the Babel East. The conflict between these early authorities soon eliminates the Apocrypha, and leaves us the Old Testament canon in its integrity as we now have it.

Having thus determined the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures as a whole, our author next resolves the Old Testament into its several components, and regards each book as a separate document for the purpose of making each succeeding author bear testimony to the writings of his predecessor, so as to fix ap-

proximately the date of the oldest books of the Bible. In other words, he traces the volume as a whole book to within sight of its latest writer—farther than this it could not be traced, because it did not exist in its integrity—and from this point, taking each sacred author as an independent authority, he climbs, step by step, by means of their testimony, up the stair of evidence to the days of the Exodus and the writing of the Pentateuch.

Paley's argument from quotations and allusions must forever be conclusive.* Any quotation from a book is proof unanswerable that that book was extant at the time the quotation was made. Well, by means of direct quotations from, or clear allusions to, or direct mention of, the Pentateuch, in the several books of the Old Testament, our author follows the Books of Moses back to the days of Joshua, who mentions them as writings well understood and of acknowledged authority among the people at that time. With the testimony of Joshua he closes the evidence from sacred authors, and concludes as follows:

It may be taken for granted that Moses was the great legislator of the Hebrews, since the proof is so strong that it may be said to have hardly ever been questioned. All the writings of the Jews, and their oldest traditions, agree that Moses was their lawgiver; and the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans held the same view. Manetho, an Egyptian priest of Sebennytus, a man of great erudition, who wrote in Greek, about B. C. 300, the Egyptian History from their sacred writings, states that the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Amenophis, and that their leader, a priest of Heliopolis, by name Osarsiphus—whose name was changed to *Moses* after he went over to the Israelites—*gave them laws*, for the most part contrary to the customs of Egypt, enjoining upon them not to worship the gods, nor to abstain from those animals held sacred in Egypt, but to sacrifice and slaughter them all. King Amenophis (Amunoph) is placed by Wilkinson at B. C. 1498–1478. Manetho's History of the Dynasties has been remarkably confirmed by the monuments of Egypt. Strabo, the great Greek geographer, (about B. C. 65,) in speaking of the Jews, remarks: "Moses, one of the Egyptian priests, possessing a part of Lower Egypt, left there, being disgusted with the existing institutions, and many, honoring the Divinity, left with him. For he said and taught that the Egyptians have not just conceptions of the Divine nature in representing it by beasts and cattle; nor have the Lybians; nor have the Greeks, who represent it by human forms. For that only is God which embraces us all, both land and sea."

The Roman satirist Juvenal (about A. D. 100) speaks of "the

* "Evidences of Christianity," p. 134.

law, all which Moses delivered in the sacred volume." "Moses," says Tacitus, "gave the Jewish nation new rites, contrary to those of other men."—P. 71.

Having thus established the antiquity and integrity of these books, the question as to their genuineness next arises. In this field Dr. Harman's scythe cuts a broad swath. His intimate acquaintance with the state of ancient learning in all the countries which enter into this question, and his knowledge of the manners, customs, and languages of the peoples concerned, enable him largely to reproduce the state of society which existed in the days of the Exodus. He is not writing a work on the evidences of Christianity, and hence his book is not polemical in tone. He is preparing the way for the study of the holy Scriptures, and therefore contents himself with the task of removing causes of misapprehension, and with restoring, as far as may be, the ancient settings and surroundings of the Bible. He does not aim at dovetailing propositions into syllogisms for the purpose of forcing conclusions. He rather assigns to himself the task of collecting the materials out of which arguments are constructed. His arrangement of these materials is rather in the form of pictures of ancient society than in the shape of demonstrations of formal propositions. Reading his work, before we know it we feel at home among the patriarchs, and the meaning of lawgiver, psalmist, and prophet dawns upon us we know not how. The best possible explanation of an author's meaning is a knowledge of the circumstances under which the book was written. Thus (on page 67) he hedges in the Pentateuch :

As a preliminary to the discussion of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, there arises the question of the antiquity of the art of alphabetical writing among the Hebrews : for if it can be shown that the art was well-known among that people in the Mosaic age, the probability that their great lawgiver *wrote* his laws will be very great.

Writing in hieroglyphics, which preceded alphabetical writing, was known and practiced in Egypt at a very remote period: The sacred books of Thoth, the Egyptian Mercury or Hermes, were written, in part at least, as early as the time of Suphis, (Cheops,) to whom the books were attributed. This Memphitic king, according to Wilkinson, reigned about B. C. 2450. Numerous commentaries were written on these sacred books of Thoth. "Papyri are of the most remote Pharaonic periods, and the same mode of

writing on them is shown from the sculptures to have been common in the age of Suphis, or Cheops, the builder of the Great Pyramid." "Every thing was done in writing." They had decimal as well as duodecimal calculation, and the reckoning by units, tens, hundreds, and thousands, before the pyramids were built. Alphabetical writing came into use several centuries later. "From the Palestinians the people near the Mediterranean Sea received their alphabet. The sounds of the alphabet itself, as it is known to us, suit well the general lingual characteristics of the Semites. It corresponds to their peculiarity, for it expresses their inclination to gutturals, and the variety of their hissing or aspirated sounds. We can, therefore, assert with high probability that *its inventor was a Semitic.*" That the Israelites possessed alphabetical writing when they went down into Egypt is quite evident, otherwise they would have adopted the hieroglyphic system of the Egyptians. The Phœnicians, who lived on the borders of Canaan, and whose language was nearly the same as the Hebrew, possessed writing at a very remote period. They attributed the invention of their alphabet to Taut, their world-god. The sacred writings of the Phœnicians, in which their cosmogony, the history of their gods and heroes, natural events, and astronomical, astrological, and psychological doctrines were contained, were called Taut-writings. Antiquity mentions seven such writings.

The existence of alphabetical writing among the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus being thus established, he proceeds to draw a picture of the arts and sciences in general in Egypt in the Mosaic age, to show that the statements of the Pentateuch respecting the arts employed by the Israelites in building the tabernacle, in making its utensils, and in adorning the priests, together with the allusions made to gold and other ornaments, are natural and credible, unless one can suppose that the Israelites, although dwelling in close proximity to the Egyptians for centuries, never learned any of their arts, and that no Egyptian artist ever appeared among them.

These collateral considerations create a strong presumption both that Moses wrote laws for the Jews and that the Pentateuch contains those laws. And now our author turns to the evidences of genuineness to be found in the books themselves. Having argued the unity of the Pentateuch from the one plan which pervades it all, showing it to be the work of one mind, he next proceeds to demonstrate its antiquity from the *archaisms* which it contains. I do not recollect ever to have seen so thorough and exhaustive a presentation of this class of evidence as is found in this book. Indeed, the chap-

ters upon this subject I regard as the gems of the whole volume. They give evidence of an amount of learning, labor, and patience which few men possess, and furnish an argument for the antiquity and genuineness of the Pentateuch which few minds can resist.

Language is a long-lived thing, but it has its youth, maturity, and decrepitude, like men and nations. The seasons in its life-time may be centuries, but they mark different stages of its development or decline. A language that had well-nigh perished may sometimes be revived and perpetuated for centuries, but its youth or maturity can never be restored when once it has been passed. Though the English tongue should become universal, and should continue to be spoken to the end of time, it would never again be characterized by the language of Spenser and Chaucer. A language may reach a second childhood, like an individual, but the second will be very unlike the first. Because language is thus ceaselessly progressive, the style, the idioms, the grammar, and the very words of any composition will go far toward determining the age in which it was written. A document found to-day written in English containing many obsolete words and forms of expression, together with antiquated spelling and strange grammatical forms, but containing no word or syllable that was not pure Anglo-Saxon, would unquestionably be assigned to a period prior to the Norman Conquest, and subsequent to the Anglo-Saxon ascendancy in England. The ages of stone and of bronze do not more clearly mark successive stages in a people's civilization than do the peculiarities of the language in which a book is written determine the age to which it belongs. Dr. Harman, with consummate skill, has collected and arranged the archaisms of the Pentateuch for the double purpose of establishing the antiquity of the Books of Moses and the unity of their authorship. We think he conclusively shows, not only that the books must have been written in the infancy of the Hebrew language, but that the same peculiarities run through all five of the books, and are not found in any other Hebrew books of great antiquity, thus showing these books to have been written by one and the same author.

The genuineness of these books being thus clearly indicated, our author next turns to examine the objections which have

been offered against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Of the *document* hypothesis of the origin of the Pentateuch, he disposes as follows :

Respecting the document hypothesis, we may remark, first of all, that there is very little agreement, as we have already seen, among the opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch in regard to the *number* of the original documents, *when* they were composed, by *whom* and from *what* sources, and *when* the final revision of the whole was made. This want of unity in view is a strong proof that their theories rest upon no solid basis of facts. One feature, however, stands out prominently in nearly all their theories: they deprive Moses, as much as possible, of all connection with the composition of the Pentateuch.

The different names for the Divine Being—*Elohim, God, Jehovah*, (properly *Jahveh*.) and *Jehovah Elohim* (LORD GOD, Eng. Ver.)—found in different portions of the Book of Genesis, furnish the original ground for the decomposition of the Mosaic writings. In the other books of the Pentateuch (with the exception of the first few chapters of Exodus) the use of the divine names furnishes no support at all for the document hypothesis. But it must be borne in mind that the hypothesis that one document or more entered into the composition of the Book of Genesis and into the first two chapters of Exodus, by no means militates against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. That the traditions of the Hebrew people would be written down during their sojourn in Egypt, where they came in contact with a people who were accustomed to write the annals of their kings, and to compose works on science and religion, is highly probable. Joseph, who married the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On, might have compiled the annals of the Hebrews and the traditions respecting the deluge and the antediluvian world. But those annals might have been very defective, and have contained no account, or a very imperfect one, of the work of creation, the order of which none but God could know. The original document lying before Moses—for we can scarcely believe it at all probable that the Hebrews had two different documents which related the history of the world from the creation to the time of Moses—may have been used by him in the composition of Genesis. In this way we might find in Genesis a narrator, (*the Elohist*.) and an editor or reviser, the *Jehovist*, (*Moses*.) How far this is probably true must be determined from the phenomena exhibited in the book.—P. 88.

After patiently exposing the absurdity of Bishop Colenso's strictures, one by one, he finally takes leave of him with this remark: "There is one peculiarity of Colenso which must be noticed. Whenever any subject admits of different views or explanations, the one which creates a difficulty or absurdity is

almost invariably adopted by him. No other document of either the ancient or modern world would be treated in the same way."—P. 217.

Curious objections by the score are satisfactorily answered, and apparent discrepancies harmonized, until the ground is completely cleared of obstacles to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. At last he opens the books of the Pentateuch, and shows that *they claim* to have been written by Moses, while no rival author has ever arisen to dispute the claim. Finally, to place the divine seal upon these old books, he turns to Jesus Christ and his apostles for their testimony:

Our Saviour and his apostles every-where assume the Mosaic authorship and the divine authority of the Pentateuch. Our Saviour, in his controversy with the Jews, says: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for *he wrote* of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" How absurd this language would be, on the theory that the Pentateuch was written ages after Moses—If you do not believe in a work made up of traditions and myths in a late age and attributed to Moses, how can ye believe in me?—and this language from Him who is the *truth* itself!

In various passages Christ speaks also of Moses as if he was the author of the Pentateuch: "Have ye not read in *the book of Moses*, how in the bush God spake unto him saying, I am the God of Abraham," etc. Mark xii, 26. "If they hear not *Moses* and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Luke xvi, 31. "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in *the law of Moses*," etc. Luke xxiv, 44. "Did not *Moses* give you *the law*?" John vii, 19.

The Apostle Peter, on the day of Pentecost, says: "For *Moses* truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me," etc. Acts iii, 22.

The Apostle Paul, in his address to Agrippa, observes in respect to his teaching: "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and *Moses did say* should come." Acts xxvi, 22. And in Acts xxviii, 23, St. Paul expounded "both out of *the law of Moses* and out of the prophets." "For *Moses* describeth (Greek, *writes*) the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth these things shall live by them." Rom. x, 5. This refers to Lev. xviii, 5, which St. Paul here declares that Moses wrote. "For even unto this day, when *Moses* is read, the veil is upon their heart." 2 Cor. iii, 15.—Pp. 224, 225.

The inspiration of the Pentateuch is left to be inferred from its contents. If it be a trustworthy history of the events which

it records, there is no escaping the conclusion that Moses was a divinely inspired man. Men always have believed and will believe to the end of time that God is on the side of truth. Whenever, therefore, they behold God's omniscience cropping out in prophecy or his omnipotence laid bare in miracles, they will believe in the truth of the man or the message in attestation of which the prophecy was uttered or the miracle performed. There could have been no deception in the miracles performed during the exodus. It was not a matter of faith but of positive knowledge with the Jews that the Red Sea parted at Moses' command. There could have been no mistake about the manna which fell, and on which they were fed. They knew whether the waters gushed forth from the rock when Moses smote it, or not; and they knew absolutely whether their clothing waxed not old throughout all their journeyings. There could have been no mistake about these and similar miracles; and the Jews would not have accepted as true the Pentateuch which contained these accounts, nor bowed obedience to its laws, had these miracles not occurred in their knowledge. But admit these miraculous interpositions of divine power through Moses, and at once he becomes the accredited agent and mouth-piece of God.

The authenticity and inspiration of the books of Moses, like the Siamese twins, are vitally united, and are, therefore, inseparable. If the books are not trustworthy histories of the events which they record, of course they are not divinely inspired. But if, on the other hand, we accept their statement of facts as true, it follows irresistibly that God breathed his own wisdom into their author, and clothed him at times with almighty power. The nature of the history determines the inspiration of the author. But the narrative of events in the Pentateuch cannot be rejected as authentic history according to any rule of criticism which would not destroy belief in all ancient history. The miraculous events, upon which the proof of Moses' inspiration rests, and about which there could have been no deception, have been attested by every Jewish writer from Moses down to the close of the sacred canon—they have been celebrated by the Jews in sacred songs, and commemorated by religious institutions and festivals through all the ages which have intervened since the events are related to have occurred.

The country over which Moses and Israel passed, in their flight from Egypt, bears names to the present day which are the echo of the miraculous events of the Exodus, and the atmosphere of Egypt and Arabia is still full of traditions respecting these events. With all these evidences corroborating the Mosaic record, it is not possible rationally to withhold assent to the authenticity of the Pentateuch. And since its authenticity establishes miracles and prophecy, the inspiration of Moses follows inevitably.

It is too late to object to the possibility of miracles and prophecy when the one has been performed and the other fulfilled before our eyes. De Wette saw and acknowledged that the Mosaic narrative enfolds the miraculous like a garment. He says: "If it is at least doubtful to the thinking intellect that such miracles really occurred, the question arises whether they did not so appear to the eye-witnesses and participants of the history; or were supposed by the reporters to have occurred in a natural way, but set forth in a poetic-miraculous light? But this must be denied as soon as the narratives are carefully considered. For there is wholly wanting in them that credulous poetic frame of mind which would contain the key to the miraculous."*

Bishop Colenso's general objection to miracles is a weak thing to dispute the power of Moses' rod. It is thus stated and annihilated by our author, (pages 218, 219:)—

"The order," says he, "of this wondrous universe, so manifold, so diverse, yet all tending to unity, to one great central Cause, a miracle, if really witnessed, would be like a jarring discord in the midst of a mighty music—not a sign of the master-musician's presence, but a token that for once he had failed to subdue the rebellious elements—would, in short, be simply frightful."† What shall we say to a miracle's being "a jarring discord in the midst of a mighty music?" Is this world nothing but harmonious music? What shall we say of earthquakes burying whole cities with thousands of human beings; of inundations laying waste vast tracts and destroying human life; of famines, pestilences, tornados, sweeping away houses, and sending ships with their precious freight beneath the waves of the deep? Is all this music in the ears and harmony to the eyes of Colenso? To those discordant and destructive forces add the passions of men, exhibited in horri-

* Schrader's De Wette's "Einleitung," p. 257.

† "Lectures on the Pentateuch," etc., p. 369.

ble wars and devastations. In the midst of such a world as this, is an extraordinary display of omnipotent power in punishing the wicked and delivering the good—the manifestation of the divine power and Godhead, the revelation of Jehovah to man, a great light in the midst of moral darkness—is all this nothing but a jarring discord? In the midst of the wrongs and the darkness of the world, who has not felt, as did Isaiah, and prayed, “O that thou wouldst rend the heavens, that thou wouldst come down?”

The bed rock of the Bible has thus been reached; and, having found the Pentateuch to be the WORD of GOD, it is comparatively easy to determine, approximately, the age, genuineness and inspiration of the remaining books of the Old Testament.

To undertake to give an adequate idea of our author's treatment of these several books would be to transcribe a large part of his work. Suffice it to say, that the same thorough scholarship and careful research are brought to bear upon every portion of the Old Testament; and if in every case we do not agree with the conclusions of his logic, we cannot help being edified and profited by his learning.

His Introduction to the New Testament, which occupies the latter part of his work, does for the four Gospels what the course of investigation pursued in the case of the Pentateuch did for the Books of Moses. His examination of the authorities bearing upon the authenticity of the Gospels is thorough and exhaustive, and his accumulation of facts for the defense of the Gospels leaves nothing to be desired. But as the treatment of the New Testament is similar to the course pursued with the Old, it does not fall within the scope of this article to enter further into its discussion.

That the book is free from errors is not claimed, nor is it hoped that all the conclusions reached by the author will be accepted by orthodox Christians; but it contains so much that is rare and valuable that we can easily afford to overlook its defects. Dr. Harman is a scholar rather than a logician. The treasury of learning which he has given us in this volume is almost faultless. The mistakes are nearly all in the conclusions which he draws from indisputable premises. Without indorsing every thing contained in the book, we regard the volume, as a whole, as a grand contribution to sacred literature, and as an armory of truth from which the weapons of our warfare will be taken for a generation to come.

ART. V.—ECHOES FROM AFRICA.

The American Missionary. December, 1878; January and February, 1879. American Missionary Association. New York.

The Three Despised Races in the United States. An Address by JOSEPH COOK. American Missionary Association. New York. 1878.

“THE fate of the negro,” it has been said, “is the romance of our age.” The events which have transpired in his history since the great emancipation in the United States, and which are now transpiring, are in the highest degree romantic. There will always gather around the history of the race a pathetic interest, which must ever kindle the imagination, touch the heart, and awaken the sympathies of all in whom there is a spark of humanity.

The intelligence we have just received from America of large migrations of negroes from the Southern to the Western States is full of melancholy and suggestive interest. To reflecting minds acquainted with the history of Southern society during the last fifty years these events are not surprising. Retributive justice may linger, but it is sure. A prosperity built up on the wrongs of a race, by the unrequited labor of a whole people, ought not to have been expected to be permanent. In 1858 the chivalry of Louisiana passed a law forbidding free blacks to come in; now they would pass a law forbidding them to go out.

“Many years ago,” we are informed by a writer of Southern birth,

“an artist of Philadelphia was engaged by the State of South Carolina to paint some national emblematic picture for her State-house. Jefferson Davis was requested to act with the South Carolina Committee at Washington in criticising the studies for this work. The most creditable sketch presented was a design representing the North by various mechanical implements; the West by a prairie and plow; while the South was represented by various things, the center-piece, however, being a cotton-bale with a negro upon it fast asleep. When Mr. Davis saw it, he said, ‘Gentlemen, this will never do; what will become of the South when the negro wakes up?’”

The discussions which the reconstruction laws have made possible in the South, the circulation of newspapers, the education of negro youth as preachers and teachers, have roused

the negro, and started him to his feet. The thunders of the civil war awoke him from his profound slumber; but he lay on the cotton-bale with his eyes open, uncertain where he was. The man who has been suddenly roused from a long sleep takes some time to recover himself. The negro is now up—stupid yet from a protracted and undisturbed slumber—but he is up, and wants to adjust his relations to the cotton-bale upon an equitable footing, or leave the bale and its owner to their fate. Hence the exodus and migration idea, which menaces the South in every department of its organic life. And this is a specially inopportune moment for the carrying out of such an idea on any thing like a large scale. The prosperity of the South has been rapidly returning under free labor, and was being placed on a satisfactory and enduring basis. Mr. Jefferson Davis lately declared that the ex-slave-holders were so far satisfied with the change that they would not, if they could, revert to the former system. And yet the owners of these reviving estates have been so unwise and reckless as to adopt such a system of treatment as has spread dissatisfaction among their hands. And, from all we can gather, this harsh and oppressive treatment has not been of a hap-hazard or isolated character, but the result of a deep-laid scheme. The plan seems to have been so to impoverish their laborers as to make them helplessly dependent, to check by a tyrannical repression the normal impulse of advance, to arrest the people through their elementary needs at a capriciously chosen point in their progress, and *fix* them in it, and thus bring about a species of serfdom very little better than the former bondage. Rev. Joseph Cook, the celebrated Boston lecturer, in an address before the American Association, furnishes the following information :

Last summer, on Lake Chautauqua, while I had a little leisure, I fell into conversation with one of the acutest members of Washington society—I dare not describe him more definitely—and he said to me: “The negro is getting in debt. He is a peasant; he rents land; he has only very small wages; he buys his groceries at a store owned by his landlord, and runs up a bill there; and the silent scheme of the South is to get the negro in debt. Then he cannot very well leave town until his debts are paid. He becomes a fixture, in many cases, because of his indebtedness; and, to make the story short, sir,” said my informant, “some of us fear that fifty years hence a considerable portion of the freed-

men will be in a state of peonage. They will be bankrupt tenants under the power of landlords. And it is often whispered in the South that this will be the next best thing to the restoration of slavery."*

No people having their eyes open and standing on their feet would long submit to such a state of things. But the intelligent among the negro population do not seem to consider that any migration in the United States will materially affect for the better the social and political *status* of the colored people.

The "People's Advocate," (Feb. 1, 1879,) a colored paper published at Washington, in an able editorial on the subject, says:

There has been a very respectable partial migration, and no perceptible change has come over the South in its ideas of negro citizenship. In 1869-70, 60,000 left Virginia and North Carolina for Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. They left Georgia by the thousands for Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and have gone from Eastern Virginia to New York and New England; but the feeling is nearly as bad to-day in Virginia and Georgia as it was years ago.

And they are now fleeing from Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

"Tis but a poor relief they gain
Who change the place but keep the pain."

And it strikes us, viewing matters from this distant standpoint, that the feeling toward the negro will continue to be "bad" in the United States, if being "bad" means the non-recognition of his social and political equality with the white man. For the negro, pure and simple, there is no country but Africa, and in America his deeper instincts tell him so. He will never be understood, nor will he ever understand his European guide and teacher, as long as he remains in the countries of his exile. He is often misled by the overflowing and ceaseless generosity of white men into a belief that his benefactors are getting nearer to the idea of practical oneness and brotherhood with him. But among the phenomena in the relations of the white man to the negro in the house of bondage none has been more curious than this: that the white man, under a keen sense of the wrongs done to the negro, will work for him, will suffer for him, will fight for him, will even die for him, but he cannot get rid of a secret contempt for him.

* "The Three Despised Races," etc., p. 25.

Mr. James Parton, in his article on "Antipathy to the Negro,"* says:

When Miss Kemble came first to Boston, in 1832, she sat next to the late John Quincy Adams at dinner one day, and the conversation turned upon the tragedy of "Othello." Miss Kemble has since reported one of Mr. Adams' remarks on this subject: "Talking to me about Desdemona, he assured me, with a most serious expression of sincere disgust, that he considered all her misfortunes as a very just judgment upon her for having married a *nigger*." If this anecdote had not come to us on such respectable authority we could hardly believe it of a man who, during the last and best ten years of his life, was looked upon as the black man's champion.

Theodore Parker, who in pleading for the slave could "stir his hearers to the bottom of their hearts and soften them to tears;" who, in his famous letter to Millard Fillmore, (Nov. 21, 1850,) could say:

I would rather lie all my life in jail and starve there than refuse to protect one of these parishioners of mine. . . . William Craft and Ellen were parishioners of mine. They have been at my house. I married them a fortnight ago this day. After the ceremony I put a Bible and then a sword into William's hands, and told him the use of each. . . . There hang beside me in my library, as I write, the gun my grandfather fought with at the battle of Lexington—he was a captain on that occasion—and also the musket he captured from a British soldier on that day, the first taken in the war for independence. If I would not peril my property, my liberty, my life, to keep my parishioners out of slavery, then I would throw away these trophies, and should think I was the son of some coward, and not a brave man's child.†

Theodore Parker, who could say, "I should like of all things to see an insurrection of slaves;" ‡ who could pronounce that pathetic and touching but terrible discourse over the great Webster; this same Theodore Parker did not think it inconsistent with his high ideal of human liberty and equal rights to write in a private letter as follows:

Last night I could not coax the thermometer down below 79° any way we could fix it. Now, at eight and a half A. M., I dare not look at it, it is so high. In the midst of the heat there

* "North American Review," Nov.-Dec., 1878.

† "Biography of Theodore Parker." By Octavius Brooks Frothingham. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1876. Pp. 410, 411.

‡ Ibid., p. 475.

just came a monstrous African black! O dear, how black he was! Fat! bless me, he looked like a barrel (no, a *sugar hogs-head*) of tar, so black, so fat! What an aggravation, with the thermometer at 90° in the shade!*

We should have taken this for the irrepressible overflow of harmless witticism but for other disparaging references to the negro. To Miss Hunt he writes, under date November 10, 1857:

There are inferior races which have always borne the same ignoble relation to the rest of men, and *always will*. For two generations what a change there will be in the condition and character of the Irish in New England! But in twenty generations the negroes will stand just where they are now; that is, if they have not disappeared. In Massachusetts there are no laws now to keep the black man from any pursuit, any office, that he will; but there has never been a rich negro in New England; not a man with ten thousand dollars, perhaps none with five thousand dollars; none eminent in any thing except the calling of a *waiter*.†

Again: "In respect to the *power of civilization*, the African is at the bottom, the American Indian next."‡ Again: "When slavery is abolished, the African population will decline in the United States, and die out of the South as out of Northampton and Lexington."§

Mr. Parker, after all he said and did for freedom, seems to have had an invincible contempt for weak and oppressed races. He waged uncompromising warfare against the process by which such peoples are degraded, but had no charity toward those suffering from the results of such process. He fought against the parent, and ridiculed the offspring. The abstract to him was hateful; the concrete examples contemptible or ludicrous. He scorned the Irish and laughed at the negro. He speaks of the Irish as follows:

I don't know but these Paddies are worse than the Africans to the country. We made a great mistake in attracting them here and allowing them to vote under less than twenty-one years of quarantine. Certainly it would take all that time to clean a Paddy—on the *outside* I mean; to clean him inwardly would be like picking up all the sands of the Sahara. There would be nothing left when the sands were gone. ||

* "Biography," p. 311.

† Ibid., p. 467.

‡ Ibid., p. 327.

§ Ibid., p. 473.

|| Ibid., p. 473.

It is a pity that in speaking of the "gentleman from Car-r-r-k," as in caricature he describes the Irishman, and of "the poor wretches from Africa," he did not conform to his own canon of criticism. Speaking of Pierpont, he says: "Just now, considering all that he has done and suffered, it would seem a little ungenerous to be quite just. All pictures must be painted in reference to the light they are to hang in and be looked at."*

Mr. Parker knew the "light" of prejudice and contempt in which his picture of the negro was to "hang," and yet, making no allowance for circumstances, and uninfluenced by the laws of moderation, he holds the balance between light and shade with an indifferent hand, paints in the gloomiest possible colors, and thus encourages rather than disarms the falsifying faculty of the observer predisposed to an unfavorable impression.

Would Mr. Parker have joined Dennis Kearney, and raised a crusade in favor of the inhospitable legislation proposed by the opponents of Chinese immigration? In view of the splendid results in the United States and in the world generally of the manly struggle which Mr. Parker maintained for truth and freedom—in view of the large sacrifices which he unquestionably made in the cause of free humanity—many errors of temper and judgment on his part may be forgotten; but the negro can never forget the slurs upon his race, of which, however, no one, perhaps, more readily than Mr. Parker would now admit the impolicy if not the injustice. For how do such utterances differ in character and effects from those of the Notts and Gliddons, of the Calhouns and Jeff. Davises? And the fact—which should be suggestive to thinking negroes in the United States—that they are reproduced in the biography by Mr. Frothingham, shows that there is a feeling that they are the proper thing to say, even now, about the negro. Can Congressional legislation remedy the evils produced by such caricatures and misrepresentations? Congress may decree civil rights to the "despised" race in America, and the exigencies of party may occasionally bring the negro to the front; but what progress can he make when a public sentiment against him is fostered in the writings and in the private intercourse of his

* "Biography," p. 329.

friends! In the language of the Liberian Declaration of Rights, "Public sentiment, more powerful than law, will ever frown him down."

The negro, pure and simple, may rely upon it that for him the most enthusiastic of his benefactors sees nothing but the lowest occupations. In the case of the most liberal of his advocates he will have occasionally to exclaim, *Et tu, Brute!*

A writer in the Methodist Quarterly Review for January, 1875, on "The Negro," has the following among the closing sentences of an able and plausible defense of the race:

Without the negro the top-stone of our national greatness will not be lifted to its predestined lofty altitude for centuries yet to come. Expatriate the negro, and our cotton-fields whiten no more; our turpentine orchards become silent as the grave; our rice-fields grow up into canebrakes, sheltering the alligator and wild boar.

But does the American conscience ever look forward to the time when, in the United States, the negro will have any common interest in, or any, the slightest possible, control over, the political and financial elements of the country—when he will be needed as a part of the directing agency in the halls of legislation, in counting-houses, and in banking establishments?

Mr. Parton, in the "North American Review," says:

The South is most happy in possessing the negro; for it is through his assistance that there will be the grand agriculture in the Southern States, which cannot flourish unless there is a class to labor and individuals to contrive. The Southern farmer, by the black man's help, can be a "scholar and a gentleman," and at the same time secure and elevate the black man's life.

Such utterances "give color to the idea" that the negro was made to live and improve only in the service and under the guidance of a superior. If this view is correct, then why does not the great Creator allow the elect masters to have free access and safe incursion into the natural home of the created slaves, and live in a land where they might hold their predestined *protégés* in unlimited numbers and in comfortable service? Why did He make for the slaves so magnificent a country, and surround it with a wall of fire, so that if the master comes to the threshold he either beats a hasty retreat or perishes in the attempt to penetrate?

"Massa run away,
Darkee stay, oh ho!"

No; the destiny of the negro and his marvelous country is veiled from the view of the outside world according to the wise and beneficent purposes of Omniscience.

"God is his own interpreter,
And he will make it plain."

He can wait, if the impatient Caucasian cannot.

The American Missionary Association, whose publications we have prefixed to this paper, in their work of lofty and noble purpose throughout the South are endeavoring to prepare the negro for higher spheres of labor than "cotton-fields, turpentine orchards, and rice-fields." Every negro who is at all acquainted with matters in the United States must have the highest admiration for that Association. Almost alone among the benevolent institutions of that land in the days of the great struggle, they never for one moment yielded to the imperious dictates of an oligarchical monopoly, but gave expression to the idea which they inscribed upon their banner, that one of the chief purposes of their organization was to resist the tyranny of the autocracy which doomed the negro to perpetual servitude. No one could be enrolled among the members of their society who was "a slave-holder." They have the gratitude of the negro race.

But history will have a brighter page than even that with which to adorn their annals when she comes to recount the devotion and sacrifices of the hundreds who have been sent forth under their auspices as uplifters of the prostrate host in the South, to whom, left as they were paralyzed by slavery, free movement and real progress were intrinsically impossible without the aid of such agencies as the American Missionary Association. As time rolls on the romance which clings to those heroes who fought to unfetter the body of the slave will fade beside the halo which will surround those who have labored to liberate his mind.

We have read with the deepest interest the report and some of the addresses made at the Thirty-second Anniversary of this Association, held in October, 1878, as well as letters from various portions of the field under its supervision. In reading the accounts of the struggles and sufferings of the missionaries, their sorrows and disappointments, their battles and their vic-

tories among the lowly in remote and sequestered districts, it is often impossible to repress the tears—tears of sympathy, of gratitude, and of joy.

At the Annual Meeting Rev. C. M. Southgate said :

We heard words of hearty praise this afternoon, telling of the success of the work. They tell hardly enough. But these efforts should be redoubled. We want more institutions like those at Atlanta, New Orleans, Charleston, and the other large Southern cities where high culture and intelligence rule. The scholarship can be compared without fear with similar grades at the North. I never heard in our boasted common schools such recitations as I have heard from boys as black as the blackest. I know what Yale and Harvard and Dartmouth can show ; but in Greek and Latin those colored students can rival their excellence. The culture in morals and manners is at least not inferior, nor the religious instruction less fruitful. The report from the Churches shows as large and as healthy success as we can show here. The young men and women in these institutions have an intense longing to be at work for the Master. The desperate condition of their race rests upon them like a pall. God is making them his prophets, and speaking through them, and sending redemption.

Rev. Dr. Bascom, in a letter from Alabama, says :

I see abundant proofs of the beneficent work of your Society here. Could its influence have been exerted in like manner among all our colored people of the South, the problem so perplexing to politicians and philanthropists, as to the future of this class in our country, would have been already solved.

The committee on the "Normal Work of the Association" reported that :

The eagerness of the colored people to obtain at least a rudimentary education has ever been a most encouraging sign. The young man who last year walked fifty miles with his trunk upon his back that he might enter school, recalls the zeal of the late Dr. Godell, of Constantinople, who, in his youth, also walked sixty miles with a trunk strapped upon his back, that he might enter Phillips Academy, at Andover. The demand for teachers from the normal schools—quite beyond the ability to supply them—is one of the surest indications that the schools are meeting an urgent need.

We regret that Professor Hartranft, in his able address on the "Five Tests of American Civilization," should have spoken of the "brutality of the negro." In what portion of the United States has that "brutality" been shown? Such a charge is in

flagrant contradiction to all the testimony borne of the negro by those who know him best.

And here we must venture to enter our earnest protest against the use of such phrases as "The Despised Races," which we see frequently used of late in the publications of the American Missionary Association. The Rev. Joseph Cook addressed the Association on the "Three Despised Races," and he was followed by Rev. C. M. Southgate on "Puritanism and the Despised Races." Such expressions as "The Despised Race" and "The Dark Continent," applied to the negro and his ancestral home, have not, we fancy, the most salutary effect either upon those who employ them or upon those to whom they refer; in the one they often beget arrogance; in the other, servility or resentment. They do more than serve the *ad captandum* purposes for which they are probably intended. In using "great plainness of speech" the instructors of humanity should be "wise as serpents and harmless as doves," which, according to a negro interpreter, means "an ounce of serpent to a pound of dove." Moreover, the whole of the rest of mankind does not hold the European, in view of his past history, in such unqualified admiration as to admit without serious question that he has a right to embody in terse phrases, and to parade in the titles of books, pamphlets, and addresses his contempt for other races. There are those of other races who also sneer and scorn and "despise." Some of the proceedings of Baker and Stanley in Africa must frequently have impressed the natives with the feeling that those energetic travelers came from much "darker continents" than any their unsophisticated imaginations had ever before suggested to them. The African now coming forward through education and culture cannot have unlimited respect for all the qualities of the European races: "A people with a passion for taking away the countries of others and dignifying the robbery as conquests; and whose systematic cruelty has been shown for ages in chaining, buying, and selling another race.

"Hearst thou, O God, those chains
Clanking on Freedom's plains,
By Christians wrought?
Those who those chains have worn
Christians have hither borne,
Christians have bought."

The intelligent negro feels that the part of the oppressor is not less to be despised than the part of the oppressed—that the part of the man-stealer and man-seller is far more contemptible than the part of the man stolen and sold. And this he will feel more and more. The brilliancy of the universal and prolonged success which has given the European the idea that he has a right to despise others and to proclaim the fact—the glories which have followed in the wake of his progress and conquests—are getting sadly dimmed in the light of a fuller understanding of the Gospel of Christ. Under the searching criticisms of rising intellects imbued with the essence of a Christian philosophy and influenced by the spirit of a science properly so called, those brutal instincts which received the eulogiums of the past are finding their proper recognition as elements of character to be reprobated and suppressed. The Bosworth Smiths of to-day are superseding the Carlyles of yesterday. Might no longer makes right. The motto on the British coat-of-arms is being slightly altered—not “God and *my* Right,” but “God and *the* Right.” Whatever “smacks of saltpeter”* is being deprecated and condemned. Says the eloquent author of “Carthage and the Carthaginians:”

It is equally reprehensible, whether it be the plunder of half of Europe by the representative of one of its most enlightened nations, the arch-robber of modern times, Napoleon, or the sack of a Chinese palace by those whom the Chinese had a right, in this instance at least, to style barbarians. If good men and great nations have hitherto often followed the example of Cicero in drawing a broad contrast between the extortions of a Verres and the high-handed plunder of Marcellus, a Warren Hastings, or a Napoleon, it is because they have not yet reached the moral standard which condemns the public robber; they look askance only at a thief. †

History, then, as it is read by the thinking negro, will not diminish the vehemence of his protest against the injustice of being regarded by the European as belonging to a “despised race,” nor lessen the grounds of his desire to reciprocate the

* Lord Salisbury's Speech in the House of Lords, 1879.

† “Carthage and the Carthaginians.” By R. Bosworth Smith, M.A., Assistant Master in Harrow School, etc. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1878. When Dr. Johnson expressed a hope that he might never hear of the Punic Wars again he never anticipated any thing like this brilliant and charming work—this startling investment in flesh and blood of the dry bones of Carthaginian history.

disparaging sentiment. His hands are free from the blood of other men. He has not in any way oppressed other races. He has suffered, *and that is all*. He has been scattered and peeled, despoiled and plundered, abused, persecuted, and downtrodden, *and that is all*. The late Professor Tayler Lewis, of Union College, when he was once asked the flippant question, "What shall we do with the negro?" replied, "And pray, sir, what shall the negro do with you? It is my logic, with no disrespect to anybody, that one question is as fair as the other." *

The negroes on the African continent who have not read European history are divided into two classes, namely, those who have seen and had intercourse with the Europeans, and those who have never seen but only heard of them. The view taken by the former at this moment is exactly that described by Mungo Park a hundred years ago. A century has made no change. Of the impressions of the latter we have a fair specimen in one of Stanley's amusing anecdotes. Mungo Park says:

Although the negroes in general have a very great idea of the wealth and power of the Europeans, I am afraid that the Mohammedan converts among them think very lightly of our superior attainments in religious knowledge. The white traders in the maritime districts take no pains to counteract this unhappy prejudice. The poor Africans, whom we affect to consider as barbarians, look upon us, I fear, as little better than a race of formidable but ignorant heathen.†

Mr. Stanley, describing the people on the south-western shores of Lake Tanganyika, says:

The conduct of the first natives to whom we were introduced pleased us all. They showed themselves in a very amiable light, sold their corn cheaply and without fuss, behaved themselves decently and with propriety, though their principal men, *entertaining very strange ideas of white men*, carefully concealed themselves from view, and refused to be tempted to expose themselves within view or hearing of us.

Their doubts of our character were reported to us by a friendly young Arab as follows: "Kassanga, chief of Ruanda, says, 'How can the white men be good when they come for no trade, whose feet one never sees, who always go covered from head to foot with clothes? Do not tell me they are good and friendly. There is something very mysterious about them; perhaps wicked. Probably they are magicians; at any rate, it is better to leave them alone, and to keep close until they are gone.'"

* Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct., 1878, p. 617.

† Park's Travels.

And again:

In these people we first saw the mild, amiable, unsophisticated innocence of this part of Central Africa, and their behavior was exactly the reverse of the wild, ferocious, cannibalistic races the Arabs had described to us.*

After the dispraging view of the negro taken by Professor Hartranft, it is not surprising that he should have exclaimed:

As to the African, there are not a few Americans, even in this day, who think a righteous solution of the African question is to ship them all off to the Dark Continent. So far as the American Colonization Society keeps in view education and other Christian instrumentalities I bid them God-speed; but if they desire to send the negro out of the country, I say, No! a thousand times, No! Let us solve the problem right here where God has placed them.

We cannot help repeating the last words of the paragraph—"right here where *God has placed them*"—and we think of the sanguinary scenes attending the capture and deportation of their fathers from the ancestral land; the devastation of flourishing districts; the desolation and ruin by fire and sword; the pillage, the plunder, the murders, and the horrors of the middle passage.

There was among philanthropists a difference of opinion when these people, or their fathers, were being shipped to America; and Professor Hartranft is not alone in his benevolent scruples about shipping them back to the "Dark Continent."

The Rev. Sylvanus Heywood, who seems to have a higher appreciation of the race and of its work, speaks of the negro as the "black diamond plucked out of Africa," and advocates for him an education the same in character and completeness as that given to the white man. He says:

You may enact laws and hedge them about with penalties for securing the rights of the blacks, but law alone will prove a failure. But give to them the highest Christian culture, and they will not only demand, but command, their rights. Give them a common school education, and it will be a blessing to them; but with nothing more they will remain but hewers of wood and drawers of water. They will be *in* society, but not *of* it. But give them the highest culture among cultured men, and the case will be far different. It is too late in the day to raise the ques-

* "Through the Dark Continent," vol. ii, pp. 68, 69.

tion whether they are capable of this. This Association has demonstrated that day by day. I have spent ten years as a teacher among the whites and two among the blacks, and I must say that I accomplished more in those two years than in ten—more in the way of giving instruction. I say it is too late to raise that question at all. It is already demonstrated. Let them be educated with broad culture. Let them have the training that will put them in possession of practical skill, such as shall win success. Let them have their own lawyers well trained in legal lore, so that they shall be able—in that natural eloquence in which they excel—to carry conviction to dignified courts. Let them have clergymen, not only earnest and sanctified, but able to cope with the deep things of science and theology—men able to stand before the most learned bodies. Let them have statesmen, well-grounded in philosophy, history, and government, so that they will be able not only to win victories upon the stump, but in the halls of legislation. Let their homes become homes of Christian culture and social refinement. Then, and not till then, will they cease to struggle for their rights, and *take* them.

But Mr. Heywood takes also a much broader view of the logical and necessary sequence of all this high culture—of all this effective training. He points to the fatherland. His philosophy is correct. For the negro, pure and simple, this is the only real solution of his difficulties. He says :

The ways of God are mysterious. We must walk by faith, and not by sight. We hear his voice saying, "This is the way; walk ye in it." In this darkness we see his hand. In the raising of this Society and the doing away with slavery we can see almost visibly the hand of God displayed upon the midnight sky, pointing to that Dark Continent, saying we should send these freemen forth as the apostles of light to purify and make glad their ancestral homes.

No man who has any proper conception of the capacities and work of the negro, and has caught any thing like a glimpse of his ultimate destiny, can fail to arrive at Mr. Heywood's conclusion. To the intelligent and earnest negro in America there is, as he rises in culture, an ever-widening horizon of duty and of liberty. Home, or rather the place of his birth, gets too narrow for liberty, too circumscribed for work, and he looks to Africa as the field for both.

In an able article in the London "Times" for May 19, on the negro migration in the United States, the following words occur :

The truth is that the negro is not a migratory being. He did not come of his own accord to Virginia or any other Southern

State, nor will he willingly leave it again now that he is acclimatized there. He has found an Africa in the South which is quite as congenial to him as that from which his forefathers were transported.

On the subject of the negro the "Times" and every body else not African are utterly in the dark. An acknowledged mystery hangs about him and his destiny. Foreigners do not know the negro. They have never had an opportunity of knowing him. Foreign slavery on the one hand, and aboriginal barbarism on the other, are the only circumstances under which they have had an opportunity of contemplating him. It is true that the "negro is not a migratory being." He would never have appeared on American soil if he had not been taken thither by violence. And the restlessness he now shows is among the strongest proofs of his freedom. He is now free to think and act for himself, and the consciousness of being a stranger in a strange land is beginning to operate upon him. The "Times" admits that "this is not the first symptom of a desire for change among the colored citizens;" and yet it fancies that the negro has found "an Africa in the South which is quite as congenial to him as that from which his forefathers were transported." The fact is, that the negro is getting every day more and more into a position to show himself no longer a dormant, but an active, factor among the forces of civilization, and the European will witness almost daily new developments in his character—the exhibition of qualities never suspected. Next to ridicule one of the most repulsive things to a sensitive mind is sympathy unduly extended, especially when the sympathizer has no means of correctly estimating the situation which he imagines should call forth his sympathy. There are very few Europeans who are qualified either to guide or to sympathize with the negro in the countries of his exile; and gratuitous advice even from these, in vital questions of his race, has no practical influence upon him.

"The enthusiasm for Liberia" has not died out, as the "Times" imagines. The American Colonization Society has at this moment five hundred thousand applicants for passage to Liberia. Dr. A. L. Stanford, a negro of culture, who was sent last year as Commissioner to Liberia from his people in Arkansas, returned with a favorable report, in which he says:

After traveling extensively in Liberia and observing the prosperous condition of the colony which the American Colonization Society has planted, and, I am convinced, firmly established, I am prepared to lend my aid in disabusing the public mind in regard to the noble efforts put forth by that Society in elevating the downtrodden negro race. I entertain very different views from what I held before. I verily believe that Africa is the natural home of the negro, and that ere long the remnant of her descendants, wherever dispersed, will return to that land. I favor a gradual emigration of the more enterprising, hard-working, and intelligent class of American negroes. I believe such a course would prove a blessing to Africa and to the race.*

It is admitted by all travelers to the coast that Liberia occupies five hundred miles of the finest and most picturesque portion of West Africa, with an interior extending two hundred miles on indefinitely back, abounding in every thing necessary for the growth and prosperity of a people. The whole valley of the Niger is accessible to this republic, teeming with a population every-where hospitable and friendly, ready and anxious to welcome to their salubrious, prolific, and picturesque home their brethren returning from the countries of their exile.

In the trade and commerce of this country there seems to be a special interest, not only for the negroes in the United States, but for the whole American people. There would be unlimited demand for American productions in that vast region now almost untouched. Gold, and hides, and beeswax, and rubber, as well as the finest coffee, might be had in unlimited quantities. Not far from Liberia are the unvisited but easily accessible and wealthy countries north and west of Ashantee and Dahomey, possessing the very highest capacity for the consumption of manufactured articles and for the production of raw material—from which a prodigious trade, struggling for an outlet, filters through in very small quantities to the Gulf of Benin.

Viewing the subject in this light, it becomes a practical business question whether there are no large capitalists in the Northern or Southern States willing to invest in an entirely virgin country, so much nearer to the United States than many of those countries from which at great expense tropical productions are now obtained for the American market—a field where

* "African Repository," April, 1879, pp. 40, 41.

agriculture may find unobstructed scope; where so many results, moral, political, and pecuniary, may be at once achieved; and where a Christian nation, with its multifarious agencies for diffusing civilization, may be built up. If American capitalists desired to engage in agriculture, and to produce the far-famed Liberia coffee or any other tropical product, they could themselves select and send out able hands from America for this work, who, while building up a congenial home for themselves and their children, and making "the wilderness and solitary place glad" for their presence, would be also enlarging the wealth of their patrons.

At a banquet given in Paris on the 19th of May, 1879, in commemoration of the abolition of slavery, M. Victor Hugo said: "In the nineteenth century the white man has made the negro a man, and in the twentieth century Europe will make Africa a world."

We admire the epigrammatic form of this sentence, but we venture to disagree with the sentiment it contains. As philosopher and prophet, the great poet is in this instance mistaken. Poetical inspirations do not always suggest sound political lessons. But what he said further on in his speech should be carefully pondered by all intelligent negroes every-where. He said:

The day had come for the vast continent which alone among the five parts of the world had no history to be reformed by Europeans. The Mediterranean was a lake of civilization, and it was the duty of Greece and of Italy, of France and of Spain, the four countries that occupied its northern shores, to recollect that a vast territory lay unredeemed on the opposite coast. England was also worthy to take part in the great work. She, like France, was one of the great free nations of the globe, and, like France, she had begun the colonization and civilization of Africa. The latter held the north and east, the former the south and the west. America had joined in the task, and Italy was ready to do so. This showed the unity of spirit which pervaded the peoples of the world. M. Victor Hugo then described the magnificent scenery, the fertility, and the navigable rivers of Central Africa in eloquent language, and concluded by exhorting the European nations to occupy this land offered to them by God, to build towns, to make roads, to cultivate the earth, to introduce trade and commerce, to preach peace and concord, so that the new continent should not be the scene of strife, but, free from princes and priests, should enjoy the blessings of fraternity.*

* "Daily Telegraph," May 20.

It is really high time that a "unity of spirit should pervade the peoples of the world" for the regeneration of a continent so long despoiled by the unity or consent of these same peoples. Thinking negroes should ask themselves what part they will take in this magnificent work, the work of reclaiming a continent—*their own continent*. In what way will they illustrate their participation in the "unity of spirit" which pervades the peoples for the redemption of their fatherland? Compared to this, most of the questions with which they are endeavoring to grapple in the United States sink into insignificance. The local can bear no comparison to the universal, nor the temporary to the eternal.

Victor Hugo exhorts the European nations to "occupy this land offered to them by God." He has forgotten the prudent advice of Cæsar to the ancestors of those nations against invading Africa. The Europeans can hold the domain "offered to them" by only a precarious tenure. But it already belongs to the exiled negro. It is his by creation and inheritance. Every man, woman, and child of the negro race out of Africa ought to thank God for this glorious heritage, and hasten to possess it: a field for the physical, moral, and spiritual development of the negro, where he will live under the influence of his freshest inspirations; where, with the simple shield of faith in God and in his race, and with the sword of the spirit of progress, he will grow and thrive; where, with his sympathetic heart, he will catch stray, far-off tones, inaudible to the foreigner, which, penetrating through the local air, will waken chords in his nature now unknown to the world and unsuspected even by himself. He will come under the influence of powers which will haunt him with strange visions and indicate the way he should go. Emerson says:

A man's genius, the quality that differences him from every other, the susceptibility to one class of influences, the selection of what is fit for him, the rejection of what is unfit, determines for him the character of the universe. A man is a method, a progressive arrangement; a selecting principle, gathering his like to him wherever he goes. He takes only his own out of the multiplicity that sweeps and circles round him. He is like one of those booms which are set out from the shore on rivers to catch drift-wood, or like the loadstone among splinters of steel. . . . A few anecdotes, a few traits of character, manners, face,

a few incidents, have an emphasis in your memory out of all proportion to their apparent significance, if you measure them by the ordinary standards. They relate to your gift. Let them have their weight, and do not reject them and cast about for illustration and facts more useful to literature. What your heart thinks great is great. The soul's emphasis is always right.*

When Professor Hartranft says, "Let us solve the negro problem right here," in America, what "problem" does he refer to? And how does he propose to solve the great questions of the African race in the United States? There are certain problems at times set before a people by accidental and temporary circumstances; these may admit of solution by extraneous help. There are others which grow out of their natural, inherent, and unchangeable relation to the outside world or the universe; these are to be solved by the people themselves under favoring circumstances; the trusts and responsibilities which these impose are special, incommunicable, and inalienable. But probably Professor Hartranft means the problem pressing upon the white man in his relations to the negro; the problem of his duty toward the "despised" race—his power to arrive at a satisfactory solution being a "test" of his civilization. In regard to this, of course, we can suggest nothing. But from all we can gather it appears that the chief problem held up to the negro for *his* solution by his friends in America is that of "conquering the caste prejudices of the whites" around him; of becoming, as the usual phrase is, "a man among men," (white men;) of "wiping out the color line," etc. Now, we beg most respectfully, with all the earnestness and deference becoming the subject, and with the serious emphasis which we know the enlightened of the race would authorize us to employ, to assure our white friends that these are matters for which the negro, pure and simple, when cultivated up to Mr. Heywood's standard, will care very little. He will then feel that in his own race-groove and on his own continent he has a work to accomplish equal to that of the European, and that caste or race prejudices are as natural to him as to the white man. The passion for equality does not always exert an elevating influence on the character, but may be positively mischievous, where to produce or sustain it certain sentiments in the mind are flat-

* The Prose Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, vol. i, p. 292.

tened by holding the higher attributes in abeyance, or brought into prominence at the expense of judgment and love of truth.

Ripe scholarship and disciplined thought, even under the training he is receiving in America, will give to the negro a freshness, a manliness, a hopefulness, and a faith which will deliver him from the tyranny of his surroundings, widen his view of his own capabilities, make him conscious of belonging to a race which has rich things in store for the world, and glorify his heart with a thousand strange and fruitful sympathies and with endless heroic aspirations.

The negro who is really restless on the ~~subject~~ of caste in America is he who, from defective culture or lack of culture, has not half found out the calling of his race; who, consequently, unduly impressed by his surroundings, is eager for immediate success, and anxious to play his part well amid the circumstances in which he finds himself—aiming at technical skill, which is popular or fashionable, rather than artistic life, which may be unique and unpopular. Fascinated by the present, he cannot conceive any thing else, and harasses himself with the ever-recurring and ever-unsatisfying and unsatisfactory task of imitating imitators. The negro raised to Mr. Heywood's standard will feel the force of Emerson's words:

We like only such actions as have already long had the praise of men, and do not perceive that any thing man can do may be divinely done. We think greatness entailed or organized in some places, or duties in certain offices or occasions, and do not see that Paganini can extract rapture from a catgut, and Eulenstein from a jew's-harp; and a limber-fingered lad out of shreds of paper with his scissors, and Landseer out of swine, and the hero out of the pitiful habitation and company in which he was hidden. What we call obscure condition or vulgar society is that condition and society whose poetry is not yet written, but which you shall presently make as enviable and renowned as any.*

Recognizing the force of these truths, the cultivated negro will have insight enough to discover his exact relation to surrounding superficial phenomena, and self-respect and independence enough to acknowledge the fact that his peculiar work cannot be done under the overshadowing influence of a foreign race; that there he cannot "communicate himself to others in his full stature and proportion;" and, feeling this, he will turn

* "Prose Works," vol. ii, p. 291.

to the fatherland, to "the one direction in which all space is open to him," and under the conviction that "he has faculties inviting him thither to endless exertion."

The teachers of the negro in America cannot have failed to observe that there seems always to be in the minds of their pupil some reservation which they cannot overcome, some hesitancy which they cannot explain, but which they attribute to a sort of modesty growing out of a sense of inferiority in the pupil. But the fact is, that, under the influence of the means of culture to which he has access, his race-consciousness is kindled into active and sensitive life, and he receives under mental protest many a dogma which for European growth and development is orthodox and inspiring. Not only the physical and metaphysical teachings often puzzle and contradict his deepest feelings, but even the Scriptures are at times a perplexity to him; and as he becomes acquainted with the original languages in which they were written, he feels that there is in them a temporary and local element which must be separated from the permanent and universal before the sacred records can utter what in the depths of his being he wants to say. But in America he will never be able to make the discrimination that will be useful to him. He will never be able to translate the letter, which is often adapted to another age and race, into the spirit of his own times and race. He is, therefore, lonely with his secret, with which nothing around him seems to sympathize. Development is denied him; he cannot expand. He fills his belly with theories and dogmas which to him are like the dry, hard husk. He cannot digest them, and they afford him no nourishment. Nearly every thing he produces comes from the memory; very little flows fresh from the heart. The African Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States is the result, in part, of just such experiences on the part of the Bishop Allens of a former day. They found that the waters flowing from the fountain which God had opened in their soul were slackened and half-choked by being forced through the pent-up and artificial channels provided for them in the white Churches, and they established that noble organization—the admiration of negroes every-where, which during the last fifty years has attained such wonderful growth—that the living streams of their unfettered nature might wind their own sweet way along the

meadows of an ecclesiastical Liberia. If the fare with which they were furnished in the new religious republic was ridiculed by their enemies as "ash cake," it was to them more than the wheat bread upon which they were starved in their previous connection. The food now dispensed to them was to their souls the very bread of life.

But there are many drawbacks to this *imperium in imperio*. It grew out of a temporary and local necessity, and, like all such products, must be partial and limited in its influence. Does it not become this most honorable and useful body—this first-born of African Churches—this pledge and proof of Africa's future evangelization—to inquire whether they may not increase their efficiency and even develop their central strength by taking a wider, deeper, and more practical interest in the land of their fathers, in their kith and kin in Africa? Their system is capable of indefinite development in the vast and unoccupied field which this continent presents. The message to them, as a Church of Christ, is, "Go ye into all the world;"—not only over the United States, from California to New York and from New England to Texas, but to "regions beyond," especially to the lost sheep of their own race. Their talents, it occurs to us, are not as useful and as profitable as they might be made. This is a drawback and a mistake. If it be sinful to wrap our talent in a napkin and hide it in the earth, it is only one degree less sinful so to handle it as to make it yield twofold only where it might yield ten. We are persuaded, however, that it is not the courage they lack for the work, but conviction. The same self-control and self-reliance, the same energy and independence, which led to the founding of the African Churches in the United States would readily, if there were earnest conviction on the subject, sacrifice the charms of home, the comforts of civilization, the æsthetic and sensuous attractions of an enlightened country, for the labors and toils and privations of the wilderness. They are quite equal to, and have shown themselves worthy of, the great achievement of taking possession of the whole valley of the Niger for Christ. Let them arise and come, and they will find in the home of their widowed parent that "the barrel of meal will not waste, nor will the cruse of oil fail." Freedom from restraint ought not to be our ultimate and final object, but FREEDOM TO WOR-

SEEK GOD: and the desire for such freedom is, in certain aspects of the subject, among the happiest of the popular instincts of the negro race.

It is remarkable that the message which Moses was commanded to bear to the tyrant Pharaoh was not "Let my people go that they may be *free*," but "Let my people go that they may *serve ME*." As long as they remained in a strange country under a foreign race they could not render that service for which they were fitted, and which God requires of every man. They could not serve the Lord with their "whole heart," the undiminished fullness of their nature, in carrying out the purposes of their being. "How could they sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" Their race impulses and instincts were hampered, confused, and impaired. So with the negro in America. Although their gatherings, of whatever nature, are usually marked and enlivened by a stream of religious feeling which continually flows with a rapid and sometimes boisterous current, still they cannot fully know God in that land, for they see him through the medium of others. Here and there there may be a "Caleb, who has another spirit within him, and follows the Lord fully;" but the masses are distracted by the disturbing *media*. The body, soul, and spirit do not work in harmony. The religious passions are predominant in their influence among them, and they show a co-operative and successful energy in ecclesiastical organizations; but in their political struggles there is no attempt at any logical or reasoned solution of their difficulties. "The negro," says Rev. Joseph Cook, "has gone to the wall in Mississippi, in spite of having a majority there and the suffrage. And he is likely to go to the wall in South Carolina. He is going to the wall even where he has a majority; and his inferiority in politics results from his lack of education"—such an education as he can never receive in America. But let him be delivered from the restraints of his exile; let him be set free from the stocks that now confine him, and he will not only arise and walk, but he will point out the way to his eminent success, which, in his particular line, only *he* can find out, and which he *must* find out for himself. He will discover the central point from which the lines may be easily and infallibly drawn to all the points of the circle in which he is to move effectively in the true work of his race for his own elevation and

the advantage of the rest of mankind. He will prove that what in African history and character seems nebulous confusion is really a firmament of stars. There are stars, astronomers tell us, whose light has not yet reached the earth; so there are stars in the moral universe yet to be disclosed by the unfettered African, which he must discover before he will be able to progress without wandering into perilous seas and suffering serious injury. Let him, then, return to the land of his fathers, and
ACQUAINT HIMSELF WITH GOD, AND BE AT PEACE.

ART. VI.—THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA.

The Ramayan of Valmiki Translated into English Verse. By RALPH T. H. GRIFFITH, M.A., Principal of the Benares College. Five vols. London: Trubner & Co. Benares: E. J. Lazarus & Co. 1870-1874.

The Ramayan of Tulsi Das. Translated by F. S. GROWSE, M.A., B. C. S. Book I, CHILDHOOD. Allahabad: North-western Provinces Government Press. 1877.

IN an article on "Dante" in a former number of this Review, the author wrote: "We count but four as having in the course of literature risen to the first class of epic poets—Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Milton* The 'Iliad,' the 'Æneid,' the 'Vision,' and 'Paradise Lost' exhaust our catalogue." † To these must be added the illustrious name of Valmiki, and in this catalogue a place not the lowest must be given to the "Ramayan."

The hero of this poem is Rama or Ram Chandra, the seventh incarnation of Vishnu, (the *Preserver* in the Hindu Triad;) and, although he was born as other men are, and sinned as other men do, still he was a wonderful personage; as the Hindus recount, "virtuous, heroic, firm, true, grateful, good, kind, bounteous, and holy, just, and wise," comparable with "Sun, Moon, Indra, Vishnu, Fire, and Air." Of the ten incarnations of Vishnu Ram Chandra is by far the most popular, and the hold he has upon the hearts of this hero-loving nation can hardly be over-estimated. In every part of the country "Ram-Ram!" is a common term of salutation; by river's bank and under the *peepul's* shade devotees sit days at a time repeating, from dawn till dark, "Ram-Ram! Ram-Ram!" The *Janam*

* Methodist Quarterly Review, January, 1852, p. 50.

† Ibid., p. 51.

Asthan, or place of his birth at Ajudhiya, is daily visited by hosts of pilgrims, (as are the other places scattered here and there over India made famous by some connection with the great hero;) and when, but the other day, the native troops were leaving the Bombay harbor for Malta, the enthusiastic cheers which arose from the dark-hued soldiers were not "Long live the Queen!" "Three cheers for the Empress!" (Kaizar i Hind,) but "Ram Rajah Ki Jai!" "Ram Chandra Ki Jai!" (Hurrah for King Ram Chandra—Victory to Ram!)

The truly surprising popularity of the poem and its hero is also seen in the "Ram Lila," (Ram's Festival,) held annually at the close of September or early in October. This festival is observed throughout the country, and continues for a fortnight. During these happy days the chief parts of the "Ramayan" are acted, and the principal adventures of Ram are brought to the notice of the Hindu public. It is an open-air theater, attended day after day by enthusiastic millions. In the larger cities, like Lucknow, Cawnpore, and Benares, great preparations are made, large sums of money expended, and a corresponding amount of enthusiasm enkindled. It is not unusual for a wealthy Hindu to spend thousands of dollars upon a single entertainment of this kind. A large garden or other walled inclosure is selected; in this tents are pitched to represent the hostile camps of Ram and Ravan. Trees are set out; rivers are made; in short, the place becomes a miniature Hindustan from Ajudhiya to Ceylon. The actors who are hired for the occasion are dressed to represent the various characters of the poem, including even the monkeys. The play begins with the childhood of Ram, and progresses day after day until the climax is reached in the slaying Ravan and burning his city by the hero. It is pantomimic, and a loud-voiced pundit marches up and down in front of the spectators, keeping them acquainted with the progress of the play. Thousands of people, men, women, and children, all dressed as well and brightly as possible, laughing and chatting in the happiest manner, climb the garden walls, look down from the tops of surrounding houses, crowd the verandas of adjacent buildings, or stand in deep ranks around the extensive stage. The scene, with its indescribable *éclat*, is most interesting to look upon, and dwells long and pleasantly in one's memory. In smaller cities the

representation is on a more limited scale ; but every-where, in city, town, and hamlet, Ram's Festival is celebrated—as it has been for at least more than a score of centuries.

The subject of the "Ramayan" is, as the name implies, the life and adventures of Ram.* In this respect it is a true epic, and well planned. Various conjectures have been made as to the date of the events (real or imaginary) related in the poem. Sir William Jones places Ram Chandra in the year 2029 B. C., Tod in 1100, Bentley in 950, Gorresio in the 13th century B. C. The last named scholar, in the introduction to his edition of the "Ramayan," adduces a number of arguments in favor of the great antiquity of the poem, but these are hardly of convincing power. Perhaps a more proper estimate is the following, found in the fiftieth volume of the "Westminster Review :"

We are ignorant of the date of the poem, or rather of the era to which its older parts belong. Probably Valmiki and Homer were contemporaries ; perhaps the Hindu was the earlier of the two, and sang his song while that Ilion was a reality which to Homer rose in the background of two or three generations. Our limits forbid us to enter into any detailed proof, nor, indeed, could any be quite satisfactory. The best arguments for its age are found in the poem itself, and the habits and manners which it describes. Thus, the burning of widows on the funeral piles of their husbands, which the Greeks describe as an old custom when Alexander invaded India, B. C. 327, is utterly unknown in the "Ramayana," and one fact like this speaks volumes. In such poems as the "Ramayana" and the "Iliad" we instinctively feel that they belong to the earlier world : we enter them as we enter a house in Pompeii—the colors may still seem fresh and no mark of decay remind us of their age, but we feel that they belong not to us or ours, and a gulf of ages lies between us and our objects.

The poem appears to have undergone two distinct revisions, one in Benares and the other in Bengal ; the former, as is generally allowed by European scholars, is the more genuine. The Bengal recension has been translated into Italian (by Gorresio) and into French, (by M. Fauche ;) but, until the appearance of the volumes before us, there had been no English version of either recension. In the years 1805-10 Carey and Marshman, the illustrious missionaries of Serampore, published the text and English translation of two books and a half, (the poem consists

* From *Rama and ayana.*

of seven books, containing twenty-four thousand verses,) but these volumes have long been out of print, and are said to be "very inferior as productions of literary art, though no blame attaches to the excellent men who published their work in the very dawn of Oriental studies."

In 1846 Schlegel published the text of the first two books, with a Latin translation of the first and part of the second. "I congratulate myself," he says in the Preface, "that by the favor of the Supreme Deity I have been allowed to begin so great a work. I glory and make my boast that I, too, after so many ages, have helped to confirm that ancient oracle declared to Valmiki by the father of gods and men :

"Dum stabunt montes, campis dum flumina current,
Usque tuum toto carmen celebrabitur orbe."

The volumes before us indicate no small amount of research, scholarly ability, taste, and poetical skill. Mr. Griffith is to be congratulated for having given this very remarkable poem to the English public in so attractive a form. It will remain a worthy monument to his perseverance and erudition.

The work opens with a happy description of the great hero, his fair, strong body, and his many good qualities of head and heart. It also gives a brief history of his life, travels, and courageous deeds, which may be epitomized as follows :

Rama was the son of Dasaratha, King of Ajudhiya, who was fifty-seventh in descent from the illustrious Manu. This famous king had three queens, and the chief of these, Kausalya, gave birth to the hero of the poem. Even while a youth he became a general favorite in the kingdom, and especially with his father. In company with Lakshman, his ever-constant brother, he set out upon his travels. Journeying to the east, he arrived at the court of Janak, a great king, who gave him welcome in his own and in his father's name. This Janak had a bow wonderfully strong, and a daughter (named Sita) marvelously fair. He had promised Sita to the suitor who should be able to bend the great bow, but although many came to make the trial all failed. Rama asked to see the bow, and when it was brought seized it in the middle and drew the string until the weapon broke in two. The lovely Sita was at once pronounced to be his, and word was sent to his royal father, who hastened to attend the nuptial ceremonies. The marriage

was celebrated with great *éclat*, King Dasaratha giving as dowry one hundred thousand cows for each of his sons. The ceremonies ended, the kingly party returned to Ajudhiya, where they were met by an enthusiastic host of "people and Brahmans," who welcomed them home. The hero of the bow became more and more popular on account of his filial obedience, courage, and beauty.

"So for his virtues, kind and true,
Dearer and dearer Rama grew
To Dasaratha, Brahmans, all
In town and country, great and small."

The king grew older, and was minded to associate with himself his favorite son as Regent Heir. A popular assembly was held, and the people were asked to express their pleasure. The plan of the king was unanimously approved, and Rama was told by his father that he should be installed on the morrow. Great preparations were made. Temples, trees, shops, and houses were covered with banners and decorated with flowers; villagers came from every side and filled the city :

"Each with his friend had much to say
Of Rama's consecration day ;
Yea, even children as they played
At cottage doors beneath the shade."

But, suddenly and without warning, the star of Rama's prosperity shot downward, and

"When Kaikeyi, youngest queen,
With eyes of envious hate had seen
The solemn pomp and regal state
Prepared the prince to consecrate,
She bade the hapless king bestow
Two gifts he promised long ago,
That Rama to the woods should flee,
And that her child the heir should be."

The king could not but keep his promise, and, weeping, banished his darling son, and in his place placed Kaikeyi's child, Bharat, upon the throne.

"Then Lakshman's truth was nobly shown,
Then were his love and courage known,
When for his brother's sake he dared
All perils, and his exile shared."

The faithful Sita, too, went with her lord. The king and people, "sad of mood," followed the departing hero until they came to the Ganges, when he crossed over and they returned to the capital. The little party went from wood to wood until

"They came to Chitrakuta's hill,
And Rama there, with Lakshman's aid,
A pleasant little cottage made,
And spent his days with Sita, dressed
In coat of bark and deer-skin vest.*
And Chitrakuta grew to be
As bright with those illustrious three †
As Meru's sacred peaks that shine
With glory, when the gods recline
Beneath them : Siva's self between
The Lord of Gold and Beauty's Queen."

The aged king pined for Rama, and died of grief. Bharat refused to reign, and wandered through the woods until he found his exiled brother. He besought him to return and take the throne, but Rama steadily refused, choosing rather to obey his father's decree :

"He placed his sandals in his hand,
A pledge that he would rule the land ;
And bade his brother turn again.

"Then Bharat, finding prayer was vain,
The sandals took and went away ;
Nor in Ayodhya would he stay,
But turned to Nandigram, where
He ruled the realm with watchful care,
Still longing eagerly to learn
Tidings of Rama's safe return.

"Then lest the people should repeat
Their visit to his calm retreat,
Away from Chitrakuta's hill
Fared Rama ever onward, till
Beneath the shady trees he stood
Of Dandaká's primeval wood."

Here the hero of the poem took up his abode. Counseled by a new-found friend—

* The garb prescribed for ascetics by Manu.

† In half the temples of South and Central India images of Rama, Lakshman, and Sita, made of marble and richly painted, are to be seen. The extent to which they are worshiped proves the estimation in which they are held.

“He gained the sword
 And bow of Indra, heavenly lord:
 A pair of quivers too, that bore
 Of arrows an exhaustless store.”

With these weapons he delivered the trembling hermits from their foes, destroying fiends, giants, and giantesses in countless numbers. The news was carried to Ravan, king of the demons,

“Whose name of fear
 Earth, hell, and heaven all shook to hear.”

“Impelled by fate and blind with rage,
 He came to Rama's hermitage.”

“He wiled the princely youths apart,
 The vulture * slew and bore away
 The wife of Rama as his prey.”

Rama returned to his leafy cot, but, not finding Sita, he rushed through the forest broken-hearted, weeping and wailing over his loss. At last he made friends with Hanuman, “the wind-god's son,” and Sugriva, a powerful chief. Hanuman went in quest of Sita. One “wild, tremendous leap” of two hundred leagues brought him to the capital city of Ceylon,

“Where Ravan held his royal sway.
 There pensive 'neath Asoka boughs
 He found poor Sita, Rama's spouse.
 He gave the hapless girl a ring,
 A token from her lord and king.
 A pledge from her fair hand he bore;
 Then battered down the garden-door.
 Five captains of the host he slew,
 Seven sons of councillors o'erthrew;
 Crushed youthful Aksha on the field,
 Then to his captors chose to yield.”

Escaping,

“The town he burned with hostile flame,
 And spoke again with Rama's dame,
 Then swiftly back to Rama flew
 With tidings of the interview.”

Rama, accompanied by Hanuman, Sugriva, and legions of monkeys, set out to rescue the captive lady. A bridge was thrown across the narrow sea between the continent and Ceylon, and the host crossed—

* Jatayu, a semi-divine bird who fought in defense of Sita.

"To Lanka's golden town,
Where Rama's hand smote Ravan down."*

Then

"To meet her husband Sita came ;
But Rama, stung with ire and shame,
With bitter words his wife addressed
Before the crowd that round her pressed.
But Sita, touched with noble ire,
Gave her fair body to the fire.
Then straight the god of Wind appeared,
And words from heaven her honor cleared.
And Rama clasped his wife again,
Uninjured, pure from spot and stain."

Raising to life his fallen warriors, in company with Sita,
Rama flew in magic chariot through the clouds to Nandigrama :

"Met by his faithful brothers there,
He loosed his votive coil of hair ;
Thence fair Ayodhya's town he gained,
And o'er his father's kingdom reigned."

His reign was very prosperous :

"Disease or famine ne'er oppressed
His happy people, richly blest
With all the joys of ample wealth,
Of sweet content and perfect health.
No widow mourned her well-loved mate,
No sire his son's untimely fate.
They feared not storm or robber's hand ;
No fire or flood laid waste the land ;
The Golden Age † seemed come again
To bless the days of Rama's reign."

With this introduction, which fills four cantos, and which, evidently, is the work of a later hand than Valmiki's, the poem properly begins. First comes a beautiful description of Ayodhya, the capital city of the old kingdom : ‡

"On Sarju's bank, of ample size,
The happy realm of Kosal lies,

* The rocks lying between Ceylon and the mainland are still called Rama's Bridge by the Hindus.

† The Brahmans count four ages, the Krita, (age of the gods, the perfect or golden age,) the Treta, (the age of the three sacred fires,) the Dwapara, (the age of doubt,) and the Kali, (the present time, the age of evil.)

‡ Now called Ajudhiya, an interesting mass of ruins, adjoining the city of Fyzabad, eighty miles from Lucknow. The site is a grand one, and it is not at all difficult to imagine just such a city as the poet sings of formerly existing here.

With fertile length of fair champaign,
 And flocks and herds and wealth of grain.
 There, famous in her old renown,
 Ayodhya stands, the royal town
 In bygone ages built and planned
 By sainted Manu's princely hand,
 Imperial seat! her walls extend
 Twelve measured leagues from end to end,
 And three in width from side to side,
 With square and palace beautified.
 Her gates at even distance stand;
 Her ample roads are wisely planned.
 Right glorious is her royal street,
 Where streams allay the dust and heat.
 On level ground in even row
 Her houses rise in goodly show:
 Terrace and palace, arch and gate,
 The queenly city decorate.
 High are her ramparts, strong and vast,
 By ways at even distance passed,
 With circling moat, both deep and wide,
 And store of weapons fortified."—*Book I, Canto v.*

King Dasaratha and his people are next described :

"And worthy of so fair a place
 There dwelt a just and happy race
 With troops of children blest.
 Each man contented sought no more,
 Nor longed with envy for the store
 By richer friends possessed.
 For poverty was there unknown,
 And each man counted as his own
 Kine, steeds, and gold and grain.
 All dressed in raiment bright and clean,
 And every townsman might be seen
 With ear-rings, wreath, or chain.

"Thus, worthy of the name she bore,*
 Ayodhya for a league or more
 Cast a bright glory round,
 Where Dasaratha, wise and great,
 Governed his fair ancestral State,
 With every virtue crowned.
 Like Indra in the skies, he reigned
 In that good town whose wall contained
 High domes and turrets proud,
 With gates and arcs of triumph decked,
 And sturdy barriers to protect
 Her gay and countless crowd."—*Book I, Canto vi.*

* Ayodhya means *Not to be fought against.*

There are many fine passages in the poem, but want of space forbids extensive quotations. We may, however, make a few :

THE BREAKING OF THE BOW.

“ Then spoke again the great recluse :
 ‘ This mighty bow, O king, produce.’
 King Janak, at the saint’s request,
 This order to his train addressed :
 ‘ Let the great bow be hither borne,
 Which flowery wreaths and scents adorn.’
 Soon as the monarch’s words were said,
 His servants to the city sped :
 Five thousand youths in number, all
 Of manly strength and stature tall,
 The ponderous eight-wheeled chest that held
 The heavenly bow with toil propelled.
 At length they brought that iron chest,
 And thus the god-like king addressed :
 ‘ This best of bows, O lord, we bring,
 Respected by each chief and king,
 And place it for these youths to see,
 If, sovereign, such thy pleasure be.’
 With suppliant palm to palm applied,
 King Janak to the strangers cried :
 ‘ This gem of bows, O Brahman sage,
 Our race has prized from age to age,
 Too strong for those who yet have reigned,
 Though great in might each nerve they strained.
 Titan and fiend its strength defies,
 God, spirit, minstrel of the skies.
 And bard above and snake below
 Are baffled by this glorious bow.
 Then how may human prowess hope
 With such a bow as this to cope ?
 What man with valor’s choicest gift
 This bow can draw, or string, or lift ?
 Yet let the princes, holy seer,
 Behold it : it is present here.’ ”

“ Then spake the hermit pious-souled :
 ‘ Rama, dear son, the bow behold.’
 Then Rama at his word unclosed
 The chest wherein its might reposed,
 Thus crying as he viewed it : ‘ Lo !
 I lay mine hand upon the bow :
 May happy luck my hope attend
 Its heavenly strength to lift or bend.’
 ‘ Good luck be thine !’ the hermit cried ;
 ‘ Assay the task,’ the king replied.

Then Raghu's son, as if in sport,
 Before the thousands of the court,
 The weapon by the middle raised,
 That all the crowd in wonder gazed.
 With steady arm the string he drew
 Till burst the mighty bow in two.
 As snapped the bow, an awful clang,
 Loud as the shriek of tempests, rang.
 The earth, affrighted, shook amain
 As when a hill is rent in twain.
 Then, senseless at the fearful sound,
 The people fell upon the ground ;
 None save the king, the princely pair,
 And the great saint the shock could bear.

"When woke to sense the stricken train,
 And Janak's soul was calm again,
 With suppliant hands and reverent head,
 These words, most eloquent, he said :
 'O saint, Prince Rama stands alone ;
 His peerless might he well has shown.
 A marvel has the hero wrought
 Beyond belief, surpassing thought.
 My child, to royal Rama wed,
 New glory on our line will shed ;
 And true my promise will remain
 That hero's worth the bride should gain.
 Dearer to me than light and life,
 My Sita shall be Rama's wife.'"—*Book I, Canto lxxii.*

The triumph of the jealous Queen Kaikeyi over Dasaratha is thus described :

"When thus the archer king was bound
 With treacherous arts and oaths enwound,
 She to her bounteous lord, subdued
 By blinding love, her speech renewed :
 'Remember, king, that long past day
 Of gods and demons' battle fray,
 And how thy foe in doubtful strife
 Had nigh bereft thee of thy life.
 Remember it was only I
 Preserved thee when about to die,
 And thou for watchful love and care
 Wouldst grant my first and second prayer.
 Those offered boons, pledged with thee then,
 I now demand, O king of men,
 Of thee, O monarch, good and just,
 Whose righteous soul observes each trust.
 If thou refuse thy promise sworn,
 I die despised, before the morn.

These rites in Rama's name begun—
 Transfer them, and enthrone my son.
 The time is come to claim at last
 That double boon of days long-past,
 When gods and demons met in fight,
 And thou wouldst fain my care requite.
 Now forth to Dandak's forest drive
 Thy Rama for nine years and five,
 And let him dwell a hermit there
 With deer-skin coat and matted hair.
 Without a rival let my boy
 The empire of the land enjoy,
 And let mine eyes ere morning see
 Thy Rama to the forest flee."—*Book II, Canto xi.*

The poet draws a pleasing picture of the three exiles going through the forest farther and farther from their Ayodhya home, and seeking in their mutual love a higher pleasure than the courtly attractions from which they were banished could yield:

“The tender dame
 Asked Rama, as they walked, the name
 Of every shrub that blossoms bore,
 Creeper and tree unseen before;
 And Lakshman fetched at Sita's prayer
 Boughs of each tree with clusters fair.”

As they approached Chitrakuta Rama thus addressed his lotus-eyed Sita:

“Look round thee, dear; each flowery tree
 Touched with the fire of morning see:
 The Kinsuk now the frosts are fled,—
 How glorious with his wreaths of red!
 The Bel trees see, so loved of men,
 Hanging their boughs in every glen,
 O'erburdened with their fruits and flowers;
 A plenteous store of food is ours.
 See, Lakshman, in the leafy trees,
 Where'er they make their home,
 Down hangs the work of laboring bees,
 The ponderous honeycomb.
 In the fair wood before us spread
 The startled wild-cock cries:
 Hark, where the flowers are soft to tread,
 The peacock's voice replies.
 Where elephants are roaming free,
 And sweet birds' songs are loud,
 The glorious Chitrakuta see;
 His peaks are in the cloud.

On fair smooth ground he stands displayed,
 Begirt by many a tree :
 O, brother, in that holy shade
 How happy shall we be !” *—*Book II, Canto lvi.*

Rama's sorrow on returning home after Sita had been stolen away, is thus described :

“ Longing to gaze on Sita's face,
 He hastened to his dwelling-place,
 Then, sinking 'neath his misery's weight,
 He looked, and found it desolate.
 Tossing his mighty arms on high,
 He sought her with an eager cry.
 From spot to spot he wildly ran,
 Each corner of his home to scan.
 He looked, but Sita was not there ;
 His cot was desolate and bare,
 Like streamlet in the winter frost,
 The glory of her lilies lost.
 With leafy tears the sad trees wept
 As a wild wind their branches swept.
 Mourned bird and deer, and every flower
 Drooped fainting round the lonely bower.
 The sylvan deities had fled
 The spot where all the light was dead,
 Where hermits coat of skin displayed,
 And piles of sacred grass were laid.
 He saw, and, maddened by his pain,
 Cried in lament again, again :
 ‘ Where is she, dead, or torn away,
 Lost, or some hungry giant's prey ?
 Or did my darling chance to rove
 For fruit and blossoms through the grove ?
 Or has she sought the pool or rill,
 Her pitcher from the wave to fill ?’
 His eager eyes, on fire with pain,
 He roamed about with maddened brain.
 Each grove and glade he searched with care ;
 He sought, but found no Sita there.”—*Book III, Canto lvi.*

He rushed wildly through the forest, asking the various trees for tidings of the missing Sita. The kadamba, bel, arjun, basil,

* “ We have often looked on that green hill,” says a writer in the “ *Calcutta Review*,” (vol. xxiii.) “ it is the holiest spot of that sect of the Hindu faith who devote themselves to this incarnation of Vishnu. The whole neighborhood is Rama's country. Every head-land has some legend, every cavern is connected with his name ; some of the wild fruits are still called *sitaphal*, being the reputed food of the exiles. Thousands and thousands annually visit the spot, and round the hill is a raised footpath, on which the devotee, with naked feet, treads full of pious awe.”

tila, asoka, palm, rose-apple, cassia, jasmine, mango, and sal, are all interrogated, but in vain. He then asks the deer, the elephant, and the tiger, but with no better success :

“ Thus as he cried in wild lament,
 From grove to grove the mourner went,
 Here for a moment sank to rest,
 Then started up and onward pressed.
 Thus roaming on like one distraught,
 Still for his vanished love he sought.
 He searched in wood and hill and glade,
 By rock and brook and wild cascade.
 Through groves with restless step he sped,
 And left no spot unvisited.
 Through lawns and woods of vast extent
 Still searching for his love he went
 With eager steps and fast.
 For many a weary hour he toiled,
 Still in his fond endeavor foiled,
 Yet hoping to the last.”—*Book III, Canto Lxi.*

As before stated, Hanuman, the monkey-god, (who changed his size to suit his convenience,) went to Ceylon to find Sita. After slaying the warriors he set fire to the city :

THE BURNING OF LANKA.

“ What further deed remains to do
 To vex the Raksha's king anew ?
 The beauty of his grove is marred,
 Killed are the bravest of his guard.
 The captains of his host are slain,
 But forts and palaces remain.
 Swift is the work and light the toil
 Each fortress of the foe to spoil.
 Reflecting thus, his tail ablaze
 As through the cloud red lightning plays,
 He scaled the palaces, and spread
 The conflagration where he sped.
 From house to house he hurried on,
 And the wild flames behind him shone.
 Each mansion of the foe he scaled,
 And furious fire its roof assailed,
 Till all the common ruin shared :
 Vibhishan's house alone was spared.
 From blazing pile to pile he sprang,
 And loud his shout of triumph rang,
 As roars the doomsday cloud when all
 The worlds in dissolution fall.

The friendly wind conspired to fan
 The hungry flames that leapt and ran,
 And, spreading in their fury caught
 The gilded walls with pearls inwrought,
 Till each proud palace reeled and fell
 As falls a heavenly citadel.

Loud was the roar the demons raised
 'Mid walls that split and beams that blazed,
 As each with vain endeavor strove
 To stay the flames in house or grove.
 The women, with disheveled hair,
 Flocked to the roofs in wild despair,
 Shrieked out for succor, wept aloud,
 And fell like lightning from a cloud.
 He saw the flames ascend and curl
 Round turkis, diamond, and pearl,
 While silver floods and molten gold
 From ruined wall and lattice rolled.
 As fire grows fiercer as he feeds
 On wood and grass and crackling weeds,
 So Hanuman the ruin eyed
 With fury still unsatisfied."—*Book V, Canto liv.*

The conflict between the opposing armies of Rama and Ravan was long continued, and the description fills several cantos. The following is one of the closing scenes :

"With wondrous power and might and skill
 The giant fought with Rama still.
 Each at his foe his chariot drove,
 And still for death or victory strove.
 The warriors' steeds together dashed,
 And pole with pole re-echoing clashed.
 Then Rama, launching dart on dart,
 Made Ravan's coursers swerve and start.
 Nor was the lord of Lanka slow
 To rain his arrows on his foe,
 Who showed, by fiery points assailed,
 No trace of pain, nor shook nor quailed.
 Dense clouds of arrows Rama shot
 With that strong arm which rested not,
 And spear and mace and club and brand
 Fell in dire rain from Ravan's hand.
 The storm of missiles fiercely cast
 Stirred up the oceans with its blast,
 And serpent-gods and fiends who dwell
 Below were troubled by the swell.
 The earth with hill and plain and brook
 And grove and garden reeled and shook :
 The very sun grew cold and pale,
 And horror stilled the rising gale. . . .



Then to his deadly string the pride
 Of Raghu's race a shaft applied.
 Sharp as a serpent's venom'd fang
 Straight to its mark the arrow sprang.
 And from the giant's body shred
 With trenchant steel the monstrous head.
 There might the triple world behold
 That severed head adorned with gold.
 But when all eyes were bent to view,
 Swift in its stead another grew.
 Again the shaft was pointed well ;
 Again the head divided fell.
 But still as each to earth was cast
 Another head succeeded fast.
 A hundred, bright with fiery flame
 Fell low before the victor's aim,
 Yet Ravan by no sign betrayed
 That death was near or strength decayed.
 The doubtful fight he still maintained,
 And on his foe his missiles rained.
 In air, on earth, on plain, on hill,
 With awful might he battled still ;
 And through the hours of night and day
 The conflict knew no pause or stay."—*Book VI, Canto ciz.*

But at last Rama was victorious, and the poet tells of

RAVAN'S DEATH.

"Then Matali to Rama cried :
 'Let other arms the day decide.
 Why wilt thou strive with useless toil,
 And see his might thy efforts foil ?
 Launch at the foe thy dart whose fire
 Was kindled by the Almighty Sire.'
 He ceased : and Raghu's son obeyed :
 Upon his string the hero laid
 An arrow, like a snake that hissed,
 Whose fiery flight had never missed :
 The arrow Saut Agastya gave
 And blessed the chieftain's life to save ;
 That dart the Eternal Father made
 The monarch of the gods to aid ;
 By Brahma's self on him bestowed
 When forth to fight Lord Indra rode.
 'Twas feathered with the rushing wind ;
 The glowing sun and fire combined
 To the keen point their splendor lent ;
 The shaft, ethereal element,
 By Meru's hill and Maudar pride
 Of mountains, had its weight supplied.

He laid it on the twisted cord,
 He turned the point at Lanka's lord,
 And swift the limb-dividing dart
 Pierced the huge chest and cleft the heart,
 And dead he fell upon the plain
 Like Vritra by the Thunderer slain.
 The Raksha's host when Ravan fell
 Sent forth a wild terrific yell,
 Then turned and fled, all hope resigned,
 Through Lanka's gates, nor looked behind.
 His voice each joyous Vanar raised,
 And Rama, conquering Rama, praised.
 Soft from celestial minstrels came
 The sound of music and acclaim.
 Soft, fresh, and cool, a rising breeze
 Brought odors from the heavenly trees,
 And, ravishing the sight and smell,
 A wondrous rain of blossoms fell ;
 And voices breathed round Raghu's son :
 'Champion of gods, well done, well done.' "

—Book VI, Canto *cx.*

One of the most striking passages in the poem is Sita's reply to Rama when he had charged her with infidelity :

" Struck down with overwhelming shame,
 She shrank within her trembling frame.
 Each word of Rama's like a dart
 Had pierced the lady to the heart ;
 And from her sweet eyes unrestrained
 The torrent of her sorrows rained.
 Her weeping eyes at length she dried,
 And thus 'mid choking sobs replied :
 ' Canst thou, a high-born prince, dismiss
 A high-born dame with speech like this ?
 Such words befit the meanest hind,
 Not princely birth and generous mind.
 By all my virtuous life I swear
 I am not what thy words declare.
 If some are faithless, wilt thou find
 No love and truth in womankind ?
 Doubt others if thou wilt, but own
 The truth which all my life has shown.
 If, when the giant seized his prey,
 Within his hated arms I lay,
 And felt the grasp I dreaded, blame
 Fate and the robber, not thy dame.
 What could a helpless woman do ?
 My heart was mine and still was true.

• • • •

Is all forgotten, all? my birth,
 Named Janak's child from fostering earth?
 That day of triumph when, a maid,
 My trembling hand in thine I laid?
 My meek obedience to thy will,
 My faithful love through joy and ill,
 That never failed at duty's call—
 O king, is all forgotten, all?'

"To Lakshman then she turned and spoke,
 While sobs and sighs her utterance broke:
 'Sumitra's son, a pile prepare,
 My refuge in my dark despair.
 I will not live to bear this weight
 Of shame, forlorn and desolate.
 The kindled fire my woes shall end,
 And be my best and surest friend.'

His mournful eyes the hero raised,
 And wistfully on Rama gazed,
 In whose stern look no ruth was seen,
 No mercy for the weeping queen.
 No chieftain dared to meet those eyes,
 To pray, to question, or advise.

The word was passed, the wood was piled,
 And fain to die stood Janak's child.
 She slowly paced around her lord,
 The gods with reverent act adored,
 Then, raising suppliant hands, the dame
 Prayed humbly to the Lord of Flame:
 'As this fond heart by virtue swayed
 From Raghu's son has never strayed,
 So, universal witness, Fire
 Protect my body on the pyre.
 As Raghu's son has idly laid
 This charge on Sita, hear and aid.'

She ceased: and, fearless to the last,
 Within the flame's wild fury passed.
 Then rose a piercing cry from all,
 Dames, children, men, who saw her fall,
 Adorned with gems and gay attire,
 Beneath the fury of the fire."—*Book VI, Canto cxvii.*

The Lord of Fire rescues the faithful dame, and brings her forth unscathed:

"Fair as the morning was her sheen,
 And gold and gems adorned the queen.
 Her form in crimson robes arrayed,
 Her hair was bound in glossy braid.
 Her wreath was fresh and sweet of scent;
 Undimmed was every ornament.

Then, standing close to Rama's side,
 The universal witness cried :
 ' From every blot and blemish free,
 Thy faithful queen returns to thee.'—*Book VI, Canto cxx.*

Rama receives her, and the happy pair return triumphantly to Ajudhiya, where Rama ascends the throne to the delight of the people : and here the story ends.

The "Ramayan" of Tulsi Das is the popular version, to be found in all the bazars of the great cities of India. Tulsi Das was a Brahman of the highest class. He spent the most of his life at Benares, visiting as well the other famous cities of his native land. He began the composition of the "Ramayan" at Ajudhiya, in A. D. 1575, and died in 1580. Two copies of the poem in his own handwriting are said to be still in existence, the one at Rajapur, the other in the temple of Sita Rama, which he himself founded at Benares. In addition to this his great work, he was the author of six other poems, all in honor of Ram Chandra. In his introduction Mr. Growse says :

The introductory portion of the first book of the "Ramayan" is not only interesting as a *resumé* of popular Hindu theology and metaphysics, but is also curious as containing the author's vindication of himself against his critics. They attacked him for lowering the dignity of his subject by clothing it in the vulgar vernacular. However just his defense may be, it did not succeed in converting the opposite faction ; and the professional Sanskrit pundits, who are their modern representatives, still affect to despise his work as an unworthy concession to the illiterate masses. With this small and solitary exception the book is in every one's hands, from the court to the cottage, and is read or heard and appreciated alike by every class of the Hindu community, whether high or low, rich or poor, young or old.

One quotation must suffice—from "Breaking of the Bow :"

Rama first looked at the crowd, who all stood dumb and still as statues ; then the gracious lord turned from them to Sita, and perceived her yet deeper concern ; perceived her to be so terribly agitated that a moment of time seemed an age in passing. If a man die of thirst for want of water, when he is once dead, of what use to him is a lake of water ? What good is the rain when the crop is dead ? or what avails regret when a chance has once been lost ? Thinking thus to himself as he gazed at Janaki, the lord was enraptured at the sight of her singular devotion, and, after making a reverential obeisance to his *guru*,* he took up the bow with most superlative ease ; as he grasped it in his hands it gleamed

* Religious instructor.

like a flash of lightning; and again, as he bent it, it seemed like the vault of heaven. Though all stood looking on, before any one could see he had lifted it from the ground and raised it aloft and drawn it tight, and in a moment broken it in halves; the awful crash re-echoed through the world.

So awful a crash re-echoed through the world that the horses of the sun started from their course, the elephants of the four quarters groaned, earth shook, the great serpent, the boar, and the tortoise tottered. Gods, demons, and saints put their hands to their ears, and all began anxiously to consider the cause; but when they learned that Rama had broken the bow they uttered shouts of victory.*

It may be remarked, in passing, that an acquaintance with this poem, "the one common and everlasting possession of the Hindus," is of great help to the missionary as he goes about preaching to these idolatrous millions. As he begins his conversation with a group of villagers seated around the public well, or gathered at some great fair, it helps him amazingly to be able to make a quotation from Tulsi Das; *exempli gratia*, the following:

"Bhe pragat Kripálá | dina dayála | Kaushalyá hitakári,
Harkhit mahtári | muni manhári | adbhut rup Nihári,
Lochan abhirámá | tanu dhan shyámá | nij ayudh bhii chári,
Bhushan baumálá | nayun bishálá | shobhásiudu Kharári." †

This stanza is from the "Ram Pariksha," (Ram Tested,) a very excellent and popular vernacular tract written years ago by the Rev. Mr. Sternberg, and widely circulated throughout North India. The tract gives extracts from the "Ramayan," and makes a comparison between Ram Chandra and our blessed Saviour. Some reference to the national epic serves as a fitting introduction to what we have to say about the sinless Incarnation. Ram is being tested. And the day will come when these millions who now yield heartiest homage to the son of Dasaritha and Kaushalya, and worship his image in thousands of temples, shall join in the praise and worship of the Lord Jesus Christ. If only the coming of the glad day could be hastened!

* Growse's "Ramayan," Book i, p. 145.

† Literally translated: "Then appeared he who is merciful, pitiful to the poor, the beloved of Kaushalya. Beholding his wonderful form, his mother was delighted, and the hearts of the munis were ravished. His eyes most pleasing, his body dark blue like the clouds, in his four hands bearing his special weapons. Garlanded to his feet, his eyes large, a sea of beauty, was the enemy of Khar."

ART. VII.—THE ITINERANT MINISTRY OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

IF there had never been such a constitution as that now existing in the Methodist Episcopal Church; if such a plan of ministerial distribution had been wrought out in theory and submitted for acceptance or rejection without previous successful experiment, there is no reason to suppose that one vote in a thousand would be given for its adoption. Not founded on the Scriptures, though not contrary to them, not based on any primary or secondary prelatival authority, involving the surrender of abstract rights, and apparently in most, and really in many, particulars incongruous with the spirit of modern democratic institutions, it would be generally and immediately rejected. Those even who might see in it great possibilities if any denomination of Christians could be induced to accept it, would consider it so contrary to the independent temper of the age as to be utterly impracticable. Yet it exists. Its growth has been contemporary with that of the Republic, its many thousands of ministers and millions of laymen on the one hand submitting to its requirements, and on the other being the staunchest advocates of personal independence in the State. The explanation of the phenomenon is that which solves so many otherwise impossible problems—constitutions and governments, in Church and State, “*grow*, are not made.”

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE ITINERANT SYSTEM.

When John Wesley began to preach the only visible bond of union between his converts was himself. Even the “Society” was not formed. But men heard, believed, were converted, sought association, and acknowledged Wesley to be the head; the work grew, and men of “gifts, grace, and usefulness” were commissioned by him to exhort and preach. They went only where he sent them, did what he directed, and departed for other fields at his bidding. The numbers increased and formed many Societies; the “helpers” were called together in conference, but had no power of decision. Wesley heard, and when all had finished announced the policy to be pursued. In process of time the limit of possible connection with circuits

and stations (except in the case of ordained ministers of the Church of England) was fixed at three years. But the ministers had become numerous, able, and learned, the Societies self-supporting and somewhat exacting. Wesley grew old, and saw that, unless provision was made, at his death the body would fall into Congregationalism. To prevent this he executed the famous deed transferring the property and all rights held by him to the "Legal Hundred." The success of the Connection, the personal relations of ministry and laity, the property interests involved, produced a coherence and momentum which carried the great body of adherents in safety over the chasm occasioned by Wesley's death; and the Wesleyan "Church" or "Denomination" became thoroughly compacted.

Before Wesley died its government was an ecclesiastical monarchy, absolute in theory, but with many concessions granted to ministers and laity, which, as time passed, made it, like the Government of England, a Limited Monarchy. At the formation of the "Legal Hundred" its government became more analogous to that of an "Aristocracy," though modified by all the rights enjoyed by the people. In the United States, prior to the sending over of ministers with authority from Wesley, there was no legal connection between the different *nuclei* of Methodism in the North and the South. When Asbury assumed jurisdiction he claimed, and the preachers accorded to him, the same power exercised in England by Wesley. The Minutes of the Conference for 1779 close with these questions:

Quest. 12. Ought not Brother Asbury to act as general assistant in America? He ought: 1st, on account of his age; 2d, because originally appointed by Mr. Wesley; 3d, being joined with Messrs. Rankin and Shadford, by express order from Mr. Wesley.

Quest. 13. How far shall his power extend? On hearing every preacher for and against what is in debate, the right of determination shall rest with him, according to the Minutes.

From that time, with considerable trouble and opposition, he exercised his powers, deciding questions, stationing and removing men, until the Revolution was ended and Dr. Coke had arrived. Then the Societies and preachers adhering to Asbury, with the class-meetings, itineracy, and all the peculiarities of Methodism, formed the Methodist Episcopal Church, the his-

tory of which momentous transaction being thus stated in the Minutes for 1785, after the publication of the letter brought from John Wesley by Thomas Coke:

Therefore at this Conference we formed ourselves into an independent Church; and, following the counsel of Mr. John Wesley, who recommended the Episcopal form of Church government, we thought it best to become an Episcopal Church, making the Episcopal office elective, and the elected Superintendent or Bishop amenable to the body of ministers and preachers.

From 1785, as from the beginning until then, the Superintendent or Bishop, with no time-limit except one for each case made in his own discretion, stationed the preachers, until 1792, when the following rule was adopted:

Quest. 4. How long may the Bishops allow an elder to preside in the same district?

Ans. For any term not exceeding four years successively.

Emory's foot-note on this question is as follows:

This restriction (for originally there was none) is said to have been introduced in consequence of the evil results of a more protracted term in the case of James O'Kelly, who had been Presiding Elder in the southern part of Virginia ever since the organization of the Church, besides having been stationed there several years before, and who thus acquired a power to injure the Church by his secession which otherwise he would not have possessed.

But there was no restriction on the discretion of the Bishops in fixing the terms of the appointments of ordinary preachers until 1804, when the following rule was passed:

Providing he (the Bishop) shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station more than two years successively; excepting the Presiding Elders, the Editor and General Book Steward, the Assistant Editor and General Book Steward, the supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers.

At that time there were no "Missionary Society," with its "Corresponding Secretaries," no "editors and assistant editors at Auburn, Pittsburgh, Chicago, St. Louis, Portland, San Francisco, Atlanta, and New Orleans," no "missionaries to Indians, Welsh, Swedes, Norwegians, neglected portions of our cities," no "people of color, and on foreign stations." There certainly was no call on the Methodist Episcopal Church to furnish

"chaplains to reformatory, sanitary, and charitable institutions, to prisons, and in the army and navy," nor for secretaries or agents of the American Bible Society. None of our ministers were required to be "presidents, principals, or teachers in seminaries of learning," for we had few such institutions in 1804. And in those days of virtual ostracism we were not likely to be asked to furnish professors to "any seminary of learning not under our care." Nor was the "Five Points Mission in New York" nor "the American Chapel in Paris" among "the things that are." The history of these exceptions is the record of the growth of the Church in numbers, intelligence, wealth, and influence, and is interwoven with that of other denominations and of the United States. The editors, agents, corresponding secretaries, and teachers, have special professions or kinds of business to master and conduct; while the chaplains, city missionaries, and "those who may be appointed to labor for the benefit of seamen," have "itinerant" congregations.

At the General Conference of 1844 the rule concerning the length of a presiding elder's term in the same district was made to read thus: "For any term not exceeding four years successively. After which he shall not be appointed to the same district for six years." In 1872 it was provided that "presiding elders in Missions and Mission Conferences in heathen lands may be appointed to the same district for more than four consecutive years." At the General Conference of 1844 the following additional proviso was enacted respecting the appointment of the preachers:

Provided, also, that, with the exceptions above named, he shall not continue a preacher in the same appointment more than two years in six, nor in the same city more than four years in succession, nor return him to it after such term of service till he shall have been absent four years.

This proviso was repealed in 1856. At the Conference of 1864 the rule enacted in 1804, limiting the term of possible service to two years, was made to read thus, "*Provided*, also, that with the exceptions above named he shall not continue a preacher in the same appointment more than three years in six."

So this unique system, which could never have been contrived and established as a whole, has grown and solidified. And now the Superintendents or Bishops, endowed with their

prerogatives by the whole Church in General Conference assembled, before a delegated General Conference was needed or projected; and maintained in the exercise of their authority by the Restrictive Rules (which define the powers never transferred by the ministry and membership to the delegated General Conference) and by the subsequent enactments of said delegated General Conference, have *theoretically* absolute power and discretion in fixing the appointments of the preachers, being amenable to the General Conference for the proper exercise of the functions of their office. So tremendous is their power in theory; but *practically* they receive counsel from the Presiding Elders and communications from both preachers and people, giving stability to the machinery by their final determining prerogative, which, though not now frequently exercised *ex cathedra*, is, like the "discretion" of a judge of the highest court, "not to be appealed from." But when the limit of three years is reached their authority and discretion end. They are themselves subject to law, and if they were to presume to appoint the most useful and popular man, under the ordinary procedure, for a fourth year, it would be an act in the Bishop attempting it of rebellion against the General Conference and the Denomination which would compel his expulsion from office. In no case has it been attempted by a Bishop, though a few instances of stretching the exceptions allowed, to cover special emergencies, have occurred, without in every case being as carefully scrutinized by the succeeding General Conference as they should have been. In this system the appointments are made annually, and the Bishop presiding at the Conference is required to give an appointment to every "effective" member of the Conference not under charges or sentence of suspension.

Every Church, under this system, must receive the minister appointed. It may protest, and object, and temporarily refuse, and by an exercise of "discretion" on the part of the Bishop it may gain its end; but if the issue be fairly joined, and the Bishop refuse to change the appointment, the Church *must* succumb, or be cut off from the body. In like manner every minister *must* go to his appointment. He may persuade, argue, implore, and convince "episcopal discretion," and so be appointed elsewhere than at first announced. But if the decree

be not changed he must go, or locate, withdraw, or become a subject of ecclesiastical discipline.

Under the operation of this complex mechanism ten thousand ministers, many of them the equals in experience, learning, eloquence, piety, and local public esteem of those who appoint them, are sent from place to place, compelled to remove at least as often as once in every three years, the whole body averaging as often as once in two years. And ten thousand Churches part on a set day with their pastors, some gladly, some willingly, some doubtfully, some very sadly; to receive others, some very sadly, some doubtfully, some willingly, and some gladly. While the number of ministers who will not go and of Churches that will not receive those who are sent, is so very small as scarcely to be a factor in the estimate of the results of the working of the system.

Many of those who observe the Denomination from without only, and some who, though within, have not carefully studied it, ask why we do, and how we can, submit to it. One answer will meet both questions. We submit to it because we approve it, and we approve it because of the immense and otherwise unattainable advantages which it confers upon the Denomination as a whole. Every thing finite must have the virtues and "defects of its qualities;" and the value of a system is ascertained by experience, and the estimate confirmed by analysis and comparison.

PECULIAR ADVANTAGES OF THE ITINERACY.

The present time and place are suitable to point out even to some who enjoy without properly estimating them the peculiar advantages of the itineracy. It will, of course, be necessary to re-state well known and "oft told truths," but the writer believes that certain considerations herewith presented have not often, if ever, been brought forward in vindication of the system of periodical transfers of the ministry. That a great work has been done by a settled ministry, and that vigorous and healthy Churches are now maintained by it, no one can doubt; and any allusions to defects in that plan are not made in a spirit of hostility to those denominations which are organized under it, but simply as necessary to the full exhibition of the subject from our point of view.

1. The itineracy provides all Churches with pastors, and all

pastors with fields of labor. In some other denominations, according to their own reports, less than one half the Churches have settled pastors, the rest having "stated supplies," transient preaching, or being destitute of pulpit ministrations. While this is the case with the Churches, between one third and one fourth of the ministers anxious to preach are without settlements or calls. The following extract is from the "Congregationalist" of September 10, 1879 :

AN EXPERIENCE MEETING.

Time, Monday, 9 A. M.; place, a corner of the Congregational Book-store; occasion, a cluster of men discussing vacant pulpits and their method of supply. Though composed of ministers it was a *live* meeting; perhaps because there was no attempt to preach or theorize, only simply heart-felt statement of personal experience and feeling. For obvious reasons other letters have been substituted for the true initials.

Brother B. was speaking. "For my part I must say I am sick of this whole business. I love to preach; it has been my loved vocation for a score of years, and if there were anywhere an open door to a field however humble, where the salary would keep body and soul together, I would gladly work on for the Master; but this coming here week after week to make one of a crowd of disappointed applicants not only disheartens, but humiliates me in a way that I do not believe good for any man."

"True, Brother B., but what can we do?"

"Sure enough, what can we? If I knew I would not only tell others, but act for myself. I see and feel the evils of our system, but how to remedy them is another thing."

"There are nine of us," spoke up Brother F., "that came in here last Saturday hoping for a chance to preach somewhere as a supply or candidate. How many of us did preach?"

Two hands were raised, and their owners explained that in one case it was gratuitous assistance for a friend, and in the other the result of an arrangement made outside the Congregational House. "Well," continued Brother F., "I happen to know of four others who last Saturday made personal application in this building for places to preach. I presume Mr. Sargent could tell us of many others, and then we all know that both here and in the 'bureau' above they have on file a large and increasing list of applications from ministers all over New England, and from the regions beyond."

"What success did the four have?"

"Of these four, one was sent out by our good brother in charge of the book-store, in response to the only single, solitary call that came from any Church whatsoever to any party in this building. The other three went, one to a temporary boarding-place he has

hired for himself and wife a few miles out, his goods stored meanwhile a hundred miles from here; one to his home down on the Cape, and the other to his home beyond the Connecticut River. His car fare, I happen to know, was \$6 90; he brought his lunch with him, but he spent five cents for a cup of coffee."

"How much family has he?"

"Five children and an invalid sister."

"How much salary has he had?"

"Six years ago it was \$1,200 and parsonage, then it was cut down to \$1,000, again reduced to \$800, and last year it was \$650, and no vacation. Fifty dollars are still due."

"Why did he come so far on an uncertainty?"

"He told me that he was getting desperate; that he had been at home five Sabbaths without employment, and that he felt he must do something or go somewhere, and so he came on to make inquiries in person."

"What does the 'ministerial bureau' accomplish anyway?"

Brother S. responded: "It has never done any thing for me except to put my letters on file; but then I do not blame the bureau; it would gladly help us all to places if it could, but when all the applications come from the ministers, and none from the Churches, it makes it a one-sided affair, a market where it is all supply and no demand."

Over against this place the fact that there is not one Methodist Church desiring a pastor, and able to support him, without one, and not one "effective" Methodist preacher "standing all day idle in the vineyard because no man hath hired him."

2. It stimulates the growth of young Churches. It does this by supplying them with men of greater ability than they could without it secure. Many of them could not offer any minister such inducements that he would voluntarily settle there; but under the itineracy the hardship is shared, and the preacher encouraged and sustained "with the assurance of a better appointment next year." By this plan it has been made impossible for the emigrant, the miner, or even the hunter, to get beyond the reach of the Methodist itinerant, "who forms a class and gives notice of preaching wherever two or three can be got together." Except by their missionary efforts, necessarily circumscribed, other denominations can accomplish little in this way, for under the regular operations of the system of settled pastors Societies must first be formed and the minister receive a call.

3. It confers peculiar benefits on the minister. He is compelled to mingle very much in society, for the spirit of a re-

cluse is fatal to his success. He is brought in close contact, in the course of years, with a very large number of persons, much larger than the ordinary settled pastor can reach. By this his knowledge of human nature is greatly enlarged. For this wisdom cannot be acquired in the closet; and by it alone men of limited acquirements frequently attain to the front rank in every sphere of public life, while where it is deficient the greatest erudition is comparatively useless.

It promotes physical vigor. To say nothing of the healthful influence of changes of climate and scenery, after preaching for two or three years to the same congregation the vital force of many men becomes exhausted. In such a state three months' labor may confirm a consumption, or permanently shatter the nervous system. The delivery of sermons, except when the vocal organs are diseased, is not unhealthy, but the mental and nervous exhaustion produced by their preparation often is. Could the failing minister be relieved from that for a few months, though still preaching, his powers would recuperate, but if settled he fears lest his resignation should be construed into a want of ability; he does not wish to ask for a long furlough because he cannot do without his salary, or lest his people should fancy that they are to have an invalid fastened upon them; and so many struggle on and break down. In the itineracy the periodic changes allow this rest, the necessity of making new acquaintances takes him out in the open air, and gives the *stimulus* to healthful exercise. If worn with a heavy city charge, a quiet rural station can be assigned him, or wherever he may be sent his pulpit preparations previously accumulated are for a time available.

Under this plan no minister is ever *required* to "candidate." If committees, self-constituted or official, go to hear him or ask him to preach on trial, he may be entirely inactive if he possess the requisite spirit. While in other systems, except in rare instances, voluntary and conscious "candidating," frequently not followed by "effectual calling," and always attended by humiliating anxiety, is unavoidable.

Many, if not most, ministers require the stimulus of variety to keep them at their best. This a new Church, congregation, Sabbath-school and community, furnish; and they place the minister under the necessity of making a new reputation for

himself. There is, to noble minds, a powerful incitement in the fact of having a position already achieved to sustain; but human nature is weak, and very many are tempted to rely on a reputation already established for permanent consideration, and thus relax effort. Under the plan of regular transfers the minister is ever under the conviction that his influence is to be gained, and that he has no time to waste. That evils may hence arise is obvious, but their examination belongs to another part of the subject.

The wide circle of attached friends which the minister forms in his changes contributes greatly to his happiness, and the relief he feels in being removed from some who have done all in their power to harass him, even though he may have had great general success, is not to be despised. The comfort which the certainty that as long as he is able to toil there will be a place for him, however humble, provided by the Church, is greater than that furnished by an endowment policy of many thousands in the best life assurance company in the world. For that could give only money; this insures friends, the opportunity to labor for Christ and humanity, and the necessaries, if not the luxuries, of existence. The support, also, in the discharge of duty when opposed by the narrow, the worldly, or the sinful, afforded by the thought that the struggle will soon end by removal, and that these foes will not be able to prevent another appointment, may with great force be contrasted with the sinking of heart which the settled minister must feel when he perceives that if he is faithful he cannot stay, and if he is dislodged by opposition it will debar him from receiving another call.

But there is one capital advantage which the itinerant enjoys that few seem to have weighed. It is the opportunity of correcting and avoiding any errors into which he may have fallen, without jeopardizing or ruining his influence. To depart from a policy already adopted, and strenuously supported, by the minister, in the same Church, is always difficult even in small things, and most dangerous in great matters; but in the discharge of his functions in another place he may, after mature reflection, deem it wise to adopt the very plan he had rejected. And he can do this without humiliation or controversy.

4. For the whole Church the distribution of different gifts in nearly equal proportions is desirable. Marked individuality

in ministers settled for many years has a tendency to stamp "their image and superscription" on their devoted parishioners. As the symmetrical unfolding of nature and grace gives the ideal type of the Christian, so the ideal Christian minister is one who, devoted to Christ, is argumentative and discriminating enough to instruct the Church, imaginative enough to attract and inspire with hope, and emotional enough to affect the heart with suitable feelings. But where is that ideal man? In one, logic predominates; in another, poetry; in a third, pathos. The best statement on this subject is from the pen of Abel Stevens:

Many men of fervid spirit and deep piety have little talent for disciplining the Church. Their discourses are chiefly hortative; they are instrumental in great revivals and additions to the membership. It is obvious that such talents need a rapid distribution. The soul must not only be converted, but trained in piety. By an itinerant system such men are changed from position to position, arousing dull Churches, breaking up new ground, invading and reclaiming ungodly neighborhoods. By the same system prudent men, with talents for instructing and edifying the converted masses, follow the former, gathering up and securing the fruits of their labors. Some pastors are addicted chiefly to experimental and practical preaching, others to the illustration and defense of doctrinal truth. Some are more effectual in the social services, others in the ministrations of the pulpit. Some have ability only for spiritual labors; others are skillful in managing and invigorating the fiscal resources of the Church, in erecting new chapels, and promoting the benevolent enterprises of the times.

Further: Changes in the pastorate under any system are inevitable. Most men are not able to sustain themselves in the same charge for more than two or three years. All things considered, there must be an increase of attractiveness to preserve a given degree of interest, for it is the same voice, manner, man, addressing the same congregation from one hundred to one hundred and fifty times a year. If the pastor succeeds he will receive a call to some more desirable field of labor. Death makes vacancies, and disturbances from unforeseen causes are liable at any time to arise. There is under other systems an interval between the removal of one pastor and the settlement of another. And frequently no settlement can be effected without the secret or open dissatisfaction of a large minority. When a pastor is disliked from any cause, and his friends are numerous or strong, the dissatisfied are driven to do one of

three things : to hear a man whom they do not like, to leave the Church, or to create such a disturbance that he must resign. The average Church member will not do the first, and is not likely to do the second ; hence the worst passions are aroused, and Churches are rent into hostile factions. Such a conflict over a minister works immeasurable evil in a community. It is, however, in proportion to the great number of Societies, of unfrequent occurrence in the Methodist Episcopal Church ; and this, not because its members and ministers are more patient or less excitable and persistent than others, but because it is obviously irrational and useless to risk the ruin of the Church on account of a minister, when at the best he can be enjoyed, or at the worst he must be endured, for but a short time. Whatever, then, has a strong general tendency to preserve the peace of the Church is of great value. It also exerts a great influence over the spirit of unity in the denomination. This is so obvious as to require but the briefest statement. In twenty years the same minister will have been pastor of more than six Churches in different parts of a State. His friends in them all observe his career and note with sympathy and interest his various changes, and thus, through him, become informed concerning other Churches. It is this which accounts, in great part, for the interest which Methodists feel in the dedicating of new churches, and for the great interest which the laity feel in the Annual Conferences, and the pleasure they derive from attending their sessions. Every member of the Church, of any considerable age, has the personal acquaintance of many ministers, and has heard others spoken of as likely, some day, to be his pastor. The pleasure which most Methodist laymen feel in the friendship of the various ministers with whom they have been brought into close relations, and whom they could never have intimately known but for the itineracy, is greater than they sometimes think, unless their attention is directed to it. In a word, the Methodist has more inducements and opportunities to become acquainted with the ministers, and societies, and general enterprises of the Denomination to which he belongs, than others can have.

Nor should the membership of the Church forget the relief it has from the disturbances incident to the trial of ministers on charges of doctrinal unsoundness or moral delinquency. The

suitableness of the candidate for the ministry is first passed on by the laity, but not with reference to his being the pastor of those who recommend him; the Annual Conference decides whether to receive him on trial. After admission a yearly opportunity is given to bring any charge against him; his trial does not take place in the Church of which he is pastor, nor, if innocent and yet damaged, does his failure to be reappointed permanently embarrass him or the Society he leaves.

If during the year accusations are made, investigation may be had at once, and its place may be located at a distance from his station. All this depends on the itineracy. Contrast its operation with the uncertainty, confusion, fierce excitement, heart-burnings, and public scandal attending the trials of ministers under other systems; especially where the laity of the Church of which the accused is the pastor are of necessity his judges; or where the lay members and permanent pastors of neighboring Churches are involved either as counsel, witnesses, or judges.

5. But it is as the bulwark of sound doctrine that the itineracy commends itself to every sincere believer in the doctrines and lover of the spirit of Methodism. Most of the heresies and errors which have rent the Church in all ages have been introduced by ministers and teachers of theology, and by them disseminated among the people. When a heretical minister is long settled in one place, if a man of force, he impresses his errors upon the people. It was in this manner that the Unitarian secession in New England arose, which took a third of the Congregational Churches. Ministers preached these sentiments until they gained sufficient adherents to take the Church with them. This could never be done in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The preacher of false doctrines remains at the longest but three years the pastor of one congregation. It is impossible for him to eradicate in so short a time the seeds of truth planted by his predecessors. And on his departure a man both sound in doctrine and able to defend and establish the truth may be appointed to fill his place.

Hence secessions of heretical ministers, accompanied by their Churches, are unknown among us. The heretic may go, but he goes alone, and if, like Robert Laird Collier, he return to the vicinity of his former pastorate, he finds his old pulpit occupied by a shepherd able to protect the fold. Or he may stay,

if he care to and can, but the reputation of uttering unsound sentiments will follow him from place to place, and his influence will wane.

EVILS INCIDENT TO THE SYSTEM.

But great as these advantages are, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are certain evils incident to the system. It is necessary, however, that in contemplating evils we should ascertain the value of any compensations which may exist. It is said that the arbitrary removal of ministers frequently terminates revivals and leaves young converts uncared for; the minister is preparing to leave and the people to receive a new pastor, and that the departing pastor is unable to transfer the mental and moral history of converts from his own mind to that of his successor. It must be admitted that this liability exists, and that sometimes there is a serious loss here. But where the converts are placed under proper leaders in classes, and are converted to Christ and to his Churches rather than to the pastor, this loss can be made very small. Many revivals also would terminate, in any event, very soon, and many revivals are caused by the extra efforts occasioned and the greater interest of the people and the pastor enkindled by the knowledge that they must *soon separate*. It must also be remembered that where there has been no revival and no probability exists of one at that time, the coming of a new pastor often arouses the whole community, and great are the results in the first year. Then ample opportunity is afforded to train converts. It is not denied that there is a loss, but affirmed that it is not necessarily large, and that these compensations are important.

It is alleged that it lays a burden upon thoughtful and modest men, and offers a premium to the flippant and superficial, and enables indolent men, secure in the certainty of a place, to repeat their old routine of sermons. Concerning this it may be said that the itineracy bears heavily upon *diffident* men, but the contact with the world which it requires tends to remove the defect, so that the Methodist minister is proverbially free from diffidence. And the superficial certainly have some advantages in a system of change. But it is not a paradise for the indolent man, whose old sermons, grown stale to

himself, are flat to the people, and in a little while he is stationed with difficulty and moved annually, increasing the rapidity of his revolutions with the diminution of his orbit, until his natural *inertia* brings his career to an end.

It may with truth be said that there is some loss of power when those who are succeeding are removed. The knowledge of the persons composing a Society, except as it reflects light on human nature in general, ceases to be of use. It requires a long time to become acquainted with a new congregation. After men pass forty years of age the difficulty of remembering names and faces becomes very great. Habits of study are broken up, and a great amount of otherwise superfluous calling is required. This, however, is not in practice as serious an evil as it seems. The class-meeting affords great opportunities of rapidly forming acquaintances. The writer is pastor of more than a thousand communicants, yet by visiting the fifteen classes of the Church, he met, under the best circumstances, in six weeks, more than three hundred members. The identification of individuals is greatly facilitated by the same institution. The people, under the requirements of the case, are social, and meet the pastor fully half way, while a promptness of approach on his part is not only permitted but expected. As the retiring pastor endeavors to correct his records and atone for any apparent neglect, and the new-comer must become acquainted, the *whole* people are quite sure to be visited at least twice in every two or three years, even if pastors were disposed to neglect this duty. We do not deny a loss of power, but admit it to be in some instances very serious. Yet it is not as great as it seems, and he who guards against it may reduce it very much. And in genuine Methodist Churches, where the class-meeting, that great "compensator," is maintained, it becomes still less.

The gravest charge made against the system is, that it renders local influence impossible. It will be found, however, when a comparison is made to our disadvantage, that some such man as Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, who is of transcendent ability, has grown up with the city, is pastor of a congregation of great wealth and commercial, professional, political, and social influence, is compared with an ordinary pastor of a Methodist Church. But let the comparison be made fairly, and several things will be observed. 1. That when a minister has been

stationed for many years in the same city, and is adapted to it, he can attain great local influence, which he does not lose by being transferred from one Society to another. The influence of Dr. A. S. Hunt, in the directions in which his tastes led him, was and is second to but few ministers of any standing in the city of Brooklyn. The number of men in other denominations of *great* local influence is not very large, though particular instances are conspicuous. It is not maintained that we have as many, but our average ministers have more influence of this local kind than that large proportion of settled ministers who are supposed not to be succeeding, and have a hostile minority ready to make capital against them out of the smallest error they may commit. But in a republic there is another kind of influence than that just referred to. It is the power of arousing and stirring the people. Into that power enter enthusiasm, facility in speech, novelty of method, fearlessness, experience in various emergencies, and close connection with the masses of the people. It is this which promotes revivals, all reforms which spring from the impulses of men, great temperance movements, and which resists the insidious encroachments of Romanism or Communism. This kind of influence the Methodist preacher can attain anywhere, and he and his brethren are leaders in these movements every-where. "How is it," said an eminent citizen, referring to a minister of our Church, "that he has a greater hold of the people than those who have lived here all their lives?" "Thank God," said a distinguished professional man in New York, a warden in an Episcopal Church, "we have one Denomination in this country that can be relied on to check the Romanists whenever they show their teeth." And thus the sum total of ten pastorates of three years in as many places may be greater than that of a successful man in one position, and is certainly immeasurably greater than that of an ordinary man.

But we concede that certain things can be done more efficiently under a settled ministry than under an itinerant. Churches can be sustained in certain localities in cities where, under our plan, it is difficult, if not impossible. We hold, nevertheless, that if the incidental disabilities were "ten times greater than they are" the advantages of the system would far outweigh them.

PROPOSAL TO REMOVE THE LIMITATION.

There are those among us who come forward with a plan which they claim will remove at once every disadvantage and secure to us all the advantages of an itineracy, and those also of a settled ministry. They affirm that the only thing that needs alteration to effect this result is to remove the *limitation*. Let all things remain as they are, let the appointments be made annually, but let pastors be reappointed for successive years as long as the Bishops think it best. This proposition has the merit of simplicity, and would require nothing but a vote of the General Conference to render it legal. There are no constitutional restrictions to prevent it. A majority of one can make it possible for any minister to spend his life where he is, providing that at the successive Annual Conferences the Bishops should re-appoint him.

In attacking the time-limit principles are advanced identical with those urged against the itineracy as a whole. But those who favor the proposition affirm that they love the itineracy, and hope that it will be maintained. One position taken strikes the writer as most singular, and implying a remarkable view of "Providence." "The present rule sets aside the indications of Providence, and substitutes an unbending iron rule of man's device. You may follow Providence within the limit of three years, but after that no call or demand of a providential character can be heeded."

But is not an annual appointment making a limit for Providence? Ten thousand men are appointed for a *year*. Nothing but immorality, insanity, heresy, voluntary withdrawal, or disease, or death, can remove them. There they must remain.

No man can vote till he is twenty-one years old, yet some are better qualified at sixteen than others at forty. Is not an heir born in this country "providentially" prevented from controlling his property till he is twenty-one, even if man devised the restriction? Judges are retired at seventy, and ineligible to reappointment. When a limit is a fact Providence takes cognizance of it. This limit of three years was made, as was supposed, in harmony with providential indications drawn from the state of the whole Church. The thing to be done is to show that those indications have changed. A man may fol-

low the indications of Providence till they lead him to make a contract which he cannot, without immorality, violate.

The proposition to remove the limitation, simple and harmless as it seems, contains in it elements which would render many of the advantages now guaranteed impossible, and in a short time put an end to the itineracy. It has been said by an advocate of the removal of the time restriction: "I realize that thousands of old men *feel* that the itineracy is bound up with this restriction. In the Church South, the restriction was repealed, (I believe in 1868,) but the majority were so moved by the tears of the fathers (who felt that Methodism had been stabbed to the heart) that they repealed their action before the session ended. I perceive and honor this *feeling*; but I know that it is only feeling. In a short life I have witnessed great changes of feeling in men and bodies of men."

The writer neither *feels* nor *thinks* that the itineracy is bound up with *this* restriction. But he believes that it is bound up with *a* restriction, a "time-limit" of some kind, contingent up to a certain point, but at that point invincible. And if he should prove to be "old" enough to attempt to substitute feeling or unsupported assertion for facts and reasoning, it will not be difficult to satisfy the Church of it. Indeed, no service can be rendered to a reform greater than a full statement of the views of its opponents. At the same time, to expose the fallacies in impracticable theories serves the cause of truth. The proposition we maintain is this: a limitation by law is essential to the successful working and permanency of the itineracy.

1. Under a limitation the appointments are made in the discretion of the appointing power until the limit is reached. The will of the Bishop determines when the pastor shall go, whether he shall return once or twice. Loyalty requires him to go or stay. But, according to his appointment, when the constitutional limit is reached the Bishop becomes "weak as other men." It is now the whole Denomination which compels the incumbent to move, and he cannot resist. If the Bishop, the Minister, and the Church, should combine, it would avail nothing. Hence it is impossible for the man to stay, and though he may go with the tears of the people mingling with his own, there is no outcry against the Bishop. But let all limitation be removed, and the exercise of Episcopal discretion is the

sole "efficient cause" of the otherwise unnecessary removal of their beloved pastor, and the people are grieved and indignant, while he feels oppressed. And after a pastor should have been settled many years in a place, if the people desired him to remain, it would be impossible to remove him without his consent. It would be useless to talk to either about the good of the Denomination as long as both were satisfied.

But it may be said, If both are satisfied, why separate them at all? The answer is manifold. It is not always a proof that the Church is prospering because the minister and the people are pleased with each other. A course of reciprocal flattery renders delight in each other, and spiritual, and sometimes temporal decline, compatible. If the Society is really prosperous, it can endure a change, while there may be another Church which that very minister might, if honorably removed to it, at once develop into a great power. But great changes would surely be introduced in Methodist usages, doctrine, and discipline. One minister believing in the annihilation of the wicked, another preaching hope for all, a third winking at dancing, card-playing, theater-going, a fourth indifferent to class-meetings, these could all, and easily, stamp their peculiarities on their congregations, and great dissimilarities in usages, doctrine, and discipline, would soon appear. If the germs of these things are planted "in the green tree, what would they do in the dry?" Then, when these evils should have become obvious, and it would seem necessary to remove the man to save the Church, the cry of persecution would be raised, those whom he had infected would gather around him, and he would remain or divide the Church. This result would be the more sure because, under a ministry likely to be permanent, those who sympathize with a peculiar style gather around its embodiment, and those who dislike it (unless they remain as a turbulent element) depart.

2. As men supposed by themselves and their people to be succeeding would not move, the work of the appointing power would be to find places for those who left under the stigma of failure. Its action would thus be regarded with disfavor in advance, and would be much more vigorously resisted than in similar instances at present, because laymen would feel, that if they received the appointee, he might stay for an indefinite

period. The work of the Bishops would be greatly complicated by the fact of there being no *certain* and *foreknown* vacancy, and no *certain* and *foreseen* removal. For example: in other Churches A. resigns and departs; a vacancy is thus made, and B. is called. B. is not called until there is a vacancy. At present, under our system, it is always known that at the end of three years there must be a vacancy, and that the pastor who has completed that period must be removed and appointed to fill another vacancy. But if all limitations of time were removed from the rule, and the appointments were made annually, there could be no vacancy until the meeting of the Conference, and no *necessary* vacancy then. And where a minister *might* remain, and yet it is understood during the year that he *must* leave, the results in most instances would be injurious. The Bishops could not foreknow what places they would have to fill, nor what ministers they would be obliged to station. For the mere rumor in other denominations that a pastor must go, often makes it certain that he cannot go without a great disturbance.

3. This appears more clearly from the fact that the membership of the Church, instead of, as now, having every motive to seek peace, would, in cases where, justly or unjustly, the preacher is disliked, have every motive to oppose him. Because they would perceive the *possibility* of his being re-appointed for an indefinite period, and unless there was decided opposition they would consider such successive re-appointments probable. To oppose him would be the only means of securing his removal.

It must be conceded that some now remain three years who should be transferred at the end of one or two. And this is an evil. But it is much less than the damage which would be caused by the disturbances resulting from the agitation and opposition which would then arise. Many of the best men do not make a very favorable impression at first. The people are somewhat disappointed. He is a stranger; they have not learned his ways, nor he theirs; he cannot seem as cordial and near to them, on arriving, as his predecessor, if beloved, did on departing. But if left to do his work in his own way, as the middle of the second year approaches his consistent deportment, ministrations in the pulpit, the sick-room, at the house of mourning, or his faithful pastoral visiting, have made a deep and general impression.

A genuine revival of religion crowns his labors with success, and at the end of the second year there is a unanimous desire for his return. But this class of men, before their qualities could be displayed, would be so opposed by those who were not pleased with them, or positively disliked them, that success would be made impossible. Some very singular things have been published on this subject, of which the following is an illustration :

I regard a first year's pastorate as necessarily experimental. There are few cases in which fitness can be determined before trial. The first year ought always, I think, to be experimental; and it ought not to be a hardship for any man or any Church to try again, to try several times. If we could get rid of triennialism, there would doubtless be more changes than now, because there would be more one-year terms. I have heard an old minister say, that out of twenty charges he had filled in forty-eight years of service, only two had been perfect fits.

On this suggestive passage two or three remarks may be made. It is clear that those who advocate the removal of the limitation perceive that its natural tendency would be to increase greatly the number of removals at the end of the first year; and it is certain that very many who, if they could be allowed to pursue their work quietly, would succeed finely in two or three years, would be removed at the end of the first under the suspicion, if not the brand, of failure. Many preachers, knowing that the Church had no longer the same motive to bear with them, would be tempted to concentrate their efforts wholly on securing that kind of popularity which would enable them to return. Perhaps the "old minister" who had but "two perfect fits" in his own judgment, and eighteen "misfits," was not the most competent judge. Some close observers might have classed the two with the eighteen, or called many of the latter "fits." Certain it is that many a faithful minister has done his best work where both he and the people for some time thought the appointment a "misfit." There are other considerations bearing on this point which cannot properly be omitted from the estimate. The opportunities for merited promotion would be much less than they now are. If a pastor were succeeding finely in a small place it would be indelicate for him to ask to be removed to a larger field, and if he did it secretly, while seeming to be pleased, it would involve

a species of duplicity. If it were proposed to remove him the feelings of the people would be wounded, for they would know that he preferred to go. Instances can be recalled in all parts of the country where a wound that has never healed was made by a pastor's preparing to leave a station where he was greatly beloved, at the end of a first or second year, to go to another with larger salary and real or supposed higher social position. But as it now is, at the end of a third year he must be removed, and, there being a vacancy for him, he can be placed where his abilities will have full scope, still retaining the undiminished regard of the people he leaves. Again, much jealousy and discord would arise between the Societies from the attempts of Churches to allure successful men away. Recently a prominent Church under the settled system received the report of its "Committee to secure a Pastor." The report stated that they had visited upward of forty churches, listening to ministers, and it appeared that finally they had dislodged a young man who was having great success in a large town at some distance from the city. In his letter of acceptance he speaks of "coming out of the shade into the sunlight." The only way a Church about to change could do, would be to invite some successful man, to the great sorrow of his people. When such things are done under the present limitation, generally, though not always, the invitation given, to be confirmed at the Conference, has respect to the expiration of the constitutional term. Also there are few men, if it were known that they *might* stay, who could not make it difficult to dislodge them; their friends, many or few, would sympathize with them, and much friction and loss would result. We learn, from the observation of other denominations, that the average man in the average place cannot with success remain more than two or three years; and as the average man is and will be as twenty to one in the Church, and as many very able men intellectually are only average men in ministerial and pastoral efficiency, the loss of harmony and satisfactory work caused by the attempt of average men to stay more than three years would be much greater in the Church, as a whole, than the gain made possible by the superior facilities given to a small minority.

4. The history of the introduction of the time limit confirms all that has been set forth. Francis Asbury, an unyielding

man, who showed himself ready to see the infant Church sundered rather than yield the claim to all the prerogatives of Wesley, was, as we saw in the beginning, unable to move the Presiding Elders as he wished until the time-limit was enacted. And he was equally unable to move the more influential preachers at the end of one, or even of two, years. An amazing, though, no doubt, unintentional, misrepresentation of the early history of American Methodism and of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been put forth by the "Brooklyn Society for the Promotion of a More Effective Working of the Methodist Itineracy:"

Up to 1804 the pastorates were all short—shorter than now; but they were made so by a judgment annually exercised by those who made them. We are quite willing that the pastorates should be short, provided that they be made short by the judgment which annually fixes them.

In 1804 the pastoral limit was fixed at two years of continuous service, and this limit was in the law for sixty years. Since 1864 the limit has been set at three years. I ask you to notice that the men who fixed upon two years in 1804 were large-minded, and set the mark up to the highest demand of any Church under their care. Two years' pastorates in 1804 met the extremest city want. If a General Conference were now to imitate the men of 1804, it could not fix the limit short of ten years. John-street, in 1804, was provided with a pastoral term up to its largest ambition; no one remembering all the changes that have occurred would think of a less term than ten years if he wished to meet the largest ambition of St. Paul's in 1880.—P. 18.

Nearly every statement in that passage is incorrect. "Up to 1804 the pastorates were all short, shorter than now." This is not correct. "Two years' pastorates in 1804 met the extremest city want." This is an error. "John-street, in 1804, was provided with a pastoral term up to its largest ambition." This is wholly wrong. Joining issue so positively on these statements, it behooves the writer to furnish irrefutable proof of the errors charged, or submit to be convicted of assailing the accuracy of another's affirmations without due care and candor. The facts are that, though for some time previous to 1794 the general custom had been for the preachers to change every six months, (albeit this was only required "when convenient,")* between

* Foot-note, Minutes, 1794: N. B.—"The Bishop and Conferences desire that the preachers would generally change every six months, by order of the Presiding Elder, whenever it can be made convenient."

1794 and 1804 the terms greatly lengthened. Many remained *two* years, and several stayed *three* years, and Francis Asbury *could not* prevent it. The proof of these statements is as follows :

1. The Annual Minutes for the years between 1794 and 1804. These show many appointments for two years, and several for three—*John-street* and Baltimore, among others, having had pastors appointed for *three successive* years.

2. Stevens' "History of the Methodist Episcopal Church," vol. iv, p. 178 :

They were not allowed to appoint preachers for more than two successive years to the same appointment; hitherto there had been no restriction, and some had been *three* years in one appointment. Asbury rejoiced in the new rule as a *great relief to the appointing power*.

3. Dr. Stevens is generally thoroughly reliable; but for details it is well to go to primary sources. Jesse Lee's "History of the Methodists" was published in 1810. He says, pp. 298, 299 : "The following rule was also formed, 'The Bishop shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station or circuit more than two years successively.' In some cases, prior to that rule, the Bishop had appointed a preacher or preachers to the same place for three years together. He now determined on a better plan, and formed this rule to prevent any preacher from wishing or expecting such an appointment in future."

The rule was not, therefore, formed to give a few stations "a pastoral term up to their largest ambition," but to render such a thing impossible. And the conclusion is, that if the iron hand of Asbury, when the Churches were weak and the discipline strong, could not maintain the itineracy without a time limitation, it is certain that, considering all the changes that have transpired, if the limitation by law were removed, the itineracy would at once and forever break down. When the proposition was first presented to the mind of the writer several years ago, in connection with the great embarrassments of a few Churches, it seemed quite plausible. But after pursuing that course which alone can lead to a safe conclusion, namely, to re-read the history of the denomination and submit the theory to unprejudiced analysis, he has been led irresistibly to the conviction that the proposition is impracticable, and that its adoption would

prove fatal to the Denomination as an organic unity in harmonious action. It is for these reasons that he feels obliged reluctantly to take issue with those who advocate this proposition, some of whom have been as useful to the Methodist Episcopal Church as he can ever hope to be.

It is also clear to his mind that to substitute four or five years for three would be open to grave objections; the most serious of which would be that it would make unnecessary removals at the end of the first year, and that many who ought to be transferred at the end of two or three would make it a matter of honor to stay for four or five. But he by no means despairs of all modification whereby occasional highly important exceptions may be provided for without overthrowing the general law.

Under the present system a pastor may return for a second term of three years in every six. This has not yet been tried on any large scale. And it certainly requires great caution. But it is a possibility, with its peculiar advantages and disadvantages, under the existing plan. However, it is obvious that in the most pressing cases it could afford but little relief, and in many none at all.

In conclusion, the writer will suggest an amendment to the rule for the consideration of those who desire some modification and yet would rather things should remain as they are than to jeopard the inestimable advantages guaranteed by the itineracy.

A POSSIBLE AMENDMENT.

Methodism has now spread to "earth's remotest bounds," and the author has recently received from Melbourne, Australia, a copy of the "Spectator" of July 25, 1879, from the editorial page of which the following is taken:

"The last Conference appointed a committee 'to prepare a report bearing on the itinerant system of Methodism, with a view to a modification of the present triennial period.' The committee has met, and nothing, of course, can be officially known as to the result of its deliberations until its report is laid before the next financial district meetings. But it is understood that it recommends the present maximum term of three years to be lengthened to six years. The appointments are to be annual, as at present, and the modification is guarded by the

provision that no appointment beyond the present limit of three years is to be made except by a two thirds vote of the Conference, and on a request sustained by a two thirds majority of the Quarterly Meeting. Thus, a minority of one third in the Conference or in the Quarterly Meeting will have an absolute veto; and the present term can only be exceeded when the reasons for it are so strong as to make both the circuit concerned and the Conference practically unanimous. The change proposed, therefore, is of only homœopathic proportions, and is fenced by such guards as may soothe the apprehensions of the most timid. How this change can be carried into effect is a question for lawyers to decide. An Act of Parliament, possibly of the Imperial Parliament, will be required; and it must take the form of an Enabling Act—an Act, that is, which will enable trustees to vary the condition of their trust so as to permit the appointment of a minister beyond the present limits. The change, therefore, even if decided upon by Conference and sanctioned by Parliament, will only take effect, as it *ought* only to take effect, in the exact degree in which the Church desires it."

This proposition has these essential advantages:

1. The itineracy is still "limited by law."
2. It is so protected that it must be *exceptional*. It would be better to make the rule three fourths of the Quarterly Conference instead of two thirds. Then the proposal for an improper case would seldom or never pass beyond that meeting. But if it did the Annual Conference could and would check it.
3. It should be so arranged as to read the Bishop "*may* appoint." Then there would be no pressure upon the free action of the appointing power, and the exception would be analogous to others.
4. It would compel influential congregations to show a little more respect to the Annual Conferences than they sometimes do. Secure in their power to obtain transfers, they have been known to isolate themselves almost entirely. But if a vote of two thirds of the Annual Conference were a pre-requisite to the retention of a pastor whom their exigencies rendered necessary to them, they would cultivate closer relations than they think important now. Such power given to the Annual Conferences would not be an innovation, as we have at present in the Discipline the following grants from the General Confer-

ence: "And also, *when requested* by an Annual Conference, to appoint a preacher for a longer time than three years to any seminary of learning not under our care;" also, "He shall have authority, *when requested* by an Annual Conference, to appoint" agents, etc. See *Discipline* of 1876, pp. 102, 103.

If some, on being refused, were to secede with their pastor, their fate in attempting to stand alone would soon work a cure. There is, however, no necessity for great haste. It is desirable to provide for exceptional cases. It would be better not to attempt it than to jeopard the wonderful and complex mechanism which we now possess. This plan, which comes from the "ends of the earth," may be feasible. Let it be thoroughly considered. For in some such direction as this, if at all, must relief be obtained.

NOTES TO EDITOR IN REGARD TO THE OLD HYMN BOOK.

MR. EDITOR: The review of "The Revised Methodist Hymnal," by Dr. Wheatley, in the July issue of the *METHODIST QUARTERLY*, did not meet the eye of the writer until recently, which may explain the delay in sending you the following notice of some of the errors into which the reviewer has fallen.

Referring to the former alterations of the Hymn Book, Dr. Wheatley says: "The fifth revision, though nominally the joint work of the Revs. D. Dailey, J. B. Alverson, J. Floy, D. Patten, Jun., and F. Merrick, with whom were associated Messrs. R. A. West and D. Creamer, was mainly the product of Dr. Floy's tireless energy and assiduous application."

The completed volume, in allusion to Dr. Floy, is said to have left "his hands," and it is designated as "Floy's revision," and "Floy's version"! On what ground rests this bold assumption? Did Dr. Floy himself aspire to any such distinction above his *coadjutors*? Does Dr. Wheatley profess to speak from personal knowledge? The whole force of his words is in their truthfulness.

What are the facts relative to the method that was pursued in the "fifth revision" of the Hymn Book? The General Conference of 1848 appointed a committee of seven persons, whose names are given above by Dr. Wheatley, for the accomplishment of that work, in connection with certain other agencies referred to subsequently.

After the adjournment of the General Conference the Hymn-Book Committee at once entered earnestly upon their labors in the city of New York, where all their meetings were held, and Dr. Floy and Mr. West, who resided in that city, were appointed a subcommittee to act as secretaries. Their duties embraced whatever legitimately belonged to the revision and was matter of record, as correspondence, (which was very extensive,) arrangement of the hymns chosen by the Committee according to an adopted plan, and correcting the proof-sheets of the work as they came from the press.

The Committee had three sessions, and nine meetings at each session, making twenty-seven meetings in all, in the course of which the old book was examined throughout three times, and a separate vote was taken upon every hymn before it was admitted into the revised version. There were six members, out of seven, present at every meeting of the Committee.

Besides the labor expended in committee, much more was accomplished by the members at their homes; and Dr. Floy probably traveled considerably in visiting various libraries in pursuit of his portion of the work. He thus spent several days in the library of the writer, at Baltimore, which were industriously devoted by both of us to the selection of hymns for the revised book; where, twenty-nine years afterward, in 1877, Dr. Wentworth spent nearly two weeks in a similar employment with the writer and his son.

Professor Merrick, who attended only the first session of the Committee, comprising three days and nine sittings, compensated for his absence from the subsequent meetings by sending to the Committee at its second session a valuable manuscript criticism upon the whole book to be revised, which was carefully consulted both in committee and by the several members thereof. There were also similar criticisms forwarded to the Committee by outside parties, from which much useful information was derived.

The distant members of the Committee were in constant correspondence with the subcommittee or secretaries, and no new hymns, as in the case of the old ones, was allowed to be entered into the revised book until it had received the approval of a majority of the Committee. And it is but fair to assert that every member thereof has left his impress upon that work.

Within a year from their appointment, the Committee having completed their labors, in accordance with the directions of the General Conference, submitted their work to the Book Commit-

tee and the Editors of the Book Concern, for their joint examination and revision; and having been approved by them, it was presented to the Bishops "for a final review," which they gave to it, and then cordially recommended the new book to the patronage and adoption of the Church.

The above is a very brief and inadequate detail of the manner in which "the fifth revision" of the Hymn Book was accomplished; from which I infer that it was not the work of any single pair of hands, nor, indeed, entirely of the seven pairs of the whole Committee, but the joint production of the Hymn-Book Committee, the Book Committee, the Editors of the Book Concern, and the Bishops of the Church. And it can no more, with propriety, be designated as the sole work of Dr. Floy than the new "Hymnal" can be characterized as the individual production of Dr. Wentworth or Dr. Rice; the relation of these gentlemen to the Committee of fifteen being similar to that of Dr. Floy and Mr. West to the former and smaller Committee of seven.

More than thirty years have elapsed since the publication of the Hymn Book of 1849, a longer period than the Church has awarded to the use of any other of its hymnals, and an unequivocal testimony of its true merits; during which interval five of the seven brethren who composed the Committee have taken their departure from earth, leaving only Dr. Merrick and myself to tell the story of "the fifth revision." But as Dr. M. was not present at the second and third sessions of the Committee, it seems eminently proper that the writer should give to the Church and the world this correction of the dubious statement of the reviewer of the new Hymnal.

DAVID CREAMER.

BALTIMORE, December 7, 1859.

DR. WHEATLEY'S REPLY.

REV. DR. WHEDON: Mr. Creamer's communication calls in question a statement I never made, namely, that Dr. Floy was the *sole* author of the fifth revision. It does not affect the statement that Dr. Floy was the principal factor of that production. The authorities for that statement are as follows: 1. Dr. Floy's own hymn book, in the margin of which are entries in his own handwriting, stating that such and such alterations, etc., were made by his sole authority. 2. The statement of Rev. J. Longking, who was printer at the time, that Dr. Floy transposed hymns, altered meters, etc., while the book was passing through the press, and that he did this without the concurrent aid of the

Committee. 3. The statement of Dr. Curry, who, as an intimate friend of Dr. Floy, regards the fifth revision as the noblest monument to the memory of that gifted man. 4. Repeated statements made by ministers and laymen to the effect that Dr. Floy was the principal and most efficient agent in the construction of the last revision.

My article does not deny the efficient co-operation of Brother Creamer and of the other members of the Committee. It simply presents Dr. Floy as the leading member of that Committee; and, for the sake of convenience, speaks of the fifth as "Dr. Floy's revision" of the Hymn Book.

R. WHEATLEY.

805 BROADWAY, N. Y., December 11, 1879.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

BAPTIST REVIEW, July, August, September, 1879. (Cincinnati).—1. God and the Bibles; by Prof. G. D. B. Pepper, D.D. 2. An Exposition of Genesis vi, 3; by Rev. J. F. Morton. 3. An Introduction to the Book of Isaiah; by Rev. Thos. D. Anderson, Jun. 4. Theism Grounded in Mind; by Hon. James M. Hoyt, LL.D. 5. Reason's Sphere in Things Revealed; by Rev. I. N. Carman. 6. The Foundation and the Keys: Exegesis of Matthew xvi, 18, 19; by Rev. S. W. Culver. 7. The Belief of the Hebrews in the Immortality of the Soul; translated from the French of M. Gregoire by Rev. W. H. H. Marsh. 8. The Portraiture of Jesus; by W. N. Clarke, D.D.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1879. (Andover).—1. The Angel of Jehovah; by Prof. C. Goodspeed. 2. Notes on Grotius' Defense; by Rev. Frank F. Hooper. 3. Bible Illustrations from Bible Lands; by Rev. Thomas Laurie, D.D. 4. The Last Days of Christ: Exegetical Notes on the Basis of Mark xiv, 17-xvi, 20; by the late Rev. Horatio B. Hackett, D.D., LL.D. 5. Relations of the Aryan and Semitic Languages; by Rev. J. F. M'Curdy, Ph.D. 6. An Essay in Systematic Theology; by Rev. George T. Ladd. 7. The Sabbath Under the Old Dispensation; by Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D. 8. Theological Education.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1879. (Gettysburg).—1. Church Orders; or, The Necessity of a Right Call to the Office of the Ministry; by L. A. Gotwald, D.D. 2. Home Mission and Church Extension Work Among Lutherans, Especially in the Great North-west; by S. W. Harkey, D.D. 3. Qualifications for the Gospel Ministry; by Rev. P. Born. 4. The Annihilation Theory Briefly Examined; by Rev. D. M. Gilbert, A.M. 5. Aspiration and Purgation; by M. Valentine, D.D.

NEW ENGLANDER, November, 1879. (New Haven).—1. Needed Improvements in Public Worship; by Rev. George Harris. 2. The Rise of an Orthodox Socialism in Germany; by M. Laveleye, translated by James F. Colby, A.M. 3. Modern Education: its Opportunities and its Perils; by President Noah Porter. 4. Some Perplexities of Thought; by Rev. Jotham Sewall, Jun. 5. Shall the Church rely on Revivalism or on Christian Nurture? by Rev. William B. Clarke. 6. The Baconian Influence in Religion; by Prof. H. M. Whitney. 7. Language and the Egyptian Language; by Dr. Carl Abel, translated by Poultney Bigelow. 8. The Mystery of Free-Will—where to find it; by Prof. Lemuel S. Potwin.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, November, 1879. (New York.)—1. The Other Side of the Woman Question; by Julia Ward Howe, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Lucy Stone, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Wendell Phillips. 2. Malthusianism, Darwinism, and Pessimism; by Professor Francis Bowen. 3. A Page of Political Correspondence: Stanton to Buchanan. 4. The Diary of a Public Man. Part IV. 5. Tariff Reactions; by Professor Arthur L. Perry. 6. Some Recent Works of Fiction; by Edward Eggleston.

December, 1879.—1. Romanism and the Irish Race in the United States. Part I; by James Anthony Froude. 2. Young Men in Politics; by George S. Boutwell. 3. The Religion of To-day. 4. Is Political Economy a Science? by Professor Bonamy Price. 5. English and American Physique; by Geo. M. Beard. 6. The Permanence of Political Forces. Part I; by Cuthbert Mills.

Professor Bowen's article on Malthusianism, Darwinism, and Pessimism, is a production of special value. It opens some veins of thought, brings them into fresh combination, and educes and suggests conclusions, both doctrinal and practical, of most momentous importance.

Malthusianism and Darwinism (with an occult assumption of Atheism) are the twin premises of which Pessimism is the conclusion; and Pessimism is the ruin of our race. Both Malthusianism and Darwinism are based upon the idea of *over-population*: the former of the human race, and the latter of the animal races. Both doctrines require the suppression of life as a safety-valve; and from both demonstrate the *worthlessness of life*, human as well as animal. If life is worthless, then suicide is innocent and murder a trifle. Before us, then, is the abyss!

WHAT IS MALTHUSIANISM?

In order to refute the doctrines of human perfectibility taught by Rousseau and Condorcet, which taught the coming of an age of peace, virtue, and happiness over the earth by natural development, the Rev. T. R. Malthus published in 1798 his "Essay on Population; or, a View of its Past and Present Effects on Human Happiness." This book for the first time threw the awful shadow of over-population before the eyes of mankind as the fatal terminus in the way of all not only perfectibility, but great permanent improvement. The more peaceful, virtuous, prosperous, and growing the community or the nations, the nearer and surer the result. The more science, charity, good morals increased, the more rapid the ruin. The only angels of redemption against this dire terminus were celibacies, suppressions of life, wars, pestilences, and famines.

For the law is common to the vegetable and animal kingdoms, the human race included, that the rate of increase, however slow

or rapid it may be, must operate in the way of a geometrical ratio. The same causes which double a population of one thousand will double a population of one thousand millions. For example: a given rate of increase between 1790 and 1800 added only 1,200,000 to the white population of this country; between 1830 and 1840 *the same rate* of increase added 3,600,000. Our population was more than doubled between 1790 and 1820; it was again more than doubled between 1820 and 1850. But the former doubling added less than five millions to our numbers, while the latter one added over ten millions; and the next doubling, in 1880, will have added considerably more than twenty millions. Inevitably then, if the population increase at all, it must increase in the way of a geometrical progression—that is, as the numbers 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc.

But the means of subsistence, at best, cannot possibly be made to increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio—that is, as the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. The surface of the earth affords only a limited extent of ground, and this is of various degrees of fertility, large portions of it being hardly cultivable at all. By putting more ground in cultivation and improving the modes of agriculture, it is conceivable that, within twenty-five years, the quantity of food should be doubled. But it is not conceivable that *more* than this should be accomplished; that is, that the second twenty-five years should make a *larger* addition to the existing stock than was obtained during the former period. Hence, under the most favorable supposition that can be made, beginning with an annual product equal to one million bushels of wheat, at the end of the first quarter of a century this might be raised to two millions, at the end of the second quarter to three millions, and at the close of the third period to four millions.—Pp. 448, 449.

ADOPTION OF THE DOCTRINE AND ITS RESULTS.

The inferences from this theory were logically of the most inhumane character. If the increase of life was the great danger, all humanitarianism was essentially criminal. Charity was a folly. Vaccination was the enemy, and small-pox the benefactor. Marriage and fecundity were crimes against the public welfare. These conclusions were, of course, welcome to the English aristocracy, both as refuting the revolutionary doctrines and as relieving them of all responsibility for the miseries of the lower classes. Political economy was, down to a late period, based on Malthusianism. "These opinions led to the enactment, in 1834, of the New Poor Law, the avowed purpose of which was to prevent what is called 'outdoor relief,' and to collect the destitute and starving in union work-houses, where, as in jails, the separation of the sexes, the lowness of the diet,

and the general severity of the regimen, should be a terror to the evil-doers who had presumed to burden society with their superfluous progeny. If the crime was not literally theirs, it was at any rate their parents' fault, and the sins of the fathers must be visited upon the children in order to deter others from like offenses. 'Go to the work-house, or starve,' was henceforth to be the answer to all applicants for parochial relief; and the reader of Dickens need not be reminded that many of them preferred the latter alternative."—P. 450.

ITS PRACTICAL REFUTATION.

As Malthusianism is a signal instance showing how a dogma may demoralize a people, so its refutation, brought about by its effects, shows how a fact may demolish a dogma.

But the triumph of Malthusianism lasted only for about half a century, and its decline and fall have been even more rapid than its rise. The tide turned about the time of the famine in Ireland in 1846-47, and the consequent fearful exodus from that unhappy island, which, in less than ten years, deprived it of full one fourth of its population. In 1845 the number of persons in that country was estimated at 8,295,000, and they were increasing with considerable rapidity. In 1851 the population was only 6,574,278; and in 1871 it was less than five and one half millions, being a diminution of nearly thirty-five per cent. The Malthusians themselves were appalled at such a result. For the evil did not stop with the immediate diminution of numbers; as usual, in such cases, it was chiefly those who were in the flower of life, the healthy and the strong, who emigrated, leaving behind them the aged, the feeble, and the diseased. Hence the people at home deteriorated in vitality and working power even in a higher ratio than their decrease in numbers. At the same period there was also a great emigration, though by no means to an equivalent extent, from England, and especially from Scotland, where the great land-owners had acted on Malthusian principles by depopulating their vast estates, unroofing the cottages over their tenants' heads, and thus compelling them to ship themselves beyond sea. Then came the great trials of the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny, with the attendant difficulty of recruiting the army, so that the country awoke to a knowledge of the sad truth that, in banishing their people, they were drying up the sources of their productive power and their military strength.—Pp. 451, 452.

TRUE LAWS OF FECUNDITY.

The discussion brings out some interesting conclusions in regard to the true principles of population. The first prominent

fact of observation is that *the lower classes of life, the poor and ignorant, are very prolific, while the higher classes, the rich, intellectual, and aristocratic, tend to sterility.* As men rise in culture and in varied means of enjoyment, they resort less to animal gratifications. The very poor have scarce any other.

On examining the facts in the case more closely, it will always be found that it is not the excess of population which causes the misery, but the misery which causes the excess of population. Hopeless poverty makes men imprudent and reckless, and leads them to burden themselves with a family because they cannot be worse off, and there is no possibility of improving their condition. In Switzerland, where the land is parceled out among small proprietors, the peasantry obtain a comfortable livelihood, and, therefore, increase so slowly that the population will not double itself in less than two hundred and twenty-seven years. In France, where also the land is cut up into very small estates, and the peasantry are vastly better off than in England, the rate of increase for the population for ten years is only five per cent. In England, for the same period, it was fifteen per cent. ; and in Connaught, the sink of Irish misery and degradation, between 1821 and 1831 it was as high as twenty-two per cent. In Galway and Mayo, notoriously two of the most destitute counties, during the same period, there was an increase in the one case of twenty-seven and in the other of twenty-five per cent.—nearly as great as in the United States. Thus the two extremes of general misery and general well-being produce very nearly the same effect on the movement of the population.—P. 454.

In England it is a matter of common observation that the families of the nobility and landed gentry constantly tend to die out, and, if they were not recruited by promotions from the middle classes, the upper orders of society would gradually disappear. Of the barons who sat in the English House of Lords in 1854, the peerage of considerably more than one half does not date back beyond 1800; and not more than thirty of them can boast that their ancestors were ennobled before 1711. The continued and increasing opulence of the landed gentry of England is chiefly attributable to this cause; since the diminution of their numbers tends, of course, to the concentration of their estates. Celibate or childless lives are common among the younger sons of the nobility and gentry, while they are very infrequent in the classes of artisans and laborers. Even here, in the eastern part of the United States, the sons in educated and wealthy families marry later in life, and have fewer children, than those in the classes who live by handiwork; while the Irish laborers are the most prolific of all. No farther back than the beginning of this century families containing from ten to fifteen children each were not infrequent here in New England; now, one that has more than six is seldom found except among the very poor.—P. 455.

DARWINISM IS ANIMAL MALTHUSIANISM.

Darwinism is based on the same assumption of the overwhelming fecundity of animal life and the beneficence of destruction. In this battle of destruction it is the animal endowed with the best advantages for the struggle that survives and propagates his like, and so arise *species*. And so, too, result the rising of species into higher grades, for it is *the best* that survives. And as the slight variations of the new-born animals are properly *accidental*, that is, guided by no *intention*, so an air of what allow us to call *accidentality* is flung over the whole process, quite acceptable to Atheism. But here, alas, as Professor Bowen shows, comes in the true principle of fecundity that upsets this theory. In both the animal and vegetable worlds the law prevails that *low life is prolific and high life is chary of over-propagation*. Insects and fishes propagate by billions and trillions, but mammals by half dozens. It is by this secret principle of superior fecundity in animal life that species survive, and not by any slight individual accidental advantage, which is sure to be obliterated in a generation or two, that species prevail. "Natural selection," therefore, is a fallacy. And when art steps in and arbitrarily selects, art can improve, can vary wonderfully sometimes, and fantastically even, but the new forms tend to reversion, to sterility, and are rarely permanent.

Between low life and high life there arises this remarkable conservative balance, that the former is protected by its numbers and the latter by its strength. And if a battle between the two can be imagined, the low would be most likely to conquer, and the unfittest to survive. The Professor piquantly says :

If a battle of this sort were possible, victory in it would not depend on superiority of organization. The existence not of the lower races, but of the higher ones, would be imperiled. We can foresee this result in our own case, whether we compare the different classes of human society with each other, or man himself, the order primates, with the inferior animals. In the grand "struggles" which will occur about the time of the Greek Kalends, the primitive stocks, such as Irish bog-trotters and Welsh peasants, would certainly "survive" the nobility and gentry, though the latter profit by the accumulated advantages of high breeding transmitted by direct inheritance through a pedigree extending back to William the Conqueror. And, in the final

stage of the conflict even these original poor representatives of humanity must die out long before some of the animals far below them. Those pests of our summer, the insect tribes, would sing the requiem of man, and feast on his remains. Accordingly, the only original and distinctive feature of Darwinism—its attempt to explain away the argument from design for the being of a God by showing that the supposed adaptations of means to ends, and the admirably complex arrangements by which every portion of a living organism is fitted to do its proper work, may all be accounted for by the blind and unconscious action of mechanical principles and physical laws, without calling in anywhere a Divine purpose or a contriving Mind—must be regarded as a baseless hypothesis. A careful study of the successive development of the higher forms of life upon the earth does not invalidate, but fully confirms, the doctrine which has been held by every great thinker, from Socrates down to the present day, that no organism could have been produced without an organizing mind.—P. 462.

PESSIMISM.

Seen under the desperation of Malthus and the accidentalism of Darwin, deprived of all the lights and colorings of a higher faith, the universe is a dismal presentation, and daguerreotypes itself on the predisposed mind as Pessimism. Life is worthless. Man is a lump of matter crowded into a certain shape by a concurrence of blind forces, stimulated by a force called *life*, with certain molecular motions in his upper end called *thought*. Shatter the lump, and the molecular motion stops; and what of it? Just as well as if it kept a-going. My life is worthless; your life is worthless. All moralities are dissolved, and crime is just as good as innocence. And the more sincere these views, the worse they are, and the more dangerous the men who hold them. "Educated men, who have come to regard their own lives as only a burden to them, though they have been driven to despair, not by the privations and miseries which afflict the hopelessly poor, but by an insensate theory which teaches them to consider the existence of the human race itself as an intolerable evil, that can be abated most effectually by reducing society to anarchy and ruin, and who have prepared themselves for the admission of this theory by getting rid of all the restraints of morality and religion—these are foes truly formidable, against whom all the precautions and means of defense which governments can institute seem to be of little avail. This is the real ground of the terror recently inspired by the

Nihilists in Russia and by the leaders of what is called 'the social democracy' in Germany."

Such is the anarchic abyss before us. To its brink we are led by Darwinism and Haeckelism. And the only remedy we have against it is the earnest hope of immortality, the powerful revival of Christian faith.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Canadian Element in the United States; by J. G. Shea, LL.D. 2. Modern and Ancient Philosophy Compared; by Rev. J. Ming, S. J. 3. De La Salle: His Life and Work; by M. O'R. 4. Recent Progress in Stellar Physics; by Rev. J. M. Degni, S. J. 5. The Mormons; by General John Gibbon, U. S. A. 6. The Internal Condition of Russia; by A. de G. 7. Cardinal Pole; by Rev. M. J. M'Loughlin. 8. The Recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII.; by Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.

Our graceful and scholarly Roman contemporary contains the *Epistola Encyclica* of Pope Leo, commending St. Thomas Aquinas to the faith of the Church. We suppose this pre-eminence is justly due to St. Thomas as being the greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, and among the greatest intellects of any age. He is so indorsed now by infallibility that his works appear to be endowed with an intrinsic infallible authority, and his words, like those of Trent, may be safely quoted as a binding authority. And perhaps this *infallibilizing* process is now performed to secure the theology of the Church against any future disturbing vagary of the infallible spokesman, and make all firm. It may be a surprise to some that he is placed above Augustine; a fact, perhaps, in some measure due to Augustine's predestinarianism. For, great as Augustine's authority was, his fatalisms were never accepted, as is generally assumed they were, by the Western Church. The creed of Trent is not Augustinian. The Church doctors, in refuting the Jansenists, were greatly embarrassed by the authority of Augustine.

The following is a Jubilate for our Yankee brethren:

Meanwhile Catholic Canada is sending her Catholic sons, her priests, her devoted sisterhoods, into this country. New England, which sought with such rabid hate to crush Canada and Canadian Catholicity, now sees her towns swarm with Canadian Catholics, with churches and convents. Did the early Cottons, and Mathers, and Endicotts, and Winthrops ever dream of such a result? Did they foresee that when their stern unchristian Calvinism had given place to Unitarianism there would be seventy thousand Canadian Catholics in Massachusetts, thirteen thousand in New Hampshire, more than twice as many in the New Hampshire

Grants, ten thousand in Rhode Island, and as many in Connecticut, and twenty-six thousand in the district of Maine, living their Canadian life, with church, and priest, and nun, reproducing that hated province on that New England soil which they sought to separate by a wall of fire from all dissent? Catholics of other lands there would be in their eyes bad enough; the despised Irish Catholics bad, very bad; Catholics of New England lineage, and many there be, horrible enough; but nothing, we think, would have curdled the blood of those New England worthies of the early part of last century more than the mere suggestion of the possibility that the day would come when one hundred and fifty thousand Canadian Catholics would quietly seat themselves on the sacred soil of New England!—P. 604.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1879. (London.)—1. J. T. Beck of Tübingen; by R. W. Barbour. 2. Michael Bruce *versus* John Logan; by the Rev. R. Small. 3. The Rule of Righteousness. 4. The Day of Our Lord's Last Supper; by the Rev. George Brown. 5. The Canadian North-west and the Gospel; by George Patterson, D.D. 6. The Historical Personality of Christ in the Four Gospels; by A. N. Macnicoll. 7. Muhammadan Exegesis of the Qurán and Traditions; by the Rev. Edward Sell. 8. The Controversy Between John Welsh and Gilbert Brown in 1598; or "Where was the Protestant Religion before Luther?" by the Rev. W. Irwin. 9. Review of Recent Literature on the Criticism and Interpretation of the New Testament; by the Rev. Professor Salmond.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (London.)—1. Adolphe Monod: A Biographical Sketch. 2. Irenæus; His Testimony to Early Conceptions of Christianity. 3. Dr. Johnson. 4. The Vatican and Civilization. 5. What is Religion? 6. Political Prospects of Italy. 7. University Education in Ireland.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1879. (New York.)—1. Germany since the Peace of Frankfort. 2. Mozart. 3. The Philosophy of Color. 4. Spedding's Life of Bacon. 5. The Civil Engineers of Britain. 6. The Family of Mirabeau. 7. Froude's *Cæsar*. 8. The Code of Criminal Law. 9. Impressions of Theophrastus Such. 10. Afghanistan.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (London.)—1. Prophecies Concerning Israel after the Captivity. 2. The English Church in the Eighteenth Century. 3. Ladies' Work among the Poor. 4. The Ancient British Church. 5. Dr. Eadie. 6. Colenso's Last Volume and Supernatural Religion. 7. The Evangelical Alliance at Basle.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1879. (New York.)—1. Pascal and his Editors. 2. The College of Physicians. 3. Albert Dürer. 4. The Founder of Norwich Cathedral. 5. Joseph de Maistre on Russia. 6. Froude's *Cæsar*. 7. The Weather and its Predictions. 8. Henry IV. of France. 9. The Submission of the Clergy. 10. Principles at Stake.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1879. (New York.)—1. The Federation of the English Empire. 2. The Law of Real Property. 3. The Indian Mutiny. 4. Cavour and Lamarmora. 5. The Bohemians and Slovaks. 6. Prince Bismarck. 7. Lord Brougham. 8. India and our Colonial Empire.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) *Essays*: 1. CREMER, The Roots of Anselm's Theory of Satisfaction. 2. KAWERAU, The Outbreak of the Antinomian Controversy. 3. NÖSGEN, The Origin of the Third Gospel. *Thoughts and Remarks*: WIESELER, The Death Year of Polycarp. *Reviews*: BAUDISSIN, The Idea of Holiness in the Old Testament, reviewed by RIEHM.

An article on "the Third Gospel" gives in ninety pages a very full review of the recent German literature on the subject. Its author, C. F. Nösgen, had published in two former volumes of the *Studien und Kritiken* elaborate articles on the historical causes leading to the composition of the third Gospel, which have attracted great attention. The author argues at length that the writer of the third Gospel did not use a common source with the authors of the first and second Gospels, that his work was not a mere translation, but that it was probably based upon notes which the writer himself had made of the great events of the gospel history. He regards it as certain that this Gospel was composed prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, and rejects as entirely groundless the opinions of those who, like Köslin and Holzmann, place the time of composition about the year 80 A. D., or, like Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, and Scholten, toward the close of the first century, or even, like Keim, into the time of Hadrian, shortly before the second destruction of Jerusalem. Proofs are adduced that the third Gospel was generally known to the Churches of the East and the West at the time of Irenæus and Tertullian, and that before this time it was known to Papias and to many of the early heretics and pseudo-epigraphs. If this Gospel had been composed after the end of the first century, it might be expected that the Gnostics, who had already begun at that time to develop a great strength, would have been in some way or other referred to. The argument against the authenticity of the Gospel which Keim derives from a pretended acquaintance of the author of the third Gospel with Josephus is refuted as inconclusive. Nösgen refers to an essay published by him in a former number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, (1879, p. 521,) in which the relations between Luke and Josephus have been fully discussed by him. The similarity of certain expressions found both in Josephus and Luke is no greater than might be expected between any two writers who belonged to the same period of literature, and both whom



wrote Greek as foreigners. In regard to the author of the third Gospel Nösgen believes that the uniform belief of the ancient Church which called Luke its author is unimpeachable. For though the statements found in the Muratorian fragment, in Irenæus, in Origen, and Eusebins concerning Luke and his Gospel are regarded by him more as surmises than ecclesiastical tradition, he lays great stress on the entire unanimity of these early statements in regard to the authorship of Luke, and he considers the weight of the argument all the greater as the name of Luke is by no means prominent in the other books of the New Testament, and as the high place he now holds in the estimation of the Christian Church rests entirely on the assumption of his being the author of two books of the Sacred Canon. The author refrains from discussing the question where the Gospel of Luke was composed. He believes that there is no passage in either the third Gospel or the Acts from which any inference could be derived. The arguments which have been adduced for several towns are based upon opinions which have no scientific value. The purity of the Greek found in the third Gospel is a testimony for the writer, but allows no inference as to the place where the book was written.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. Edited by Hilgenfeld. First Number. 1880. 1. A. HILGENFELD, The Gospel of John and the Defense of its Authenticity, by F. Godet and C. E. Luthardt. 2. FR. GÖRRES, The Pretended Persecution of Christians at the Time of the Emperors Numerianus and Carinus. 3. H. HOLTZMANN, Papias and Johannes. 4. SPATH, The Jonathan of the New Testament. 5. R. HILGENFELD, P. Salpicius, P. F. Quirinius. *Reviews:* 1. HARNACK, The Muratorian Fragment, (1879.) 2. NÖSGEN, On Luke and Josephus, (1879.) 3. ANNULUS RUFINI, edited by Tobler.

We have referred, in our account of the new number of the *Studien und Kritiken*, to the controversy which German theologians keep up on the relations between Luke and Josephus. Several theologians of the liberal school are very positive in maintaining that Luke, both by the use of some Greek phrases peculiar to Josephus, and still more by a reference to facts which he must have taken from Josephus, shows a dependence on that writer, and that, therefore, the Gospel bearing his name must have been composed later than the works of Josephus. Among the theologians who defend this view is H. Holtzmann, Professor of Theology at the University of Strasburg, and a regular and frequent contributor to the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*. He has explained his reasons at full length in

the volume of the *Zeitschrift* for 1877, (p. 535.) In reply to him C. F. Nösgen, the author of the above article in the *Studien und Kritiken* on Luke, wrote in the volume of the *Studien* for 1879, denying that any phrase or fact can be found in the third Gospel which can be traced with certainty to the works of Josephus. In the present number of the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie* Holtzmann replies to Nösgen. The controversy is somewhat seasoned by the flavor of personalities, each writer assuring us that he cannot discover any thing of real worth in the dissertation of his opponent. Holtzmann declares himself to have derived great pleasure from the fact that his views regarding the partial dependency of Luke upon Josephus are indorsed by some able scholars, of whom he mentions E. Rénan; the author of "Supernatural Religion," in the "Fortnightly Review," October, 1877; and W. Brückner.

In a postscript to the present number of the *Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie*, Professor Hilgenfeld indorses the opinion expressed by Th. Zahn in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, that the Greek original of the work of Irenæus against the heretics, and the *απομνήματα* of Hegesippus in five books, were still extant in the sixteenth century, and may yet be found. He adds that he has recently found, in an edition of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, by Turrianus, (De Torres,) published at Venice, in 1563, another proof that not only the work of Hegesippus, but also the *Syntagmas* of Ignatius and Hippolytus were extant at that time.

French Reviews.

- REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review.) August, 1879. 1. LEOPOLD MONOD, French Protestantism and Evangelical Missions. 2. HECTOR BERLIOZ. September, 1879.—1. G. MEYER, The Evangelization of France. 2. PRESSENSÉ, The Last Manifestations of the Naturalistic School in Literature. 3. DE RICHAUMOND, La Rochelle Beyond the Sea. John Jay. 4. ROHR, Discourses Addressed to the Students of Theology at Strasburg by Professor E. Reuss. 5. DECAPPEL, The Invasion of the Locusts, Joel i and ii. October, 1879.—1. STAFFER, Review of the third volume of Havet's *Le Christianisme et Ses Origines*. Tom. iii, Judaism. 2. E. W., The Life of Charles Kingsley. 3. F. ALONE, Too Probable Not to Be True. A Novel. November, 1879.—1. PRESSENSÉ, Address on the Influence of the Christian Press made at the Eighth Ecumenical Conference of the Evangelical Alliance. 2. E. W., The Life of Charles Kingsley. 3. F. ALONE, Too Probable Not to Be True.

In France, as in the other Latin countries of Europe and America, Protestantism has been crushed by the iron hand of bigots

and tyrants, but it has secured a permanent place in the history of Protestantism. What Protestant France has done for the foreign mission cause is the subject of the very interesting article by Leopold Monod in the August number. The article was originally prepared for the *Allgemeine Missions Zeitschrift*, a German monthly, devoted to the cause of foreign Protestant missions, which in this field has hardly any superior; but as the subject is of special interest to French Protestants, it is published in the *Revue Chretienne* also. Of course, while suffering from terrible persecutions at home, and struggling for a mere existence, the Protestant Churches could not be expected to do much for the extension of Protestantism in foreign countries. How efficient the persecution was to which the Protestants were subjected may be seen from the fact that at the last enumeration of the Reformed Churches made at the national Synod of Alençon, in 1637, there still were in existence eight hundred and six Churches, with six hundred and forty-one pastors. In 1806 the number of Churches had dwindled down to one hundred and seventy-one, and of these fifty were vacant. The first French Republic ended the long persecution of Protestants, and secured to it for the future religious toleration. The first French Protestant Bible Society was founded in 1818; in the same year the first Protestant paper, the *Archives du Christianisme*, was established. In 1821 Pastor Janssen, of Geneva, published in the French language a missionary work entitled, "Description of the Present Condition of Protestant Missions in Infidel Countries," as far as it was known in the beginning of the year 1820. It produced a great effect, and in many towns appeals were made by the pastors for missionary contributions. The first contributions were sent to Basle, but in December, 1822, a Missionary Society was established at Paris. The director of the missionary institute at Basle, M. Blumhardt, urged the society to establish its own mission, and the society resolved to follow this advice. The first missionary employed was Jonas King, an American minister, who offered to work under the auspices of the society among the Mohammedans and Jews of Palestine. In 1823 this committee announced that it had secured a mission-house, which had received two pupils from Basle. From that time a rapid progress was achieved. The receipts in 1823 amounted to thirteen thousand

and sixty-one francs, in 1846 to one hundred and four thousand francs, in 1878 to two hundred and eleven thousand francs. Soon after 1846 came a great crisis, and the mission-house had to be closed for several years; but, thanks to the liberal aid furnished by the Protestants of other countries, it was reopened in 1856. It had in 1879 four students, and two others were educated in the preparatory school of Batignolles. As a condition for admission to the mission-house the academic degree of *bachelier ès lettres* is required. Auxiliary societies have been formed among women and children, but it is complained that the organization of the branch societies is not as efficient as it ought to be. The liberality of the missionary contributions considerably varies in different parts of France. The total Protestant population was given by the census of 1872 as 580,757, in a total population of 36,102,921.* At the census of 1872, which gave an entire population of 36,905,788, no inquiry was made into the religious divisions of the population. The figure given by the census of 1872 for the Protestant population is generally considered by Protestant writers as too low, and Monod, in accordance with an article on the religious statistics of France in Lichtenberger's "Encyclopædie," estimates it from 600,000 to 650,000. Dividing the Protestants of France into eight territorial groups, it has been found that the highest average contribution for foreign missions from any of these groups was ninety-two centimes for every Protestant inhabitant, the lowest ten centimes, and the average for all France twenty centimes. The number of missionaries sent out was forty-nine, of whom thirty-seven were Frenchmen. France has only one Protestant missionary journal, the *Journal des Missions*, which is sent to 1,820 persons, and has 714 paying subscribers.

Many of the Huguenots who were driven from France by

* The figure given in the census of 1872 (580,757) means the entire Protestant population, including children. Some works erroneously give it as the number of communicants, and estimate the entire Protestant population at about 1,500,000. That this is a mistake appears at once from the denominational division of the population of France given in the census, which is as follows: Catholics, 35,587,703; Protestants, 580,757; Israelites, 49,439; other non-Christian denominations, 3,971; without religion, or religion unknown, 81,951; total, 36,102,921. It will also be noticed that the author of the above article claims no higher figure than 650,000 for the entire Protestant population.

fierce persecution have risen to great distinction in other countries, especially in Prussia and the United States. The article "La Rochelle Beyond the Sea," treats especially of the fate of the Protestant exiles who are descendants of the citizens of the great stronghold of French Protestantism, La Rochelle, and gives in particular a biographical sketch of John Jay, who played a prominent part in politics in the early period of the United States, and finally was appointed Chief Justice of the United States.

In a brief article of the same number of the "Christian Review" Pressensé calls attention to the literary productions of the new chief of an ultra-materialistic school, M. Zola. "It is a disgrace of our generation," he says, "that the utterances of the materialistic school attain a fabulous number of editions." I believe that the last but one novel of M. Zola, *l'Assommoir*, has exceeded its seventieth edition. Evidently it must have the entire world for its market. The materialistic school claims to paint nature, or, more correctly, real life all naked, all crude, without any attenuation. It purports to represent the hideous sides without excluding anything, and in a brutal language which is, as it were, a photograph of its ugliness, the cast of its monstrous excrescences. The series which has made M. Zola famous is called *Rougon-Macquart*. He makes a cynical application to humanity of the law of natural selection and heredity. He follows through all their situations the descendants of one family, and shows them carrying along a first hereditary germ which gradually develops and is modified in a terrible struggle for life which gives no room to any pure, generous sentiment, to any remonstrance of conscience. The author paints to us, with an extraordinary relief, contemporaneous life, in the country as well as in the large cities, from the court of the Emperor Napoleon III. to the tavern where the workman becomes brutalized, under the purely materialistic influence of a gross existence. It is impossible for any one who has not read *l'Assommoir* to imagine a more odious abuse of a great talent. The language, purposely vulgar, surpasses all expectations. And such works are devoured by thousands of our contemporaries! M. Zola, however, has received a striking proof of the failure of his system in an artistic point of view. He must have seen that his realism will not bear being presented to a

large assembly of men, and that it can only be relished in the solitude when one is alone to blush. When he has tried to bring *L'Assommoir* upon the stage, he has seen himself forced to come back to a quite ordinary drama, where vice is punished and virtue rewarded."

ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF GERMANY.

THE most important event in the history of the German Churches during the past year is undoubtedly the meeting of the First General Synod of the Prussian State Church. The German Churches have been for several years in a state of transition. From the Reformation until the present time they have been, on the whole, governed by the sovereigns and heads of the State, and self-government has been almost unknown. For some time there has been a steadily growing demand in all the States of Germany for the introduction of a synodal constitution, which would secure to the Churches, though not an entirely independent position, at least the right of representation, and of the co-operation of her chosen representatives with the State authorities in the administration of Church affairs. In nearly all the smaller States the synods have been in operation for several years. The greatest obstacles had to be overcome in Prussia. An extraordinary General Synod of the Churches of the old provinces (those belonging to the monarchy before the acquisition of Schleswig-Holstein) was held at Berlin in 1873, and was on all sides regarded as an event of marked importance. The plan of establishing a periodical General Synod, as a permanent institution of the Church, was generally concurred in, but the actual meeting of the first regular General Synod has been repeatedly postponed. It finally took place on October 9, 1879. It was composed of one hundred and ninety-four members, of whom one hundred and forty-nine had been elected by the provincial synods, thirty had been appointed by the King, nine were Superintendents General, and six representatives of the theological faculties of the universities. Like its predecessor, the preparatory General Synod of 1873, it represented only the Churches of the old provinces of the monarchy. The Churches in the new provinces, Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, and Hesse-Nassau, have not yet been fully incorporated with the organism of the State Church. The religious complexion was different from that of its predecessors, and may have been a surprise to many outside of Germany, who have some vague idea of an entire relapse of the German Churches into rationalism and infidelity. In 1873 the majority of the extraordinary synod belonged to the so-called *Vermittlungspartei*, or party of mediation, which prevailed at the Prussian universities, and, as its name indicates, tried to find a middle ground be-

tween the orthodoxy of the Churches of the sixteenth century and the rationalistic schools of the present age. At present this party is in a minority, and the two parties representing the theology of the sixteenth century are in a decisive majority. These two parties are: 1. that of the *Konfessionellen*, or the strict Lutherans, who stand up for the undiminished authority of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, and desire to keep unimpaired the Lutheran character of that portion of the United Evangelical Church which at the time of the establishment of this Church was regarded as Lutheran; 2. that of the "Friends of the Positive Union," who claim an authoritative character only for the "consensus," or the common doctrinal points of the Lutheran and German Reformed Churches, but would allow no further latitude for liberal or rationalistic tendencies. These two parties disagree on every thing that is peculiar to strict Lutheranism, but they generally act conjointly in opposition to all propositions proceeding from the other parties. Together the two parties numbered about one hundred and twenty votes, and they therefore formed a considerable majority of the General Synod. The middle party, which has assumed the name of *Evangelische Vereinigung*, (Evangelical Association,) had about forty-nine regular members and a number of sympathizers. The adherents of the Protestant Union who hold decidedly rationalistic views constitute the insignificant party of the Left, numbering no more than eight members. The members of the high nobility, which are very numerous, belong mostly to the strict Lutheran party; among them are Herr von Kleist-Retzow and Count Krassow, the political leaders of the party; Herr von Seydewitz, the President of the German Reichstag; the Superintendent General Dr. Büchsel; the Consistorial President, Dr. Hegel, a son of the celebrated philosopher. The Friends of the Positive Union constitute the most numerous party in the House, because most of the members appointed by the King belong to it. The royal family before the establishment of the United Evangelical Church did not belong to the Lutheran, but to the Reformed Church and the personal sympathies of the present King, like those of his father and brother, the late Kings Frederic William III. and Frederic William IV., are with the party of permanent union rather than with the Lutheran party, the tendency of which is toward weakening and ultimately toward repealing the union. As some preachers of the court have obtained considerable influence in this party, it has by its opponents been sometimes called the Court Preachers' Party. The most influential man of this party is the court preacher, Dr. Kögel. Among other well-known members are the Superintendents General Dr. Wiessman, Dr. Erdmann, and Dr. Möller; Professor Gess, well known by several theological writings; Dr. Wiase, the author of a number of educational works; Count Bismarck-Bohlen, and a number of high State functionaries. The party of the Evangelical Association counts the largest number of theological writers of note; among them are the Professors Beyschlag and Dr. Köstlin, of Halle; the jurist, Dr. Hölscher; and Dr. Schrader, a distinguished writer on educational affairs.

The General Synod elected as its President, by unanimous acclamation, Count Arnim-Boytzenburg, and the election appears to have given general satisfaction. His experience in parliamentary regulations, his extensive scholarship and familiar acquaintance with all the subjects discussed, and his thorough impartiality, are acknowledged on all sides. The Vice-President, Rübsem, who is a Superintendent in Pomerania, belongs to the Lutheran party. The present Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, Herr von Puttkammer, a brother-in-law of Premier Bismarck, strongly sympathizes with the orthodox majority of the General Synod, while his predecessor, Dr. Falk, was supposed to share the views of the Left, which is now but so feebly represented. The Government and the majority of the General Synod are fully agreed in desiring the restoration of the doctrines of the Reformation; they differ in regard to the position which is to be given to the claims of a strict Lutheranism. The resolutions adopted by the General Synod aim at the restoration of Protestant orthodoxy; the Lutheran question will come up for its solution at some future time.

The labors of the General Synod have been very extensive. The Supreme Ecclesiastical Council has prepared nineteen bills for discussion and adoption; besides disposing of these, the General Council passed a number of other important resolutions. Of special significance is the position which the Synod has taken with regard to the school question. The orthodox parties of the Prussian Church with great unanimity reject the principle of unsectarian schools, and favor the denominational character of the public schools. The General Synod has declared itself very emphatically in favor of a close connection between the State schools and those Churches which the State recognizes. Minister Puttkammer has publicly declared his concurrence in these views, and designated the question of denominational schools as one of those in which he entirely dissents from his predecessor, Dr. Falk. Government and Church will, therefore, make a united effort to arrest the progress which unsectarian schools have begun to make in Prussia, and re-establish the direct influence of the Church upon the school. A great excitement has been produced among the laity by the demand of the General Synod that the professors of the theological faculties teach in harmony with the faith of the symbolical books, and that the Church, through its representatives, co-operate with the State in examining the candidates for theological degrees. Of course this would mean for the near future the suppression of all but the orthodox tendencies at the theological faculties, and, in case the precedent of Prussia is followed by the smaller Prussian States, would give an entirely different complexion to German theology. The present theological faculties of the Prussian universities greatly dislike this proposition, and the University of Berlin has been induced by its theological faculty to enter a protest against it as inconsistent with the freedom of academical teaching. Another resolution aims at the introduction of a common *Buss- und Bettag* (day of fasting and prayer) for all the Protestant Churches of Germany.

The next General Synod is to be convoked six years from hence. In the meanwhile a Standing Committee will represent the General Synod in all questions in which the Church or the General Synod has to cooperate with the State in questions of administration.

The meeting of this synod may be regarded as a turning-point in the history of the Protestant State Churches of Germany. The period in which these Churches were completely governed by the State is at an end; the new period of a synodal government has now been fully inaugurated in all the Protestant State Churches of Germany. If it is remembered that the Prussian State Church, with which a population of about twelve millions is connected, is, next to the Church of England, the largest Protestant State Church of the world, the importance of the Prussian Synod for the entire Protestant world cannot be doubted.

ART. X.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE. GERMANY.

AMONG the important theological works that are announced as being in preparation is a collection of the Greek writers who, in the early period of the history of the Christian Church, attacked Christianity. It will be published by C. J. Neumann, under the title *Scriptorum Græcorum qui Christianam Impugnauerunt Religionem quae Supersunt*. The importance of these works for a thorough understanding of the early history of the Christian Church cannot be doubted, for they alone can explain to us the reasons which induced educated pagans to reject Christianity. Unfortunately, complete copies of these works are no longer extant. It is not correct that, as is commonly believed, the Emperor Theodosius II., by his decree of Feb. 16, 448, ordered all anti-Christian books to be burned. His decree only referred to the writings of Porphyry, which accordingly were completely destroyed. But all the others became soon very scarce, as they ceased to be copied, and thus are now likewise lost. Fortunately some of the Christian replies to the pagan attacks are completely extant; as the books of Origen against Celsus, the work of Eusebius against Hierocles, the *ἀποκριτικός πρὸς Ἑλληνας* of Macarius of Magnesia, which has been recently discovered; finally, ten books of Cyril of Alexandria against Julian. These works embrace numerous fragments of the anti-Christian writers; other fragments are found elsewhere, as extracts from Porphyry in the *Præpan. Evangel.* of Eusebius, and in the commentary of Jerome to Daniel. All these fragments will be collected in Neumann's work. The first part will contain the true word of Celsus. A reconstruction of this work has recently been attempted by Keim in Germany, and by Aubé in France. But both have only given translations, not the Greek text. The publication of the latter requires a new critical edition of Origen's work against Celsus, which, therefore,

will be prepared conjointly with the attempted reconstruction of the work of Celsus. The second part contains the fragments of Porphyry and Hierocles. A reconstruction of Porphyry, like that of Celsus, is not possible, because none of the works written against him have come down to our days. The material extant suffices, however, to acquaint us with the plan of the work of Porphyry, and the method of his polemics. The extensive fragments of the philosopher found in Macarius will be given in this part of the work. It is certain that these fragments do not belong to Celsus. Mr. Neumann expects to prove that the philosopher is not, as was assumed by Müller, identical with Julian, and that he must have been either Porphyry or Hierocles. An introduction to this part will sketch the development of the neo-Platonic polemics from Porphyry to Julian, and its relation to Celsus. The third part of the work will embrace the books of Julian. The first of the three (not seven) books of the Emperor can be almost completely restored from the ten books of Cyril of Alexandria. Several new manuscripts of this latter work have been compared. For a restoration of the second and third books of Julian much less can be done, because of Cyril's work the books following after the tenth are lost. All the fragments, however, which are preserved, either in Greek or in a Syrian translation, have been carefully collected. The latter have been copied by Dr. Nestle, in Tübingen, from the British Museum, and will be supplied by him with a Latin translation. Some fragments of Julian are found in the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Photius. An introduction to this part will give a historical account of the work of Julian and the numerous replies to it, and will explain the attempt of restoring the book. As it is supposed that Julian's work will interest many others besides philologists, the edition of the Greek text will be followed by that of a German translation.

Another new work on and against the supremacy claimed by the Popes of Rome has been published by an Old Catholic theologian, Professor Friedrich, of Munich, (*Zur ältesten Geschichte des Primates in der Kirche*. Bonn : 1879.) Professor Friedrich, before the beginning of the Old Catholic movement, was regarded as one of the greatest Church historians of the Catholic Church, next to Döllinger. His Church history of Germany was well received both by Catholics and Protestants, and is still regarded as a standard work on the subject. Since then he has joined the Old Catholic Church, and published the best work extant on the history of the Vatican Council. A work from so prominent a historian on the history of the primacy of the Bishops of Rome will be sure to command the attention of the theological world. In the Roman Catholic Church it is now an article of belief that Peter received from Christ primatical powers over the entire Christian Church; that he was the first Bishop of Rome; and that his successors, the Bishops of Rome, inherited his primatical powers. Catholic historians, therefore, however learned, cannot be expected to investigate and discuss this subject impartially. Protestant historians have completely demolished all arguments that have been adduced to prove a supremacy of the early Roman

Bishops over the entire Church, and have even made it very doubtful whether Peter was ever in Rome. One Orthodox German theologian, Dr. Uhlhorn, has recently undertaken to prove that James, the brother of Jesus, occupied a primatical position in Jerusalem, which extended far beyond the Churches of Palestine. Professor Friedrich adopts this view, and this new work is written for the special purpose of proving its correctness. He starts from an interpretation of the seventh canon of the Council of Nice, and shows that this Council forms a turning-point in the history of the Papal supremacy, and that before 325 there is no trace of it. He quotes in support of his theory a statement of Eusebius, according to which Clemens of Alexandria, one of the oldest Church writers, calls James the Just the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and the successor of the Lord himself. A number of passages of the New Testament are quoted as proving that James did, and that Peter did not, hold a primatical position. The first change in the supremacy of the Church of Jerusalem he assumes to have taken place after the second destruction of Jerusalem, in 135, when both Jews and Jewish Christians were forbidden to settle on the former site of Jerusalem. Then the authority of other apostolic bishoprics, especially Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, gradually rose. The gradual predominance of Rome over the other sees was secured by a number of falsifications and forgeries which are set forth in the book at full length and with great learning. The schemes of the Roman Bishops were strongly aided by the general tendency toward a compact centralization which sprang up in the old Church. The two agencies combined created the Papal system. The work of Professor Friedrich is of a strictly historical character, and draws no inferences from the attempted establishment of historical facts as to the theory of Church government. This will be done in a larger work, which the author is now preparing, and of which the present work is a forerunner.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Studies in the New Testament. By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neuchâtel. Edited by the Hon. and Rev. W. H. LYTLETON, M.A. 12mo., pp. 398. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1877.

Professor Godet is one of the leaders of the Evangelical non-Calvinistic Protestants of France, and is author of Commentaries on the Gospels, which have been translated into English. His writings are marked by a certain freshness of thought and the lucidity of style in which the French excel, with something of that diffuseness which is their failing. He first, here, surveys the Gospels, and furnishes not a few fine suggestions. He then gives a dissertation on "The Four Principal Apostles;" and in regard to Paul's

predestinarianism makes the following decisive remarks: "There is no trace in Paul of a fatalistic predestination. Human free-will and responsibility are always presupposed and often asserted by him; and as to Rom. ix and x, we will undertake to prove that they contain precisely the strongest protest against that fatalistic predestination of which Israel audaciously made use as a reason for not receiving the gospel."—P. 267. As our own Commentary of Rom. ix is the only one that has taken this decided ground, we would rejoice to know how our French Professor handles the matter. He is copious and suggestive on the Apocalypse. In his exegesis we do not concur; but we are obliged to him for his refutation of the identification of Nero risen from the dead with any conception of the Apocalypse.

The argument for identifying Nero with the symbolic number 666 in xiii, 18, is based on what, if not a true identity, seems a very curious coincidence. That number it is said makes in Hebrew exactly the name *Nero Cæsar* as it is read in the Rabbinical writings. This name seems to have dawned upon the minds of four eminent scholars almost simultaneously, in 1836; namely, Fritzsche in Rostock, Hitzig in Zurich, Benary in Berlin, and Reuss in Strasburg. With a certain class of thinkers it seems to carry all before it. An almost conclusive proof of this name being the true solution arose from a very peculiar coincidence. Irenæus tells us that there were in the then extant manuscripts two different readings of the numbers; the older and more accurate was 666, but a later 616. Now there were, also, two forms of the name Nero, both used in Hebrew; one, after the Greek, was *Nerōn*, the other, after the Latin, *Nero*; and the former of these make the 666, and the latter exactly 616! Should not that settle the question?

To this one might reply that Irenæus tells us that the 616 was found only in later manuscripts, and so they could not have come from John. And how could copyists have adjusted their codices to Nero's name and Irenæus never have heard of that name as a candidate? Indeed, Irenæus' omission of that name in discussing the candidates is a powerful argument against its claim.

But Godet denies that 666 is the true number of the Hebrew name *Nero Cæsar*. Its true number is really 676 according to the spelling in St. John's day. The number 666 is spelled with the three Hebrew consonants K S R; the needed E of the first syllable being supplied by a vowel-point; whereas the true orthography of the word *Cæsar*, as identified by contemporary record, has four letters, requiring the E to be not a vowel-point

but a full letter, thereby increasing the number by ten, making 676. This would entirely destroy the identification of the numbers with Nero. It is, indeed, given up by such rationalistic scholars as De Wette, Lücke, Bunsen, and Dürstendieck. We consider the Neronian solution of this name, like the Neronian date of the Apocalypse, a very plausible, yet entirely preposterous, fable.

There could be no very destructive inferences drawn from the partial identification of Nero with the beast, as symbol of the Roman Empire in its most persecuting phase, if the identification could be proved. Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou art the head of gold;" that is, Thou art the Empire of Babylon. And John could as truly have said to Nero, during Nero's reign, "Thou art the Roman Empire." Just so Louis XIV. could say, despotically, "I am the State." And so in Daniel, followed by the Apocalypse, *kings* stands for *kingdoms*. And as this identification of Nebuchadnezzar with Babylon did not at all affect the shape or nature of the great symbolism of empires in Daniel's image, so Nero's identification with Rome might leave the Apocalyptic interpretation untouched.

But the most untenable, as well as repulsive, part of the rationalistic exegesis is the making John base important Apocalyptic conceptions upon a contemptible whim of the Roman rabble. Nero was driven from the throne and had committed suicide; but the baser rabble, with whom the bloody despot was popular, cherished the hope that he had escaped, was truly alive, and would yet return to the throne. On this John is imagined by these commentators to have founded the image that one head of the beast received "a deadly wound;" that the wound was "healed," that he shall "ascend out of the bottomless pit and go into perdition." That is, the resurrection of the beast is to be identified with Nero's escape and return. But in point of fact the idea of a resurrection from the dead by Nero formed no part of the popular notion even of the Roman rabble at the time of the writing of the Apocalypse. All that the historians of the day or the contemporaneous literature say is that the fancy was current that Nero had escaped, would return, and would take a terrible revenge on Rome. It was not until a later generation, especially of Christians, remembering Nero as *the* typical bloody persecutor, identified him with the Antichrist, and found him in the Apocalypse. Augustine first mentions the idea of his resurrection, and later still Primasius is the first commentator that

connects the idea of a resurrect Nero with the sacred texts. And that furnished a notable mare's nest for modern rationalism.

Gebhardt, admitting this discordance between John's conception of the beast's resurrection and the Neronian rumor of a mere *return*, nevertheless maintains that John modifies the rumor to his own purposes. The modification, we reply, is much the largest part of the modified subject. And if the nucleus was a miserable falsity, the modification enlarges it to an enormity. We cheerfully admit that John does often take a nucleus of fact and modify it to his own needs. We may admit that chap. xii abounds in such modifications. But we call attention to the most decisive fact, that *every nucleus John appropriates for such modification in his Apocalypse is drawn from the sacred records*. Hengstenberg has well shown, in discussing another point, that John never goes to classic or profane literature for any of his conceptions. He forcibly denies on that ground that the "palms" of chap. vi are borrowed from pagan customs. All John's imageries arise from within the sacred domain. Perfectly unendurable, then, is the thought that John goes to the slums of Rome and picks out from the very dregs of heathendom a base *canard*, overlays it with a wretched, lying superstition of his own, and brings it into the sublimest of all prophecies. We pity the moral taste of the man who, on a full survey of the case, does not repel such a notion with disgust.

But there are some points of peculiar significance both in the figures 666 and the combination of the Greek letters that form the number as they present themselves to the eye.

First, as to the significance of the 666: as seven is the perfect number, so 777 would be the trinal symbol of divine perfection, the Trinity. Three *half-sevens* would be the reverse of perfection; the directly bad. Three *sixes* are an attempt to attain or display the divine perfection, but are a failure, a falling short; and that perhaps by a divinely-imposed limitation. And thus in this 666 is numerically figured the antichrist.

And as to the combination of Greek letters that form the number 666, they are in John's Greek text $\chi\xi\xi$, that is, chi, xi, st. But striking out the middle letter, the remaining two, $\chi-\xi$, are the customary abbreviation in the manuscripts of the name *Christ*. Now let the serpentine ξ crawl in between these two letters, and what have we in $\chi\xi\xi$? A central serpent wearing the externals of Christ, a serpent-Christ, an antichrist! Nor, says Godet, must this be promptly dismissed as a puerility. The Orientals were

thus accustomed to express conceptions in figured forms to the eye, as even in our modern West we have our coat of arms, and in our America our stars and stripes. An ingenious, reflective Oriental people, before books were ever printed, were inclined to shape a momentous thought into an impressive mnemonic form. Thereby we get coin stamps, monograms, signet-rings, abraxases, symbols pregnant with impressive import. There is certainly presented here a curious combination of agreements. They are a numerical name, *Lateinos*, that points to Rome; a trine number 666 that suggests the pseudo-divine; and a monogrammic triplet of letters $\chi\xi\xi$ that imports a Satanic Christ. It has taken centuries of thought to unriddle this combination, indicating that $\nu\omicron\upsilon\zeta$ has been exerted here in large amount. The reader can decide for himself whether the combination was really planned by the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\zeta$ of John.

The Atonement in Christ. By JOHN MILEY, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. 12mo., pp. 351. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

It is the opinion of Dr. Miley that Arminianism has furnished much less discussion of the atonement than Calvinism. We think it is true that Arminianism has furnished, in proportion to its magnitude in the Christian Church, much less theological discussion generally than Calvinism. The contradictions of Calvinism, contradictions between its different dogmas and contradictions between its dogmas and "the universal common sense of mankind," have kept the Calvinistic mind ever restless and on the stretch for reconciliation. The whole system is like the Irishman's cane, "so crooked that it cannot lie still." Meanwhile we Methodists have held firmly and deeply to the atonement; have sung it in our most favorite hymns, have prayed it in our most fervent intercessions, have firmly preached its reality, and boldly claimed its universality and all-embracing mercy, without a great amount of critical analysis of its precise terms. There was room, therefore, for Dr. Miley's monograph, and that room he has well filled. His work is the result of an extended and searching analysis, crystallized into a very clear and symmetrical synthesis. The language is lucid; its brief and pointed sentences seldom or never obscure, generally even and level, yet now and then rising into a glow, and sometimes becoming eloquent. Our young ministry especially will, we think, find in its transparent pages a great aid in clearing their views and symmetrizing their conception of the whole subject. We recommend Dr. Miley's manual

as a clear and conclusive exhibit of the Wesleyan-Arminian view of the atonement.

Upon the old oppressive doctrine of "Satisfaction," according to which the atonement covered the elect alone with a completed and perfect righteousness, by which they were justified and truly sanctified and saved, Dr. Miley is full and very conclusive. The doctrine usually embraces the absolute absurdity that by intrinsic justice one man can be righteously punished for another man's sin. If there be such a thing as a moral axiom, it is that guilt and penalty are untransferable. The clumsy evasion introduced by some thinkers, that the word *guilt* has two meanings, is here untrue. For what we are talking about is absolute justice and literal guilt, as seen by the intuitive faculty. Such *guilt* is one and sole; and it inheres solely in the personality of the agent in the guilty fact. To foist in here a secondary meaning of the word *guilt* is simply to introduce a gratuitous muddle into a discussion where clearness is an all-important desideratum. That second sort of *guilt* has no real existence.

And when the universal character of *guilt* is fully seen, and due perception is secured that Christ endured not literal *punishment*, but only took upon himself *suffering* for others, the atonement is brought into clear analogy with the course of things in the Providential system. When men are told that Christ was *guilty* of and *punished* for another's sins, the intuitive feeling is that it is absurd, impossible, out of the nature of things; but when they are told that he assumed *suffering* that another man might be relieved from the consequences of his guilty doings, it becomes one of an immensely large class of facts. Indeed, without the possibility of *suffering for others* the profoundest exhibitions of benevolence would be impossible in the world. Our skeptical friends are proud of Socrates. His death as a classic martyr is a thousand times rehearsed. But, with all his goodness and wisdom, to how much less he would amount were it not for his dose of hemlock. He died for others. Without that possibility he would sink nine tenths in the scale. Leonidas died to save his country, and oratory and song have for ages grown rapturous over the deed. But surely the highest ideal would have been wanting had it not been possible for One higher than all to have *died*; *died* not for the good, but for the criminal and condemned; died for those who inflicted his death; died not for somebody else, but *for us!* That is, indeed, *for us*, theme for eloquence and anthem.

A Compendious and Complete Hebrew Lexicon to the Old Testament, with an English-Hebrew Index. By BENJAMIN DAVIES, Ph.D., LL.D. Carefully revised. With a Concise Statement of the Principles of Hebrew Grammar, by EDWARD C. MITCHELL, D.D. 8vo., pp. 752. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1879.

This Lexicon is founded upon those of Gesenius and Fürst, but is essentially a new work. Though the product of authoritative scholarship, it is adjusted to the wants of beginners. It claims to be at once "compendious and complete," having "over a thousand more Hebrew words or forms than appear in Tregelles' or Robinson's Gesenius, besides incorporating into the body of the work all the grammatical forms contained in Robinson's Analytical Appendix." The "Concise Statement of Principles of Hebrew Grammar" is placed in the beginning, under the persuasion that the better way for the beginner is to forego all intermediate "lesson books," and take to Bible and Lexicon at once, grammar coming in as a felt want to be directly applied. The "English-Hebrew Lexicon" is brought in at the end, embracing about forty-five pages, and contains the English word with a numeral reference to the page and place where the correspondent Hebrew word stands. It thus forms an aid for Hebrew composition. Both pupil and master will, doubtless, find the work a valuable part of the "apparatus."

History, Biography, and Topography.

The North Americans of Antiquity: Their Origin, Migrations, and Type of Civilization Considered. By JOHN T. SHORT. 8vo., pp. 544. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

Though possessing little interest, either as history or romance, the antiquities of our more Northern America have awakened much enthusiasm of late as matter of science. Even as science their investigation scarcely crosses the path of the biblical scholar or theologian, and scarce passes out of the limits of archaeology and anthropology. Yet every liberal inquirer must feel an interest in the question, Who and what were our ancestors on this continent? and must feel obliged for this thorough and convenient summary of the whole subject by Mr. Short.

Our Red Indian, whosoever fault it is, persists in being a very uninteresting specimen. His predecessors, the Mound Builders, were better, but not very much. The Cliff Dwellers of the South-west had a slight touch of romance and a very faint hue of poetry to them. As to the question, How came they here?

there can be little doubt that the true answer is, By the way of Behring's Straits. Mr. Short critically examines all the theories, especially the indigenous theory, and leaves this a well-settled question. As to the question of the time of their occupancy of American soil, beyond a few centuries it is all a matter of sheer guess. The trees growing on the mounds are some six hundred years old. Let us then give the Red Indian six hundred years and the Mound Builder six hundred more, and fling in six or seven hundred more *ex gratia*, and we arrive at the Christian era. Fling in a thousand or two years more, and we arrive at the time of Abraham. Sir John Lubbock limits his demand to three thousand years for the whole, and that is quite as much as any known data justify. American chronology, has, therefore, no significance for the biblicist.

Our paleontological friends have had hard grubbing in American soil. From the Floridian jawbone down to Dr. Abbott's drift flints in New Jersey, the geological man turns up a phantasm. They just get finger on his tail, and lo! *non est*. And even had they caught him, how would they show any historical connection between him and any living race? Scientists should not *guess*. Boasting of their grounds of *certainty*, they must give us demonstration, not conjecture nor prophecy. Dr. Dawson, in his "Archaia," twenty years ago stated the probability that *anthropoids* might be exhumed from the depths of our American soil; but anthropoids are not, of course, men. The fox-sized predecessor of our horse was not a horse. Far less are anthropoid apes real men. Man is not only body and life and intellect; he is also *spirit*. *The power to chip a flint does not prove a man*. But, as an eloquent negro bishop once said, "Whoever can lift his hands to heaven and say 'Our Father' is a man." The Adamic man was not only developed from the "dust" below, but endued with the divine "breath" from above, and no development from below, no genetic descent, could have made him an immortal *man* without the endowment from above. The anthropoids described by General Thomas as exhumed near the line of the North Pacific Railroad, with their receding frontals and long dog-like, or bird-like, aquiline snouts, may have been predecessors of man, genetic or typical, without being man. There may be missing logical links, as well as missing generative links, in the process of proving pre-Adamic man.

Our southward advance into the isthmus brings us to a region where archæology rises into something like a glimmer of history.

Chiapa, Guatemala, and Honduras were the home of the ancient Maya race, whose architecture, especially at the ancient capital, Palenque, inspires us with wonder. We are also told, with solemn face, that its antiquity is "very remote;" that its growth is plainly "indigenous," and that traces of "development" are very evident. But its proofs of antiquity are not very frightful. Several very splendid architectures have come into existence and "developed" to perfection in Europe since the Christian era. Christianity created several new forms and styles. There is the Byzantine, which took its rise in Constantinople and attained perfection in the Church of St. Sophia. The Gothic arose some seven hundred years ago, and came to perfection in less than three centuries. The Saracenic sprang from the Byzantine, and produced the Alhambra in Spain. What proof that Palenque is older than Solomon's temple, or Herod's temple reconstruction, or than Diocletian's palace, or than the Moorish Alhambra? Whatever evidences of pre-Adamic, or pre-Mosaic, or pre-Christian antiquity the Maya civilization may present, we do not find them in the architectural remains.

The traditional testimony of the Mayas affirms that they are not an indigenous race, but that they came, as more usually said, from beyond sea and from the East. Mr. Short amply shows how they may have immigrated from the other hemisphere either by an eastern or western route. Especially interesting is his treatment of the Atlantis tradition. Plato tells us that the Egyptian priests declared that there was once a great island on the western coast of Africa connecting with a great western continent, which was submerged in the sea. A similar tradition exists among the Mayas. These concurrent traditions (as *we* infer) are quite a demonstration, not only of the fact of the submersion, but that the fact took place, partially at least, within the reach of human recollection. Strange to say, the modern sea-depth explorations have confirmed the truth of the tradition. A high submarine plateau runs from the north coast of Africa to America. But, apart from this lost natural bridge, the concurrent trade-winds and equatorial currents are powerful enough to precipitate the mariners' barks from the eastern to the western hemisphere with great ease. In the year 1500 Cabral started from Portugal with a small fleet for the Cape of Good Hope; but, passing the Cape de Verd Islands, he bore westward to avoid being becalmed on the Guinea coast, and in a few weeks found himself on the coast of Brazil. The distance from Africa to Bra-

zil is but about fifteen hundred miles, a voyage none too great for Phœnician enterprise. The problem of immigration from the West is not much more insoluble. The numerous isles of the Pacific served as stages on the way; they were once more numerous than now, many having been submerged even during the human age. They were once populous, civilized, and near neighbors. The Pacific gulf streams even now wreck their sailors in considerable numbers annually upon our shores.

The civilization of Central America is unmistakably Hamitic. Shem was no colonizer by sea, and no architect. Japheth did not develop early on the Mediterranean or Atlantic. But Ham had three great descendants—Nimrod, or Assyria, (or Chaldea;) Mizraim, or Egypt; and Sidon, or Phœnicia; and each one of these has had share in setting an impress upon the American civilization. Ham was a sea-rover and a colonizer, and would easily cross to Chiapa; he was a builder, especially in pyramids, and could readily have founded Palenque and Cholula. He was, like the Mayas, a sun-worshiper, a Molochian offerer of human victims. He bore the deluge tradition and the *crux ansata* to America. His Egyptian orientation and terracing of the pyramids are there. Thither Phœnicia has sent her serpent and her cosmogonical egg. Assyria has sent thither her "sun symbol," her bearded tree-worshipers, and her outspread sun-wings. Yet it is not so much from Egypt that America has imported her pyramids, which in fact are hardly true pyramids. Her truncated structures came from Babel and Babylon; are partially derived from the Jupiter Bel or Baal temples. In fact, these architectures almost seem to have traveled from Shinar eastward, and to have come round to America across the Pacific. So great a master of comparative architecture as Ferguson affirms that Burmah borrowed her architecture from Babylon; that farther east than Burmah the ruined cities of Cambodia show *teocallis* (pyramidal sanctuaries) like those of Mexico and Yucatan. Ferguson (as quoted by McCausland) says, "As we advance eastward from the Valley of the Euphrates, at every step we meet with forms of art becoming more and more like those of Central America;" adding that but for the geographical difficulty no doubt would exist of the derivation of the American architecture from that origin—a difficulty amply solved by Mr. Short.

One record of the Mosaic deluge tradition Mr. Short finds so deeply imbedded in the native history that it cannot be rejected as an appropriation from the Christian missionaries without in-

validating all existing Central American history. He summarizes the tradition in these words: "In a preceding chapter we have given the deluge tradition from Ixtilxochitl, who states that the waters rose *fifteen cubits* (caxtolmolctli) above the highest mountains, and that a few escaped in a close chest, (toplipetlacali,) and after men had multiplied they erected a very high *zacuali*, or tower, in order to take refuge in it should the world be again destroyed. He further states that then their speech was confused, so that they could not understand each other, and that they dispersed to different parts of the earth." But the story of sending out three birds as weather explorers is, he thinks, so transparent an appropriation that he can hardly name it with "gravity." Change the names of the birds, and you have just Moses over again. And yet this very story is found, fully detailed, in the Assyrian account, as given by both Smith and Lenormant; and if here aboriginal, is, beyond all question, derived not from Moses but from Assyria. How can Mr. Short reasonably reject this striking passage as too servilely biblical, and yet accept the "fifteen cubits" as aboriginal? Though Lenormant half yields the bird tradition to the higher criticisms of Ramirez, we do not; for where one crucial passage of the flood-tradition is fully admitted there is a fair presumption in favor of other passages, which should check hypercriticism. The existence, also, of two records from distant quarters of the same passage, establishes a favorable presumption for the third. There is a valid probability that Assyria, Palestine, and America possess three copies of the same bird-tradition. And this is all confirmed by the fact that the courier birds of the flood so impress the human mind that they are constantly reappearing in the various traditions. Lenormant finds them in the Iranian tradition in Asia; the dove and olive branch are seen on the Arkite symbols at Apamea, Phrygia; and even among the Chippeway Indians Menabosha (which Lenormant suspects to be the Aryan Manu Vaivasvata) sends a bird out of his bark to know if land be dry, and thus restores our race.

Mr. Short quotes a document to disprove the common statement that the pyramid of Cholula is connected with the Tower of Babel. Our own conclusion is that his document, if admitted as good authority, confirms that connection. The document is simply a verbal narrative uttered by an old inhabitant of Cholula, and recorded by Father Duran, A. D. 1585. The story is, that creation being not quite completed, and the land being "all a plain without hill or elevation, *encircled in every part by water,*

without tree or created thing," certain giants, fascinated with the glory of the new-made sun, endeavored to find his secret place of setting and rising. Defeated in their attempt, (the narrator says,) "they determined to build a tower so high that its summit *should reach the sky*. Having collected material for the purpose, they found a *very adhesive clay and bitumen*, with which they speedily commenced to build the tower, and having reared it to the greatest possible altitude, so that they say it reached to the sky, the Lord of the Heavens, enraged, said to the inhabitants of the sky, 'Have you observed how they of the earth have built a high and haughty tower to mount hither, being enamored of the light of the sun and his beauty? Come and confound them, because it is not right that they of the earth, living in the flesh, should *minge with us*.' Immediately, at that very instant, the inhabitants of the sky sallied forth like flashes of lightning; they destroyed the edifice, and divided and *scattered its builders to all parts of the earth*." If criticism admits this as a true aboriginal document, Cholula is a second edition of Babel. The remarkable specialty "clay and bitumen" is a crucial proof. We then have the "tower," the purpose of building to the sky, the bituminous material, the parley of Jehovah in heaven, the defeat of the tower, and the *dispersion* of the builders through the earth. All this in a series of biblical phrases. The flood is, indeed, in the background. From a deluge by rain it has become a quiet submergence in the incompleteness of the creation. We submit that Cholula is Babel Junior.

Lectures on Electricity in its Relations to Medicine and Surgery. By A. D. ROCKWELL, A.M., M.D., Electro-Therapeutist to the New York State Woman's Hospital, Member of the American Neurological Association, Fellow of the New York Academy of Medicine. 8vo., pp. 100. New York: Wm. Wood & Co.

This little volume, from the pen of this well-known and prolific writer on the subject of electricity in its various applications for the alleviation and cure of disease, although addressed to, and especially intended for, the medical profession, commends itself to the general public as a concise exposition of the advances which have been made in the medical use of this subtle and mysterious agent within the past few years. Soon after the method of exciting electricity by friction was discovered, attempts were made by educated physicians to apply this powerful agent to the cure of disease, but with so little success that these attempts were finally abandoned by regular practitioners of medicine.

Similar attempts followed the discovery of Galvanic and Faradic electricity, and with similar results.

It was found that these agents were powerful in their influence on the human system, but that their employment was quite as likely to injure as to benefit the patient. The scientific principles on which their successful use necessarily depends had not yet been studied out. Unscrupulous charlatans, however, found in electricity exactly what suited their methods of practice. By its use they made a profound impression, and now and then a marvelous cure. If they failed to benefit the great majority of their patients, and injured many more than they cured, they ignored their failures and boasted of their successes in such manner as to build up their own fortunes at the expense of their unfortunate patrons. This employment of electricity by charlatans served to bring its use in medicine still more into discredit than the failures of honest practitioners had before done.

Within the past few years, however, many well-educated physicians have been engaged in an honest, laborious, and thoroughly scientific investigation of the subject; and they have succeeded in studying out the principles in accordance with which electricity must be applied in order to make it uniformly of service as a remedial agent. Brilliant successes in practice have been the results of these studies. Duchenne and Remak in Europe, and Beard and Rockwell in this country, have been foremost in discovering and elucidating the principles in accordance with which electricity may be made a powerful remedial agent—Duchenne by his investigations regarding the localized use of Faradic electricity, Remak regarding the localized use of Galvanic electricity, and Beard and Rockwell by their studies and discoveries on the employment of general faradization, through which remarkable tonic effects are obtained, and of central galvanization, through which the brain and spinal cord are directly and beneficially influenced.

There can be no doubt, then, that electricity, as a remedial agent, is now as thoroughly understood as is any other remedy. Indeed, there would seem to be greater difference of opinion regarding the efficacy and proper use of drugs than in regard to the use of electricity as taught by the masters above mentioned. But it should be mentioned that even physicians make signal failures in the use of electricity as a remedy, until to a knowledge of anatomy and physiology and the general science of medicine, they add a special knowledge of the science of electricity, and much

study and experience in its medical use. Hence it is that although the Lectures of Dr. Rockwell are of great interest to the general reader, their perusal will in no wise justify him in undertaking or advising the employment of this powerful remedy without the direction and advice of a competent physician.

History of the Christian Church from its Origin to the Present Time. By WILLIAM BLACKBURN, D.D., Professor of Church History, Chicago. 8vo., pp. 719. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

This magnificent volume is a not unsuccessful attempt to present Church history, with a living spirit, in a continuous readable style, so as to be easily contemplated as a comprehensive whole. It is written from the evangelical stand-point; and as regards the line that divides the evangelical Church into two doctrinal sections, by the predestinarian dogma, it is written, so far as we can judge, in a spirit of entire fairness. It begins from the apostolic founding of the Church, and ends with the present hour. It gives a completer sketch of the American Churches than any we have seen, and thereby suggests a repetition of what we have formerly said, that it is quite time that some scholarly men or set of men should give, in one or more volumes, a complete view of American theology as a whole. Dr. Blackburn has constructed several charts, or rather what might be called *maps in theological geography*, which present a great deal of history in a single page in an impressive and suggestive manner.

When the Wesleyan Arminian writes a Church history from his own specific stand-point, he will refuse to brand the essential Arminians of the Western Church in the Middle Ages with the epithet "Semi-Pelagian." They were neither Semi-Pelagian nor Semi-Augustinian; but were the true continuation of the primitive orthodoxy of the first three centuries, from which Augustinianism and Pelagianism were opposite aberrations. It was the earliest theology, and is bound to be the latest. Pressensé truly says that predestination was to the early Church a heresy, and Richard Watson well defines his Arminianism as being neither Augustinian, on one hand, nor Pelagian on the other. There never was an Augustinian Church until after the Reformation; and then came Calvinism, more Augustinian than Augustine, black fatalism itself.

The style of Dr. Blackburn is animated and often graphic, but wanting in graceful flow, abrupt, with occasional solecisms. Thus he says of Vincent of Lerins (misprinted Lerijs) "his little

'History of Heresies' does not contain his own name as that of a heretic, for *he thought himself sound*!" Of Faustus he says, "Pope Gelasius *put him and Cassian down* in the first Index of Prohibited Books." Page 697 says that Asbury "preached in private circles for a year, while Garrettson was flogged," etc. Our Bishops "itinerate, and are elected by the General Conference." We thought their election came before the itinerating. The following characterization of Dr. Olin is, we think, extravagant. "His successor, Dr. Stephen Olin, so attached to the Greek Testament, at home or in his tent by the Jordan, gave to Methodism a vigor which is manifest in ethical, scientific, theological, historical, biblical, and cyclopedic literature, thus holding fair rivalry with denominations which are credited with an earlier inheritance of scholarship." This is far from true of any one man among us, but nearer truth of Dr. Fisk than of Dr. Olin. Yet the sentence is good proof of the intentional fairness and liberality of the writer.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By LORD MACAULAY. 8vo., pp. 609. Vol. I. Set of five volumes. New York: Harper & Bros. 1879.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L., LL.D., Corresponding Member, etc. 8vo., pp. 579. Vol. I. Set of three volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

These two stately sets upon our table from the Harper press are, of course, a necessary requisite for the completion of every historic library. Full tributes to each of these historians have lately been paid in our pages in articles from able pens. The histories are both written in the same modern spirit; detailing narratives of events impregnate with the modern spirit of enlightenment and advance. The Dutch history presents the development of a Republic in striking analogy with our own, but really advancing to a stage equivalent to our Confederacy before the formation of our national Constitution. This was owing to the death of that great hero, whose living character so remarkably resembled our Washington, and whose martyrdom by the hand of an assassin suggests our Lincoln. But while the Dutch history presents an analogy to our own, the English is truly and literally our own. For we are English, and not Dutch, and English history is the earlier part of our own history; and while in Motley we are among crude but genuine Republicans, yet they are comparatively strangers, with foreign faces and odd, pedantic Dutch-Latin names; whereas, in Macaulay, we are among old acquaintances, historically pioneering our own historic course, with our own

faces in more beefy condition, talking our own language, and bearing our own or cognate names. We take our place on that wide area which an Englishman has called "the greater Britain," on whose wide and widening territory the language of Chatham and Daniel Webster is spoken. What a grandeur it is that a Macaulay and a Motley are able to address with proud acceptance so world-wide an audience!

Life of Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D.D., for Thirty Years Pastor of Old Pine-street Church, Philadelphia. By M. BRAINERD. 12mo., pp. 455. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. Price, \$2.

It was about the year 1825 that Thomas Brainerd presented himself to be a scholar at Mr. Grosvenor's Academy at Rome, New York. With some rural traits in his appearance and style, he soon exhibited a manliness of port, a vigor of intellect, and a freedom of utterance easily rising into a flow of oratory, that commanded all respect. He was going to be a lawyer, a politician, a statesman, with an unlimited ambition. But in the good providence of God his path was intersected by Charles G. Finney. In a revival of most marvelous sweep, under the early ministrations of that wonderful evangelist, Brainerd was arrested, and a most unexpected turn was given to his life. It was not a change of ambition. It was an agonized surrender of his ambition to his sense of duty. He studied theology at Andover, and his clear ability soon brought him into association with such men as Lyman Beecher, Albert Barnes, and Charles G. Finney. The earlier part of his ministry was spent in Cincinnati, but during the many years of his maturer life he was one of the ecclesiastical "powers that be" of Philadelphia. His memoir, from the hand of his surviving widow, Mrs. Mary Brainerd, evinces how well he had chosen his partner in life. Eminent as was his career, it was not more eminent than was expected by his academic comrade.

Protestantism in Michigan: Being a Special History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Incidentally of Other Denominations. By ELLIAH H. PILCHER, D.D. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 461. Detroit: R. D. S. Tyler & Co.

Upon a history of Methodism and Protestantism generally in Michigan, Dr. Pilcher has been engaged, as time allowed, for twenty years, and has been enabled to bring his work to great fullness and apparent accuracy. It will be very acceptable to thousands, of the Peninsular State especially; and will form a very interesting and valuable part of the permanent religious history of both our Church and country. The narrative of the early

start of Methodism in old French Catholic Detroit is very interesting. A hard soil it was; very hard, indeed, as is attested by the utter failure, in the first attempts, by such men as Nathan Bangs and William Case. The numerous personal sketches give piquancy and point to the narrative. At every advance we are cheered with advancing victory. The engravings recall to our memory the face of many a departed, or still living, friend. Eminent in the history, justly and truly, as early pioneer and faithful, loyal, and stalwart pillar, is the author, Dr. Pilcher himself.

The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism. By DR. GERARD ULLHORN, Abbot of Loccum, and Member of the Supreme Consistory in Hanover. Edited and Translated with the author's sanction from the Third German Edition by EGBERT C. SMITH and C. J. H. ROSES. 12mo., pp. 508. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.

A more precise title for this volume would be: A History of the Overthrow of Paganism in the Roman Empire by Christianity. It begins with the reign of Augustus, and extends to the total defeat of the last effort of paganism with the death of Julian. It consequently unfolds the greatest revolution in the history of mankind. And ecclesiastical history, if such purely it can be called, has seldom been clothed in so living a style. We have not the statistical dryness of Mosheim, nor the perpetual sarcasm of Gibbon, nor the dreamy diffuseness of Neander; but great events, characters, and principles portrayed with a fresh and vigorous power. It is written with a thoroughness of scholarship to satisfy the scholar, yet with a zest of spirit and a freedom of style that suit it for the popular reader.

The History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Revolution in 1688. By DAVID HUME, Esq. A New Edition, with the Author's Last Corrections and Improvements, to which is prefixed a Short Account of His Life, Written by Himself. In six volumes. (In a box.) 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 644. Vol. II, pp. 652. Vol. III, pp. 613. Vol. IV, pp. 587. Vol. V, pp. 569. Vol. VI, with Index, pp. 527. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

Hume's history is old, but not quite obsolete. Criticism has invalidated many of its statements, and present public thought largely rejects his general views of England's history, in which he strangely contrived to unite the bigotry of a high Tory with the looseness of a freethinker. Charles Fox said that "Hume so loved a king and Gibbon so hated a priest, that neither could be trusted where a king or a priest was concerned." That Hume is, in spite of all drawbacks, demanded for re-publication, is proof of the great intellect of the man.

History of the Rise of the Huguenots of France. By HENRY M. BAIRD. 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 577. Vol. II, with Index, pp. 681. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.

Our readers are familiar with productions in our pages from Professor Baird's classic pen. The present work is, doubtless, a labor of love, portraying the tragic history of his spiritual and personal ancestry, the French Huguenots. The present volume traces their rise, and closes with an epic fitness with the memorable massacre of St. Bartholomew. The author has had access to a large amount of sources shedding new light on the history. A fuller review may be expected in our Quarterly.

History of the United Netherlands from the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce—1609. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L., LL.D. In four volumes. (In a box.) With Portraits. 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 532. Vol. II, pp. 563. Vol. III, pp. 599. Vol. IV, with Index, pp. 632. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland. With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years' War. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L., LL.D. In two volumes. With Illustrations. (In a box.) 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 389. Vol. II, with Index, pp. 475. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

These new and handsome editions of Motley, neatly boxed up and freshly issued, will be very acceptable to the reading public. Both have been amply reviewed in our Quarterly, and they only need announcement.

Educational.

A New Latin Dictionary. Founded on the Translation of Freund's Latin-German Lexicon, edited by E. A. ANDREWS, LL.D. Revised, enlarged, and in great part re-written, by CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D., and CHARLES SHORT, LL.D. 4to, pp. 2019. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.

The best German and American scholarship is embodied in this work. And the American contributions, by both the late Professor Andrews and Professors Lewis and Short, have brought it with an admirable completeness to the latest dates. For, strange as it may seem to some, "progress" is as rapid and real (though not as flaring) in Latin lexicography as in other departments of thought. The following paragraph will suggest to our readers something of the nature of this progress:

Great advances have been made in the sciences on which lexicography depends. Minute research in manuscript authorities has largely restored the texts of the classical writers, and even their orthography. Philology has traced the growth and history of thousands of words, and revealed meanings and shades of meaning which were long unknown. Syntax has been subjected to a profounder analysis. The history of ancient nations, the private life of their citizens, the thoughts and be-

liefs of their writers, have been closely scrutinized in the light of accumulating information. Thus the student of to-day may justly demand of his lexicon far more than the scholarship of thirty years ago could furnish. The present work is the result of a series of earnest efforts by the publishers to meet this demand.

We expect a full review of the work from the hand of an amply competent scholar.

◆ ◆ ◆

Literature and Fiction.

Literary Studies. By the late WALTER BAGEHOT. With a Prefatory Memoir. Edited by RICHARD HOLT HUTTON. Two volumes. London: Longmans & Green. 1879.

To most American readers Mr. Walter Bagehot, who died some two years since, was known only as a writer on politics and finance. His books on these subjects, "Lombard Street," "Physics and Politics," and "The English Constitution," were reprinted in this country, and the last named is used, we believe, as a text-book in several of our colleges. But these two volumes show that as a literary critic Mr. Bagehot had abilities of the very first order. A part of these essays were first collected into a volume some twenty years ago; and we are inclined to agree with Mr. Hutton, the editor of this edition, that "the literary taste of England never made a greater blunder than when it passed by that remarkable volume of essays with comparatively little notice." The essays are a series of studies upon the lives and work of some of the greatest English writers, including Shakspeare, Milton, Gibbon, Butler, Cowper, Shelley, Scott, Thackeray, and a half dozen others. What is first noticeable in them is their freshness of manner and wholly unconventional tone. Both in matter and in style they are delightfully original. It is a common observation that studious men, even though writers by profession, write dull books. They have knowledge and opinions, but they lack the art to communicate them. As has been wittily said, their hard reading is the cause of their writing what is hard to read. If one is to get the ear of the world, one must have the speech of the world; and this is not to be learned in the closet. In particular, the literary criticism of a professed critic is often tiresome reading; it is over subtle, and sometimes seems to be written in a kind of technical dialect. But Mr. Bagehot was a banker. And he wrote like a banker—which is as much as to say that, in most respects, he wrote exceeding well. The shrewd sense, the varied experience of men and things, the racy vigor and curtness of speech, the ready and pungent wit, the homely and striking illustration, these all mark the man of the street rather than of the study.

Not that these essays show any lack of wide reading, or of keen critical insight. On the contrary, the range of Mr. Bagehot's reading and the catholicity of his taste are surprising. He wrote almost equally well of Beranger's Songs and of Butler's Analogy; and the pithy criticism upon men of widely different ages which is scattered incidentally through these volumes—upon Homer, Plato, Voltaire, Dante, Goethe, and Dryden, for example—show that he had somehow found time to familiarize himself with what is best in all the great European literatures. But his reading did not warp his originality nor make him bookish. Upon the most well-worn themes—Shakspeare, for instance—he had something new to say, and a fresh and forcible way of saying it. Few collections of essays contain so little second-hand opinion, so much that is new and yet true.

As for his acumen we have seen nothing in recent English criticism to equal it. But it never led him into fanciful or laborious analysis. It was constantly held in check by the practical temper of his thought. To use a phrase he was fond of, he could always tell you what a thing "came to;" and that is the office of criticism. By its easy rapidity, its manifold suggestiveness, and its versatility, the writing of Mr. Bagehot reminds one of that rare thing, the talk of a really good talker. It is uncommon to find so much depth and power of thought combined with such vigorous plainness of expression and felicity of illustration. Indeed, Mr. Bagehot seemed sometimes curiously rather afraid of his own penetration. After stating some principle of conduct or opinion discovered in the life or writings of the author under criticism, he had a way of saying, "Now, this may seem to many people like nonsense, but in reality it isn't. For,"—and then would follow some homely but conclusive examples of the principle in common life.

It is largely to this union of the speculative and the practical temper that we ascribe the humor which constantly played about Mr. Bagehot's pen. For humor, if any thing more than easy good-fellowship or the gush of animal spirits, depends upon the quick perception of contrasted relations. And this perception Mr. Bagehot had in a remarkable degree. The philosopher and the banker in him were always laughing at each other. Very suggestive of the nature and the source of his humor is such a passage as this:—

There seems an unalterable contradiction between the human mind and its employments. How can a *soul* be a merchant? What relation to an immortal being have the price of linseed, the fall of butter, the tare on tallow, or the brokerage

on hemp? Can an undying creature debit "petty expenses" and charge for "carriage paid?" All the world's a stage;—"the satchel and the shining morning face,"—the "strange oaths,"—the "bubble reputation,"—the

Eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
Full of wise saws and modern instances.

Can these things be real? Surely they are acting. What relation have they to the truth as we see it in theory? What connection with our certain hopes, our deep desires, our craving and infinite thought? "In respect of itself, it is a good life; but in respect it is a shepherd's life, it is naught." The soul ties its shoe; the mind washes its hands in a basin. All is incongruous.

The essays are remarkably even. If we mistake not, however, those which deal largely with the relations of philosophy and religion to practical life are written with greater zest than the others. Those on Huxley, Coleridge, Arthur Hugh Clough, and Milton are excellent, but the best of the series is the essay on Butler. We do not remember to have seen in so brief compass such a clear and satisfactory statement of the character and limitations of Butler's work.

C. T. W.

Periodicals.

The Popular Science Monthly. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1879.

This magazine for April contains a translation of an article by G. De Mortillet, in the *Revue d'Anthropologie*, on "Early Traces of Man," written in a very positive style of faith in the geologic man, yet making some remarkable discriminations.

First, it maintains the absolute settlement of the question in favor of the reality of quaternary man. And the remains of this epoch are found as truly in the East, in Assyria, in Egypt, both lower and upper, as in America. It notices with peremptory contradiction the claim made by Mr. Southall that no traces of paleolithic man are found in Egypt and the Orient; maintaining that they have been discovered in positions decisive of their genuine geological antiquity. And of the vastness of the quaternary age he thus speaks: "All geologists are agreed that the duration of the period in which we live is as nothing compared with that of the quaternary period. It is as a day compared to ages, as a drop of water in a stream. All paleontologists understand what a length of time is requisite for the rise and decline of animal species—species which, while they have been upon the earth, have been lavishly distributed over an enormous area."—Page 795. On this we remark that, positive as paleontologists are of this stupendous length of time, the physicists as positively maintain that no such time can be allowed. As yet the physicists possess the field.

But Mortillet is also sure not only of the tertiary man anterior to the stupendous quaternary, but even of the miocene. We do not quote his proofs, our main object being the certain discriminations above hinted. Was the fossil man the complete man of our present humanity? Or was he, in fact, a lower *species*; an anthropoid, and not a man. If so, the Adamic man may have no genetic connection with the pre-Adamite, and our race may have begun with Adam. On this point we adduce the following passages:—

But first let us understand what is meant by the terms quaternary man and tertiary man.

The fauna of the mammals serves clearly to determine the limits of these later geological periods. The tertiary is characterized by terrestrial mammals entirely different from extant species; the quaternary by the mingling of extant with extinct species; the present period by the extant fauna. The man of the early quaternary, he who made the St. Acheul hatchets and used them, is the man of Neanderthal, of Canstatt, of Enggisheim, of La Naulette, of Denise. He is indubitably a man, but differing more widely from the Australian and the Hottentot than the Australian and Hottentot differ from the European. Hence unquestionably he formed another human species, the word *species* being taken in the sense given to it by naturalists who do not accept the transformation doctrine.

Tertiary man, therefore, must have been still more distinct—of a species still less like the present human species—indeed, so different as to entitle it to be regarded as of distinct genus. For this reason I have given to this being the name of man's precursor. Or he might be called anthropopithecus—the man-moukey. The question of tertiary man should therefore be expressed thus: Did there exist in the tertiary age beings sufficiently intelligent to perform a part of the acts which are characteristic of man?

So stated, the question is settled most completely by the various series of objects sent to the Anthropological Exposition. . . .

It results, therefore, from the Abbé Bourgeois' researches, that during the middle tertiary there existed a creature, precursor of man, an anthropopithecus, which was acquainted with fire and could make use of it for splitting flints. It also knew how to trim the flint-flakes thus produced, and to convert them into tools.—Pp. 797, 798.

But if even quaternary "man" was not of the same species with our present man, then there properly is no quaternary man. And inasmuch as even "the man of Neanderthal, of Canstatt, of Enggisheim, of La Naulette, of Denise," is of very questionable character, how do we know that the being intelligent enough to split flints by fire or by tapping had a human form at all, even rudimentally? Quantitatively, the beaver and the bee have as great an amount of intelligence, although qualitatively in different direction. We are, therefore, unable to be sure that the flint-splitter was "the precursor of man." But even admitting his precursorship, he was still an animal, with animal body and intellect. The higher nature, the *spirit*, was wanting. The being may have possessed an animal body, and an animal soul, but have lacked the *πνεῦμα*, the transcendent humanity. For man was not only made

of "dust" and "became a living soul," but he "became" so by the *inbreathing* of the Divine. We are still left, then, on this scientific admission, ample room to deny that the Mosaic history of the Adamic man is contradicted. The view of Tayler Lewis, and later of Mivart, is left unrefuted. Or, rather, we may say that the genetic connection between Adam and the geologic man remains entirely unproved.

The West African Reporter. Four folio pages. Vol. V, No. 68. Sierra Leone. April, 1879.

We have received and looked over with interest a few numbers of this paper that have flowed as if by spontaneity from Africa into our office. In the present number, in refuting the existence of "caste in literature," the editor says:—

Professor Blyden, in his writings above referred to, has been recognized and welcomed as a co-worker by the ablest writers. His articles have been quoted and copied, and what is, perhaps, a greater compliment, plagiarized by periodicals in England and America. The *Edinburgh, Contemporary, and Saturday Reviews* in England have quoted from and reviewed them. *Littell's Living Age* and the *Methodist Quarterly Review* in the United States have copied some of them entire.—Ed. W. A. F.

The *Methodist Quarterly Review* has copied none of Mr. Blyden's articles from English periodicals entire. Our *Quarterly* was the first to discover Mr. Blyden; and his article in our *Quarterly* was the first of his ever published, and, doubtless, the first article in any review or magazine from a man of his race. He has been contributor to our *Quarterly* ever since, and an article of his will be found in this, our January, number. The only article of his ever partially republished from England in our pages was written by him for our *Quarterly*, but intercepted in England and published in Frazer's Magazine.

Miscellaneous.

The Lesson Commentary on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1880. By Rev. JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D., and Rev. J. L. HURLBUR, M.A. 8vo., pp. 252. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Senior Lesson Book (Berean Series, No. 1) on the International Lessons for 1880. 16mo., pp. 166. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Berean Question Book (Berean Series, No. 2) on the International Lessons for 1880. 16mo., pp. 165. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Berean Beginner's Book (Berean Series No. 3) on the International Lessons for 1880. 16mo., pp. 169. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Boys' Pocket Library. Volume III. 24mo., pp. 283. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

- The Boys' Pocket Library.* Volume IV. Popular Delusions. 24mo., pp. 253. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Boys' Pocket Library.* Vol. V. Strange Stories about Strange People. 24mo., pp. 263. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Conrad.* A Tale of Wiclif and Bohemia. By EMMA LESLIE, author of "Flavia," "Elfreda," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 293. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Margarethe.* A Tale of the Sixteenth Century. By EMMA LESLIE, author of "Ayesha," "Leofwine the Saxon," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 324. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Cecily.* A Tale of the English Reformation. By EMMA LESLIE, author of "Leofwine the Saxon," "Conrad," etc. Four Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 324. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Blossom Books.* (Juvenile.) 10 Volumes in a Box. 4to. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.
- The Princess Idlewats.* A Fairy Story. By Mrs. W. J. HAYS. Illustrated. 16mo., pp. 124. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The Life of Rev. Thomas M. Eddy, D.D.* By CHARLES N. SIMS, D.D. With an Introduction by Rev. Bishop SIMPSON, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 592. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Methodist Year-Book for 1880.* Edited by W. H. DE PUY, D.D. 8vo., pp. 88. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.
- Young Folks' History of Rome.* By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE, author of "The Heir of Redcliffe," "Little Luey's Wonderful Globe," "Book of Golden Deeds," "Young Folks' History of Germany," "Greece," "France," "England," etc. 12mo., pp. 443. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1879.
- Mordecai's Tenants.* By Miss A. D. WALKER. Two Illustrations. 16mo., pp. 142. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- Glenwood.* By JULIA K. BLOOMFIELD, Author of "Patient Susie; or, Paying the Mortgage," etc. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Young Folks of Renfrew.* (In the Interest of the Missionary Cause.) By Miss M. ELLEN TANNEYHILL, A.M., (Mrs. Dr. H. J. BEYERLE,) formerly Preceptress of Williamsport Dickinson Seminary, Williamsport, Pa. Three Illus. 16mo., pp. 239. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.
- The Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1880.* New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co.
- The Mode of Man's Immortality; or, The When, Where, and How of the Future Life.* By Rev. T. A. GOODWIN, A.M. 12mo., pp. 264. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 1879.
- English Men of Letters.* Edited by JOHN MORLEY.—*Edmund Burke.* By JOHN MORLEY. 12mo., pp. 214. 1879.—*John Milton.* By MARK PATTISON, B.D. 12mo., pp. 215. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- Art in America.* A Critical and Historical Sketch. By S. G. W. BENJAMIN. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 214. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The Boy Travelers in the Far East.* Adventures of Two Youths in a Journey to Japan and China. By THOMAS W. KNOX. Illustrated. 8vo., pp. 421. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- An Involuntary Voyage.* By LUCIEN BIART. Translated by Mrs. Cashel Hoey and Mr. John Lillie. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- A True Republic.* By ALBERT STICKNEY. 12mo., pp. 271. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Lessons from My Masters: Carlyle, Tennyson, and Ruskin.* By PETER BAYNE, M.A., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 449. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Afternoons with the Poets.* By CHARLES D. DESHLER. Square 12mo., pp. 320. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- The Telephone, the Microphone, and the Phonograph.* By COMTE DU MONCEL. With 70 Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 277. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- The American Bookseller for Christmas.* 1879. Paper Covers. 8vo., pp. 592. New York: The American News Co.

- Readings from English History.* Selected and Edited by JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A., LL.D. Three Parts in One Volume. 12mo. Part I., pp. 152. Part II., pp. 152. Part III., pp. 140. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Shakespeare's Comedy of Twelfth Night: or, What You Will.* Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. Square 16mo., pp. 174. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Shakespeare's Comedy of the Winter's Tale.* Edited, with Notes, by WILLIAM J. ROLFE, A.M. With Engravings. Square 16mo., pp. 218. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The German Principia, Part II.* A First German Reading Book. Containing Anecdotes, Tables, Natural History, German History, and Specimens of German Literature, with Grammatical Questions and Notes, and a Dictionary. On the Plan of Dr. William Smith's *Principia Latina*. 12mo., pp. 263. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- Analysis and Formation of Latin Words,* with Tables for Analysis, List of Roots, etc. By FRANK SMALLEY, A.M. 12mo., pp. 87. Syracuse, N. Y.: John T. Roberts. 1879.
- The Egotist.* Essays of Life: Its Work and its Fortunes, its Joys and its Sorrows, its Success and its Failure. By HENRY T. KING. 12mo., pp. 270. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1880.
- Plain Talk to the Sick.* By ADAM MILLER, M.D. 12mo., pp. 212. Chicago: Published for the Author. 1879.
- HARPER'S GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS: *M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistulæ Selectæ.* By RECOGNOVITZ REINHOLDUS KLOTZ. 18mo., pp. 286. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1879.
- FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY, 4to., paper: *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club.* By CHARLES DICKENS.—*Poems of Wordsworth.* Chosen and Edited by MATTHEW ARNOLD.—*Cousin Henry.* By ANTHONY TROLLOPE.—*The Two Miss Flemings.* By the Author of "Rare Pale Margaret."—*Miss Braddon's Mistletoe Bough for Christmas,* 1879.—*The Egotist: A Comedy in Narrative.* By GEORGE MEREDITH.—*The Bells of Penraven.* By B. L. FARJEON.—*A Few Months in New Guinea.* By OCTAVIUS C. STONE, F.R.G.S.—*A Doubting Heart.* By ANNIE KEARY.—*Little Miss Primrose.* By the Author of "St. Olave's," etc.—*Donna Quizote.* By JUSTIN MCCARTHY.
- HARPER'S HALF-HOUR SERIES, 32mo. *American Ballads.* By THOMAS DUNN ENGLISH, M.D., LL.D. Pp. 155. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- Tyrol and the Skirt of the Alps.* By GEORGE E. WARING, JUN., Author of "A Farmer's Vacation," etc. Illustrated. Small 8vo., pp. 171. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—Our last Quarterly contained a biographical sketch of Rev. Dr. Nelson, written by Bishop Harris, containing some remarks upon the "trying ordeal" through which the Book Concern had passed at the time of Dr. Nelson's election as Agent. It is proper to say that in these remarks it was not the intention of either the Bishop (as we say by his authority) or the Editor to express or imply any censure upon the then Junior Agent, Dr. Lanahan, or upon any other person who was engaged in officially moving or conducting the inquiries into the condition and management of the Concern. The only allusion was to unofficial and irresponsible persons who took advantage of the investigations to malign the Church.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1880.

ART. I.—THE GLORIOUS RETURN OF THE VAUDOIS.

Histoire de la glorieuse Rentrée des Vaudois dans leur Vallées: Paris: Grassort, 1879.

A NOTABLE book is that which we place at the head of this article. It was mostly written by Henry Arnaud, "Pastor and Colonel of the Vaudois," a man who, preaching, praying, and fighting "for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," would have gladdened the heart of Cromwell, and who deserves to rank among the greatest heroes of history. The recent edition of the work is, as nearly as possible, a reproduction in form, typography, etc., of the original edition, issued about a century and three quarters ago. Its full title, almost literally rendered, is "The History of the Glorious Return of the Vaudois into their Valleys, in which it will be seen that a troop of these people, less than a thousand strong, sustained a war against the King of France and the Duke of Savoy; made headway against their army of twenty-two thousand men; opened a passage through Savoy and High Dauphiny; beat many times the enemy, and at last miraculously re-entered their heritage; maintained themselves therein, arms in hand, and re-established the worship of God which had been interdicted during three years and a half. The whole compiled from memoirs which have been faithfully made of all that occurred in this war of the Vaudois," etc.

We propose to narrate, though it must be in mere outline,
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXXII.—14



the "Glorious Return;" but some preliminary pages are necessary. An American writer complains of the comparative ignorance of our Churches respecting the Vaudois—the most interesting people, perhaps, in the whole history of Christendom since the apostolic age. American Christians know in a vague way that somewhere in the mountains between France and Italy lived and still linger the "Waldenses;" that they have had a curiously antique history; and that, since the unification of Italy, they have been descending their mountains to propagate pure Christianity over the peninsula, for which they have peculiar advantages as Italians, with the national language for their vernacular. Only the best-informed minds among us know how surpassingly marvelous has been their history, and how equally marvelous seems their destiny; that in their valleys, up among the snows and clouds of the Cottian Alps, looking down to the south-eastward upon Italy, and to the north-westward upon France, they maintained their Church, pure in doctrine, morals and polity as that of Scotland itself, while all the rest of Europe fell away into paganized Christianity; that, according to their local traditions, their religious history dates from the time of Paul's preaching in Rome; that Paul himself possibly passed through their valleys on his way to Spain; that, at least, some of his Roman converts, or their early successors, fled at the outbreak of the persecutions to these mountains, and founded the faith which remains there to our day; that while, century after century, all the rest of the Christian world was sunk in moral death, and covered with the night of the "Dark Ages," the pure apostolic light shone undimmed on these mountain heights; that France on the one hand, Italy on the other, prompted by Rome, attempted age after age to break through the Alpine barriers and extinguish the strange heresy, as it was called; that the one terrible St. Bartholomew's of France went on here through successive generations, but in vain; that every valley, almost every cliff, has its traditions of martyrdom; that deeds of prowess by the mountaineers, hurling back whole hosts of Papal invaders, now on France, now on Italy, in at least thirty-three distinct wars, have given them an heroic history never surpassed in the military annals of any other people, dotting their territory with scores of Thermopylaes and Marathons; that, after centuries of

praying, watching, and fighting for their faith, they stood, still in arms, amid the ruins of their homes and their churches, and laid down their weapons only when a solemn pledge from the enemy conceded their rights; that this pledge was immediately violated, nearly all their heroic men imprisoned in thirteen Piedmontese dungeons, their children put in Catholic schools, their women in nunneries; that the Vaudois were at last considered extinguished, their own historians, who had fled to other countries, declaring "the ancient Church of the mountains," the "Israel of the Alps," "obliterated," "irrecoverably lost," as one of them said; that of the fourteen thousand heroic prisoners of Piedmont all died of starvation or disease save three thousand, who, liberated at last, but forbidden ever to re-enter their valleys, made their way to Protestant Switzerland and Germany; that seven or eight hundred of them afterward combined under a vow to redeem their lost cause and country, armed themselves clandestinely, -marched, under the command of their pastor, Arnaud, through the most intricate ravines of Switzerland and Savoy, under the shadow of Mont Blanc, along the cliffs of Mont Cenis, through passages in which only mountaineers could make their way, with no commissariat, each man carrying his own ammunition and food, the Catholic towns and villages rising against them, but quailing before them, as if a terror from God had fallen upon the land; that France on the one hand, Italy on the other, sent armies to arrest their triumphant march, twenty-two thousand men in all; that they rolled back the enemy in victorious fights, entered their ancient valleys "with singing and shouting," fought the Catholic foe from rock to rock through months, supplying themselves with ammunition only by their victories, destroying ten thousand of the enemy in eighteen victorious attacks, winning peace at last, restoring their old homes, schools, and churches, receiving their expatriated wives and children, sheltering even their persecuting sovereign, who had to flee from his enemies below to seek their protection; and that, re-established in their mountains and enfranchised by their government, they are now bearing the Gospel over Italy, and are thus displaying before the eyes of this skeptical age the providential meaning of their history.

Such are a few mere allusions to this remarkable history—

the most remarkable, we are inclined to think, on record. We delay not to discuss the questions which have excited so much inquiry among European scholars respecting the date of the origin of the Vaudois, a date lost in the obscurity of remote time. We have mentioned their own traditions on the subject, as attested by Arnaud, in his history of the *Glorieuse Rentrée*. We know that centuries before the Reformation they were a pure Church; that their doctrines, forms of worship, Church government, show no traces of ever having been reformed, as they show none of ever having needed reform. We know, also, that as early as the fourth century St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, testifies that the Church corruptions of Italy had not penetrated these mountains, and that about one thousand one hundred and twenty-five Catholic writers allude to them as soiled by inveterate heresy. These evidences are sufficient for our present purpose, and we can now approach our main subject.

The *Glorieuse Rentrée* originated in the persecutions which attended the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Vaudois on the French side of the Cottian Alps were, of course, included in that most impolitic and disastrous measure of Louis XIV. The king was determined to extinguish Protestantism in France. According to the historian Capefigue, (himself no friend to Protestantism,) no less than two hundred and thirty thousand Protestants fled from their country to escape the persecution; nearly one thousand six hundred of these were preachers, two thousand three hundred were elders of the Churches, fifteen thousand were "gentlemen," the others mostly merchants and artisans—the best in the kingdom. Capefigue's figures were taken from official statistical returns made at the period; the emigration continued years later. Charles Coquerel says that the Revocation "kept France under a perpetual St. Bartholomew's for about sixty years," and that more than a million of the best citizens were either driven abroad, or put to death, or sent to the galleys or to dungeons. A single province (that of Languedoc) was officially reported to have sacrificed a hundred thousand by the wheel, the gibbet, or the sword. Three years before the Revocation the Protestant pastors reported to the Government one million eight hundred Protestant households in the kingdom; in about twenty-five years after the Revocation the king declared that

Protestantism was exterminated in France. His bigoted and ferocious policy had struck disastrously the best interests of his country, but it had laid the foundations of the manufacturing and commercial prosperity of the Low Countries, of England, and of much of Germany, and had given to the American colonies some of their best families, from New Rochelle to Savannah. The emigration comprised some twenty-one thousand Protestant soldiers and sailors, and six hundred military officers. Most of these entered foreign service, and avenged on France in many a battle the wrongs of their brethren. Thousands helped to save the Protestant throne of England by fighting in Ireland against the attempt of Louis XIV. to restore the apostate Stuarts. They conquered their old persecutors at the battle of the Boyne, and on other Irish fields. Marshal Schomberg was one of them. Their descendants in Germany, still bearing their ancestral names, were among the best heroes of the last war with France; and Jules Simon, the French statesman, had occasion to show his country that the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes had given at least eighty eminent officers of the German staff of the terrible invasion of 1870, by which France was trodden in the dust.

The king's assertion, that there were no more Protestants in his realm, was apparently, though not really, correct. The Protestant temples were all either demolished or given to the Catholics. Protestant pastors were hanged or broken on the wheel all over the south. None remained except in concealment, and with the certainty of death if they were discovered. Their people could worship only in caves, or in recesses of forests. Never was there a more studiedly minute or more diabolical edict issued by a government than the Act of Revocation, and its accompanying acts. They reached all classes and all interests of the Protestant population. It was death if they were found worshipping in public; it was the galleys for life if they were heard singing their hymns in their own houses. It was five hundred *livres* fine if they did not send their children to the Catholic priest for baptism. Protestant marriages were illegal, and their children illegitimate. All children more than five years old were to be taken by the magistrate from Protestant homes. Protestant midwives were forbidden to assist their Christian sisters in childbirth. Protestant physicians,

surgeons, druggists, lawyers, notaries, school-teachers, librarians, booksellers, printers, grocers, were all suppressed—and there were hundreds of thousands of them. All Protestant schools, charitable, public, or private, were closed. Protestants could no longer be in any government employment, even as workmen on the highways. All Bibles and Protestant books were to be publicly burned. “There were bonfires of them,” says a good authority, “in every town.” Protestants were not allowed to seek employment as servants, nor Protestant families to hire them, the penalty being the galleys for life. Protestant mechanics were not allowed to work without certificates that they had become Catholics. Even Protestant washerwomen were interdicted the common washing-places on the rivers. “In fact,” says Samuel Smiles, our best popular authority on French Protestantism, “there was scarcely a degradation that could be invented, or an insult that could be perpetrated, that was not practiced upon these poor Huguenots who refused to be of the king’s religion.” Such was the persecution of the infamous Revocation. According to Coquerel’s figures, it drove a million of the French out of their country, and suppressed a thousand pastors, one tenth of whom were either put to death or, worse, consigned to the horrors of the galleys.

When the king supposed his work of extermination done, he was reminded of the humble Vaudois, hid away in the ravines of the French sides of the Cottian Alps. The atrocious work could not be pronounced complete while these remained. The light might again stream down from these heretic heights upon the plains and towns of southern France. They were one in faith, and in every other respect, except political allegiance, with the Italian Vaudois of the other side of the mountains. The king, therefore, demanded the co-operation of the Duke of Savoy in the extermination of both. The duke hesitated; blood enough had flowed in these mountains, and but thirty years before, fourteen thousand of their devoted population had been massacred in vain; they appeared invincible; but he had to yield to the superior sovereign, who threatened to do the bloody work himself and to appropriate the territory as his own. Thus began the thirty-third war against these unconquerable mountaineers. The armies of both nations made si-

multaneous invasions; terrible struggles ensued at three or four different points, but we cannot here detail them. On Easter Monday, 1686, a general attack was made. The pastor, Arnaud, became on this day first known as a hero—the hope of the persecuted people for the future, if not for the present. The Duke of Savoy led one attack; Catinat, with his French, another. Both were hurled back the first day; on the next, Catinat destroyed the little force opposed to him, and massacred men, women, and children. The commanders of the Italian troops sent messengers to the Vaudois at other points, assuring them that their brethren in the Valley of St. Martin had surrendered and received pardon; the positive promise of the duke, assuring them of their pardon, their lives, and liberties, was declared to them, and on this pledge they all laid down their arms, surrendering impregnable positions. Immediately the pledge was violated; they were loaded with irons, and fourteen thousand of them, according to Arnaud, were incarcerated in the prisons of Piedmont. “Their children,” says the historian Mustan, “were carried off and dispersed through Roman Catholic districts; their wives and daughters were violated, massacred, or made captives. As for those who still remained, all whom the enemy could seize became a prey devoted to carnage, spoliation, fire, excesses which cannot be told, and outrages which it would not be possible to describe.”

The great aim of the Revocation was now supposed to be accomplished. Louis XIV. declared, as we have seen, that there were no more Protestants in his realm. One of his officers in these mountains wrote that “all the valleys are now exterminated; the people all killed, hanged, or massacred.” “Rome,” says Smiles, “rang with *Te Deums* in praise of the final dispersion of the Vaudois.” The Pope congratulated the Duke of Savoy in a special brief. Roman Catholics were settled in the valleys on the lands of the dispersed Protestants. It was now that one of their historians, a refugee in London, wrote, “The world looks upon them no otherwise than as irrecoverably lost and finally destroyed.” But the Vaudois Church was inextinguishable; it was still alive in the thirteen dungeons of Piedmont. Of the fourteen thousand prisoners there, many were daily perishing by hunger, thirst, or disease, mar-

tyrs for their apparently lost cause; eleven thousand thus perished, according to Arnaud, and the three thousand that at last came forth to wander in foreign lands looked, he says, "more like shadows than men." On reaching Protestant Switzerland they were, he adds, but "moving skeletons." The people of Geneva were affected with deepest pity for them, and as they moved along, some to Lausanne, some to Berne, to Basle, to Neufchatel, and into Germany, they were not only fed and sheltered, but many of the feebler sufferers were borne in the arms of the good citizens. Some died on the route. The scene reminded the generous Swiss of the hosts who, in the days of their fathers, had filled their highways, fleeing from the horrors of St. Bartholomew's in France, and many a devout heart sent up the appeal to heaven, "How long, O Lord! how long!" They dared not dream that these "moving skeletons" were soon to rise up like those of the "valley of vision," and bear again to their ancient mountain heights the standard of the faith, and thence march down at last with triumphant hymns to Rome itself.

Assuredly such a purpose, in such circumstances, must have been a superhuman inspiration. In the heart of the heroic Pastor Arnaud, and many others, it was strong at this very moment. The strangers were allotted settlements in several places in Switzerland and Germany, but Arnaud had whispered the bold design to some hundreds, who therefore declined remote invitations, and kept together as much as possible, to be ready for the coming hour. There was no visible hope of it, but these men had as much faith as valor. Could the cause of their Lord Christ suffer any final defeat? Why had they been sustained, fighting successfully through more than twelve hundred years against the attempted invasions of Papal corruption and trained armies? Why was almost every valley, every cave, every cliff, of their country consecrated with martyr blood? Was there no providential design in these things? Could not the Lord God of hosts raise up unknown means of salvation for them? Had not a great man, one Oliver Cromwell, the greatest sovereign who had ever ruled England, made France and Italy tremble when he threatened to interpose for them? Had he not refused to sign a treaty with France till the alarmed Mazarin consented

to join his intervention? Had not a greater man, his secretary, one John Milton, the greatest poet of the nations, written for them, and thrilled Europe with his indignant words:

"Avenge, O Lord! thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold," etc.?

And was there not a great man rising, in the Protestant North, William of Orange, the enemy of their enemy, and one who could aid them? But what if no help were apparent? Could God's "almightiness," as John Milton delighted to say, could this fail? Had he not rescued their valleys time and again? Therefore they silently, but bravely, passed the word along their new, scattered settlements: "The valleys can and shall be rescued again. We can march into them under the Captain of our salvation—and, if need be, under him alone." They found in Geneva "the old Vaudois hero, Javel, who had done many a brave deed in the valley. He was now too aged, and too disabled by wounds, to return, but he planned their campaign, and bade them fight it out. "You will be told," he said, "that all France and Italy will be gathered against you. But were it the whole world, and only yourselves against all, fear ye the Almighty alone; he is your protection."

The secret must be sacredly kept, for the Protestant Governments which now sheltered them had delicate relations with France and Savoy which ought not to be compromised. Three faithful men were sent to spy out the land and report on the route. Arnaud went to Holland and consulted William of Orange, and obtained funds for the outfit of arms, and other provisions. Twice they started on their march, and had to abandon it and return—their own Protestant friends, the cantonal authorities, interposing and warning them back. Arnaud, though of undaunted courage, had a sagacious eye, and saw that the hour had not yet come; but he did not allow them to disperse the second time without inspiring their hope by a sermon at Bex on the text, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

They now waited more than a year, to allay public suspicion, before resuming the attempt. But at last, in August, 1689, they secretly assembled in a woods back of Nyon, on the northern shore of Lake Lemman, and, with prayer and preaching

from Arnaud, hastily organized. Between eight and nine hundred were there. The secret had been well kept, but the neighboring peasants were wondering at the strange gathering, and reports would immediately get to the municipal authorities. Curiosity to learn what was going on in the forest attracted some fifteen boats to the neighboring shore. Arnaud saw his opportunity. After prayer, at the head of the little army, he ordered the boats to be seized; their owners were compelled to row them across the lake to the Savoy shore. The first passage was successfully made by two o'clock on the night of August 16-17, but the boatmen, fearing for their lives on the Catholic coast, on returning for the remainder escaped up and down the lake. There could be no delay for the waiting two hundred; the transported little force, now but about seven hundred, were in the enemy's country. They were arrayed in three divisions—main column, vanguard, and rear guard—comprising nineteen companies under select captains. They had plenty of officers, but Arnaud was effectively their leader. They were near Yvoire, and they knew that the alarm would be spread by daylight through the country. They must pray and march immediately. One of their three pastors went in search of a guide, but was taken prisoner by the authorities and sent to Chambery. They immediately summoned Yvoire to surrender, threatening to burn it if it did not; it had to open its gates and give up three of its functionaries as hostages, to be marched with the Vaudois to the next town, and to be sent back only when they could be substituted by new hostages—a policy which was maintained throughout the campaign.

And now commenced this wondrous march, the *Glorieuse Rentrée*—compared with which Xenophon's "Retreat of the Ten Thousand" was an insignificant feat. The little army had no commissariat, as we have said, each man carrying his own provision of food and ammunition—they had no animals—none but chamois could go where they had to go; had no drums—even these would have been an incumbrance; their only music was that of trumpets and psalms. It reminds us of that night when the Hebrews began their march for the Holy Land, "that night of the Lord, to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations."

They moved rapidly, but in unbroken order and with un-

shakable resolution; and their determined bearing struck with awe the hostile populations through which they advanced. They knew that they must sometimes use desperate expedients, but they hesitated before none that were necessary; they must seize their food as they passed, but they scrupulously paid for it with the money sent them from Holland. They could take no prisoners, save hostages; for how could they feed them or guard them through the Alpine passes? and they might soon be more numerous than themselves. They must dispatch them on the spot, and give no quarter in battle. Their whole route lay through the territory of the Catholic Government which had attempted their extermination; woe to any man who should challenge them! Few words, decisive acts, were all that could be possible. A desperate Puritanic rigor was their only policy, and it was grimly expressed in all their features and bearing. The Catholic populations could not mistake them, and recoiled, or obsequiously supplied their needs. Even the priests sometimes laid down their stores before them, and bade them go on "in the name of God." From town to town they took the nobles of the castles, the priests, or the leading citizens, as hostages; it was submission or death; the first alternative was always chosen, for there could not be a momentary doubt of the determined earnestness of the Vaudois. They sometimes had forty or more hostages, and had no little trouble with the *curés* and *fat friars*, who puffed and halted in their difficult mountain climbings. On the first day of the march four "gentlemen," or Savoyard knights, "on horse, well armed and followed by peasants," confronted them, demanding wherefore they advanced in this array, and proudly commanding them to lay down their arms. There was but one reply: "Down from your steeds and march with us, our hostages!" Mounting a hill, they saw two hundred armed peasants awaiting them, commanded by a Savoyard nobleman. They dispersed them at a blow, broke to pieces their arms, and took some of them as guides, "with the menace," says Arnaud, "of being hung to the first tree if they should be found unfaithful." Their commanders wrote to the municipalities beyond that the Vaudois were honest, paying for all they took, demanding only a passage. They prayed their fellow-citizens not to sound the tocsin, and not to appear in arms. Accordingly, during this

day the people on the way met them with provisions. They halted at Viù, where they were treated with bread and wine, and then resumed their march in the moonlight. At St. Jayre the frightened magistrates had rolled out a hogshead of wine for them into the street, but "some drank not, fearing it was poisoned." They marched on till midnight, when they sent back their hostages, and, taking a brief sleep on the ground, after prayer, were early again on their way; for it was necessary to hasten; all the country was now in alarm, and the French and Italian troops were in motion to intercept them. They reach the town of Cluse, in the valley of the Arve. Mont Blanc towers sublimely above them. The town is walled, and the people hostile; the municipal authorities threaten them, and bar the gates; "but it is necessary," says Arnaud, "to traverse this town." The inhabitants are under arms and line the *fosses*, and the peasants are descending the surrounding mountains with resounding shouts. There is but a prompt word from the Vaudois; they must pass, if they have to break the walls, and go on by fire and sword. Their hostages, fearing for their own lives, write to the municipality to save them; the gates open, and the little troop marches in triumph through lines, on either side of the street, of awe-struck citizens under arms. Beyond the town bread and wine are sent to them; the Vaudois send back money in payment. The leading citizens, admiring their chivalry, or glad for their own escape, send a polite invitation to the officers to return and dine with them; but there is no time for such courtesies. They forcibly take new hostages, and march on for Salanches. They defile through a narrow valley, inaccessible mountains on one side, the Arve, swollen by rains and impassable, on the other. "Stones rolled down the steeps could," writes Arnaud, "have wiped out an army." Here they face a town, a castle; and a force of armed peasants, but the latter are content to let them pass unmolested, though they bear off the nobleman of the chateau and his priest as hostages. They have now twenty of these necessary incumbrances—the first men of the country hitherto.

As they approached Salanches they heard the tocsin ringing; they must cross a bridge to reach the town, and it was defended by armed men. They rushed forward, and the enemy fled. Once across, the Vaudois formed in order of battle, for six hun-

dred troops were before them. Terror fell upon the town and its defenders. Four monks were sent to parley with them, and offered them passage and two hostages if they would release the forty now with them and hasten away. This was all the Vaudois wished; but when the two hostages appeared they were found to be poverty-stricken townsmen, *deux misérables*, says Arnaud. The monks, seeing him indignant, attempted to escape; he seized two of them and "enrolled them in the company of hostages," and "it is proper to say," he adds, "that they were of great advantage to us afterward, for their remonstrances, prayers, and intercessions with the enemy on our farther passage were so efficacious, we were astonished at the power of these good fathers over their co-religionists." Threatening now to burn the town, they were allowed to pass on, and encamp a league beyond, where they slept under a drenching rain, but "thanking God," says Arnaud, "that the storm probably kept the enemy from rallying" in pursuit of them. The next three days were terrible, by the weather and the steeps they had to climb. French troops awaited them in the valley of the Isère, and they must evade them, if possible. Purchasing ample provision from the peasants, they resolutely moved on, sometimes passing through villages which were deserted by their frightened inhabitants; at others, meeting armed populations which fled before them. The rain drenched them; they waded through snow "up to their knees;" they scaled Lez Pras and Haute Luce mountains, seven thousand feet above the sea; on the latter they were lost in the clouds, "by which God hid the Vaudois from the eyes of their enemies." The "good and holy exhortations of Arnaud animated," says one of his companions, "the courage of the troops under all sorts of miseries in this place, mounting and descending on steps cut in the rock, where twenty persons could have overthrown an army of twenty thousand." They ascended, or rather, says the history, "crawled up the Col Bonhomme, knee-deep in snow, the rain on their backs," and, standing at last on the heights of the Alps, beheld the valley of Isère, in which the French troops were prepared for them. Descending to it, they turned into the valley of Tignes, and thus escaped the enemy. Arriving at the base of Mont Iseran, they thanked God and rested a few hours, Arnaud having had no sleep for about a

week. Besides all the horrors of the weather and the mountains which they passed through in these days, they encountered in some places hostile peasant forces; they heard the tocsin, "a horrible clatter," says Arnaud, "of all the steeples;" they had to break over barricaded paths guarded by armed mountaineers; they passed over fortifications which had been erected in anticipation of their former advance; they were now deserted, but they were so situated that a small force could have annihilated the little army—their failure a year before had saved them.

The next day, as they passed over Mont Iseran, word reached them that troops awaited them at the foot of Mont Cenis. "Instead of alarming us," says Arnaud, "this news inflamed our hearts, for, knowing that the strength of our arms depended absolutely on God, for whose glory we fought, we doubted not that he could open our way against all who should attempt to close it." They advanced to Besas, where an insolent mob defied them; they seized their chatelain, their priest, and six of the people, and marched on. The seventh day (Friday, 23) they ascended Mont Cenis; some of their scouts seized the baggage mules of the Cardinal Ranuzzi, the papal nuncio in France, who had passed on another route to Rome to assist at the election of a pope. The spoils were rich, but all were given back to the muleteers, except some papers which exposed the designs of the French king. The loss of these documents defeated, it is reported, the hope of the cardinal for the papacy, and he died of mortification, exclaiming, "*My papers, O my papers!*"

The little army traversed the Grande and the Petite Cenis through appalling suffering—"surpassing the imagination," says Arnaud. The snow was deep, they lost their way, were enveloped with clouds. They were overtaken by night, and not a few sank down exhausted and were left behind, but rejoined the main body the next day in the Valley of the Gaillon. Again climbing the steeps, they could see the mountain outposts of their native valleys. They were approaching the large and fortified towns. Before them stood Exilles; to their left, Susa. The struggle onward had been terrible thus far, but now came the real tug of war. Twenty-two thousand French and Italian trained troops were before them, and the seven hun-

dred must soon encounter their outposts. But the heroic band advanced, says Arnaud, "with intrepid courage." They attempted to evade the garrison of Exilles through a lateral ravine, but the French troops and peasants fired from the steeps upon them, and rolled down rocks; the way became impassable; they lost several men, and had to retire, and attempt to turn, in another direction, the heights occupied by the enemy. They soon heard drums, and saw the garrison marching to intercept them. Descending the valley of the Doire, they saw before them, on and beyond a bridge, nearly four times their own number, twenty-five hundred troops, with all the provisions of war. What was now to be done? They must pass through this force or go back. The night was falling; could they dare to rush across the guarded bridge and plunge into this armed host in the darkness? They counseled and prayed together. Forward was the final, the only, word. They advanced in the darkness, and encountered a formidable body of French at the bridge, under the command of Colonel de Larrey. They heeded not a shout from the enemy to halt; they received a volley, and three fell; they rushed on the bridge, sweeping all before them. Arnaud's sharp eye saw on the other side the main body preparing to fire, and quickly cried out, "Down!" They bowed, and the volley passed over them. "Forward, the bridge is ours!" cried one of his captains, and the Vaudois leaped to their feet, and pressed onward under the fire of the whole French force. They threw themselves upon it, broke its line, and prostrated it every-where. The day, or rather the night, was gloriously won. The whole two thousand five hundred French were dispersed or killed, for no quarter could be given. "Is it possible," cried the commander, a French marquis, "that I have lost both the battle and my honor!" He escaped wounded, and was carried to Briançon. Seven hundred of the enemy lay dead on the earth when the moon, breaking through the night, enabled the victors to survey the field—one for every man of their own force. The latter had lost but fifteen killed and twelve wounded. Valor and impetuosity had made up for their lack of numbers. They had taken the camp of the enemy, and were thus supplied abundantly with ammunition and other provisions.

And now occurred a memorable scene. The Greeks erected

monumental trophies on the fields of their victories; these mountaineers cared for no such commemorations; but there, under the shadow of the everlasting hills, in the moonlight, they threw up a trophy befitting the occasion—a pyramid of all the baggage and arms of the enemy beyond what they could carry, over barrels of powder, and withdrawing, after touching a match, saw the heavens illuminated and felt the earth tremble under an explosion which sent among the heights reverberation such as the Alps probably never echoed before, nor since. It was heard, says the history, even in the city of Briançon, in France. As the echoes rolled along the mountain peaks the trumpets sounded, and the victors “threw,” writes Arnaud, “their hats toward heaven, and made the air resound with the shout, ‘Glory be to the God of armies, who hath given us the victory over all our enemies!’”

All but six of their forty hostages escaped in the confusion of this battle. The little troop needed rest, for during three days they had marched “day and night;” but there might arrive new foes at any hour; they employed, therefore, the remainder of “this glorious night to climb, by the favor of the moon, the mountain of Sci,” and penetrate to the valley of Pragelas. They would thus be in the Vaudois mountains.

They had, in one week and one day, made their way through a hostile country, through the most difficult mountain passes, through rains and snows, and through armed enemies, to the very gates of their own mountains. On the ninth day, Sunday morning, they stood far up on the heights, looking down upon Fenestrelles, and before them lay their ancient homes, their consecrated valleys, now occupied by Papists, and desecrated by more than twenty thousand French and Italian troops waiting for their coming. Arnaud ordered the force to be gathered around him, and pointed to the peaks of their beloved mountains, “exhorting them to thank God, who, after they had passed through such miraculous deliverances, permitted them once more to see their old homes.” He then offered a prayer “which animated them all anew.” Forthwith they marched down into the valley of Pragelas, and encamped before the church. Though it is the Sabbath, there is no mass to-day in all the valley, for the “priests, thinking only of their own safety, had taken to flight.” They march on toward

the valley of St. Martin, driving before them some of the dragoons of the enemy, and spend the night on the highest settled point of the Col du Pis. The next morning they discover, at the foot of the mountain, Italian troops, "well arrayed." They pause that Arnaud may pray, which he does "with loud voice and great devotion," and then they move in three columns on the enemy, who take to flight, leaving all their baggage to the Vaudois. The pass was thus opened to the strongest hold in all their mountains, the "famous Balsille," a natural mountain fortification, with but a single approach, with three almost inaccessible terraces, with caverns cut into its rocky sides, the old asylums of the persecuted mountaineers, now convenient barracks and magazines, and with fountains of good water. Hardly had they reached this important refuge when they perceived a company of Italian troops appearing in another part of the valley to hold the pass. The Vaudois rushed upon them, took them, and, after a council of war, "exhorting them to pray to God," slew them all—a half hundred men, lacking two. It was a grim, an atrocious policy, but the enemy had necessitated it by establishing it. All the Vaudois who had been taken prisoners had been immediately hanged; no rights of war were allowed them. If they were not disposed to retaliate, they nevertheless had no means of guarding their prisoners, and to release them was only to reinforce the enemy.

The twelfth day is entitled in the history the "Day of Consolation," for they advanced to Pralis, and, after burning a new Catholic chapel, took possession of one of their own old churches, and, divesting it of its Romish paraphernalia, worshiped there again the God of their fathers for the first time since their expulsion. They sung the Seventy-fourth Psalm, an appropriate war-song. Arnaud stood in the door-way, addressing them, within and without, from the One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Psalm: "Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, may Israel now say: many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, yet they have not prevailed against me. . . . Let them all be confounded and turned back that hate Zion." Arnaud writes, It was remarkable that this first public worship of the returned Vaudois was in the temple served by Pastor Leidet, who three years before was hanged

for the faith in the fort of St. Michael. The whole force sang the Psalm upon which Arnaud preached, and prepared to march onward.

On the next day, August 29, after prayer, they advanced for the valley of Luzerne, and had to pass over the Col Julian. They captured on the way the Marquis de Parelle, an important officer of the enemy. All the country was now swarming with the hostile troops. They soon met their vanguard, who shouted to them, "Come on, come on, ye barbets of the devil; we have seized all the forts, and are more than thirty thousand." But the Vaudois drove them back, charged on the fortified position of their main force, and in half an hour dispersed them all, taking their camp, baggage, and ammunition, even to the "rich habits" of their commanders, and losing but one of their own heroes, whose name the historian deems worthy to be recorded, Joshua Mandan, a "valiant man," whom they buried with honors "under a rock." The victors pursued the flying foe as far as the "Passarelles de Julien," and took and slew thirty-one of them. They found, also, the horse of the commander, with his pistols yet on the saddle; the overthrow was complete. The pursuit was continued on the next day, driving them out of Bobi, where the heroes took possession of their ancient homes, expelling the Catholic intruders who had occupied them some three years. "Thus," says Smiles, their English historian, "thus, after a lapse of only fourteen days, this little band of heroes had marched from the shores of the Lake of Geneva, by difficult mountain passes, through bands of hostile troops, which they had defeated in two severe fights, and at length reached the very center of the Vaudois valleys, and entered into possession of the promised land."

Here an impressive solemnity ensued. The next day was Sunday, September 1; a pulpit was extemporized on the rocks, and one of the pastors, (Montaux,) mounting it, preached on Luke xvi, 16. Arnaud then proclaimed "with a loud voice" an oath, to which all responded, "lifting their hands to God," and swearing "before the face of the living God and at the damnation of our souls" not to succumb, "even if reduced to three or four men," but to persist in "re-establishing the reign of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, even unto death." They stood on the hill of Silaoud, and the surrounding mountains—

the witnesses, through centuries, of the persecutions of their fathers—reverberated their chant of the Seventy-fourth Psalm, “sung to the clash of arms.”

Meanwhile they knew that their worst trials were yet before them. The enemy was pressing in upon them from all sides. It would not do for them to shut themselves up yet in any stronghold; not even in the nearly impregnable Balsille, for they could be starved out. They must march and fight through all the country; either they or the multitudinous enemy must apparently be utterly overthrown before the unparalleled struggle could end. The latter was the only alternative they thought of amid the tremendous odds. The combined armies of France and Italy were not only more than twenty thousand strong, but the Catholic peasants were impressed into their service. The little force must fight back nearly thirty-five times their own number. Their only commissariat must be foragings on the herds and stores of the Catholic usurpers of their old lands. They must fight the enemy with the enemy's own ammunition, won by incessant assaults. Never did heroes confront worse odds than those now before them. The narrator may well wax dithyrambic over such a story. But how can we go on with it in our restricted limits? We have been, thus far, gleaning only salient facts from a hundred and fifty pages of Arnaud, the pastor-colonel; more than two hundred of his most thrilling pages remain; but we have followed the gallant little army into the very heart of their old mountain homes; we can only summarize the remaining and the bravest part of their campaign.

They had struggled through half a month; they were to struggle on through nearly ten months more. “The war now became,” says Smiles, “one of reprisals and mutual devastations, the two parties seeking to deprive each other of shelter and the means of subsistence. Armies concentrated on the Vaudois from all points. They were pressed by the French on the north and west, by the Piedmontese on the south and east, furnished with all the munitions of war.” They fight from valley to valley, from cliff to cliff, “now in one place, and perhaps the next day some twenty miles across the mountains, in another, with almost invariable success. It seems little short of miraculous.” They divide their small force to carry

on the struggle in separate valleys, sometimes without knowing each other's fate for weeks together. Their clothing has become rags; they often scale heights on their hands and feet; they are sometimes famishing by lack of provisions. They take many prisoners who have to die; but one of them they discover to be a surgeon; him they spare, providentially for him and themselves; they retain him for their own wounded, and he serves them well, for he knows that instant death would be the consequence of any unfaithfulness. At another time, while Arnaud is praying, the sentinels see the enemy moving to secure a necessary post on the mountain of Vachère; the pastor abridges his prayer, and sends a detachment, who "made such diligence and bore themselves so well that they gained the post in the face of the enemy, slaying a hundred of them without losing a man." At one time their leader, Arnaud, is separated from them and seems lost, but "after praying three times with six soldiers who remain with him, he is able to re-join the band on the mountain of Vendalin." His fellow-pastor, Montaux, is not so fortunate; he is captured and sent to prison in Turin, where he languished till the end of the war.

A sadder trial came upon them; most of the French Vaudois gave up in despair, and retired with Turrel, their chief, down into France. Turrel had been the nominal head of the army, though Arnaud was its real leader, its Leonidas. The retreating band were nearly all captured by the enemy, and killed or sent to the galleys, where they and their leader perished. Smiles can almost apologize for them. "Flesh and blood," he says, "could not endure such toil and privations much longer. No wonder that the faint-hearted began to despair." But the Italian Vaudois knew no despair. Arnaud prayed and preached on, and their diminished numbers fought on and conquered almost from day to day.

Winter was at hand, and they must provide for it. They cut their way through the enemy toward their ancient stronghold of the Balsille. They never could have reached it again had it not been for their knowledge of the mountain passes, and their ability to climb; the enemy was waiting for them in all the surrounding valleys, but they scaled the intervening heights by night, and stood in the dawn on the Balsille, above all the hostile hosts.

Here they immediately laid in provisions by foraging on the neighboring farms, and prepared for the winter and for their fiercest struggle. They made stronger every point of their naturally strong position by barricades and intrenchments one above the other. The winter begins early in these mountains, and lasts long; it was now November; it is difficult for armies to operate at any time in the valleys; it was now next to impossible; but the honor of two great sovereigns was concerned in the desperate struggle; among their troops were regiments who had won distinction on historic fields; they were led by eminent officers, who were mortified by the superior valor and success of these "devil's barbets;" and, above all, the faith was dishonored. It would not do to give up, and the contest went on more or less amid the indescribable horrors of an Alpine winter. "Through six months the Vaudois beat back every force that was sent against them." Arnaud "preached twice," says the history, "every Sunday, and once every Thursday, and prayed with them every morning and evening, very seriously, all kneeling with their faces on the earth." "They had an unshakable resolution to await with firm foot the enemy, and to no more fatigue themselves in waudering from mountain to mountain, as they had done." The repeated assaults of the enemy failing, they had to retire to Maneille and Perier for a season, confounded and profoundly chagrined. They burned all the houses and barns around, to deprive the Vaudois of provisions, and cried in departing, "You shall see us again at Easter." The Vaudois, now only four hundred, by the absence of some of their brethren in a distant valley, "commenced to respire again." "They could say with reason," adds Arnaud, "that the eternal God had declared himself for them."

Meanwhile favorable overtures are made to them, but they know too well the treachery of the enemy to accept them. They send out frequent detachments for forage; they slay the enemy at his outposts and burn his outer barracks. At last, on April 30, 1690, while Arnaud is preaching, the foe is seen thronging up the valley and on all the neighboring summits. Their position was entirely surrounded. The struggle was recommenced "under the directions of General Catinat in person." "The enemy," says Arnaud, "to the number of twenty-two thousand, (ten thousand French, and twelve thousand Ital-

ians,) sent a detachment of five hundred men, selected by Catinat to open the attack. On May 2 they reached the first bastion, which had been covered with prostrate trees. They supposed that they had only to draw away the trees and their way would be clear, but they found them made sure by heavy stones. Then commenced so grand a fire from the Vaudois that they prostrated the assailants to the earth. It was a thing surprising, the hail-storm of balls which filled the air; the younger Vaudois recharged the arms, while the older fired, in-somuch that there was a continual fire, abyssing the enemy, "while a snow-storm played upon them." At last the Vaudois made a sortie, and slew the whole assaulting column except ten or twelve, who escaped without hats or arms to report their defeat to the mortified Catinat. "We must sleep in these barracks to-night," had said in the morning their commander, Colonel de Parat; he was now wounded and taken prisoner, and, after being kept some time in the Balsille, was put to death. The enemy lost a colonel, a lieutenant-colonel, and other officers—twenty in all. Not a single Vaudois was killed or wounded on this "bloody day," as Arnaud calls it. "The French retreated in astonishment to Macee; the Piedmontese, who had been spectators of the bravery of the Vaudois, holding their only way of escape, retired to Champ la Salse." Arnaud preached after the victory, the tears flowing from his eyes, and his flock weeping around him.

General Catinat was not willing to risk his honor by risking another defeat; he was hoping for the marshal's baton, and it evidently could never be earned here; he committed the desperate work to the Marquis de Fenguieres, who determined on thorough measures, and was saluted beforehand as "the conqueror of the barbets." By May 12 the position of the Vaudois was again surrounded; the neighboring mountains were planted with artillery completely commanding it, and threatening to batter it to fragments; all the outletting valleys were occupied. Five corps of disciplined troops bore down upon it, each man preceded by a pioneer, who bore for him a protection against the fire of the Vaudois. The day of consummate trial for the little corps had now come, and they could fully appreciate it; but they swerved not; God had been with them, would he now desert them? They could see no way of escape, but

had it not seemed that the angels of heaven had protected them, that the very "stars had fought for them in their courses," and could they not still expect miraculous deliverance? A French writer, in contemplating their condition, says, "We know not in all history a more striking illustration of the phrase, 'Nothing is impossible to him that believeth.' Faith transformed them into heroes, and rendered them invincible." Each man knew that defeat now meant death for each. Yet no man spoke of capitulation. The Marquis de Fenguieres, having arranged all his positions for an overwhelming attack, again sent overtures to them. "What is your demand?" asked the Vaudois of the messenger. "That you surrender at once," was the reply; "if you do so, you shall be accorded passports to a foreign country, and five hundred *louis d'or* each; if you do not you must all perish." "That shall be as the Lord will," was their answer. The commander wrote to Arnaud again, offering favorable terms, but declaring that if they were declined every man taken alive should be hanged. Arnaud wrote back: "We are not under your French king; he is not master of this country; we can make no treaty with your messieurs; we are in the heritage that our fathers have possessed in all times, and we shall, by the help of the Lord God of armies, live and die here, should there remain only ten men of us. If your cannon fire, our rocks will not be frightened, and we know how to return your fire." That very night the Vaudois made a sortie, slaying a number of the enemy. The marquis ordered his guns to be pointed on Mont Guigneverte, his most formidable position, and hung out a white flag, and soon after a red one, to signify that there would be no hope after he began to fire. Finally, on May 14, the guns began to play destructively upon the Vaudois' position; it had been gallantly held for nearly seven months, but the rocky defenses were now crumbling under powerful artillery. The assailing columns attacked the Vaudois at three points, "pouring upon us," says Arnaud, "an incessant hail-storm, so thick that, after a hundred thousand shot, we had to abandon our lowest terrace." It was no longer tenable, but they ascended to a higher one, under protection of a thick mist, which saved them from the fire of a redoubt, which might have swept them to destruction. They fought on till nightfall, but it was now seen that the



stronghold would be battered into ruins and overwhelmed; they must escape or be lost. How to escape was the question. They were encompassed by tens of thousands of troops and hostile peasants; all known passes were occupied by the enemy; if seen the next day attempting to escape, their little troop could be instantly annihilated. "The night fires of the enemy," writes Arnaud, "were blazing all around; the obstacles seemed invincible. In fine, we saw that the hand of God could alone deliver us. Committing ourselves to him, we learned very soon that he who had rescued us from so many dangers had now led us into this extremity only the better to show in what manner he could save us." One of their number was a native of this very region; he reported to them that he knew a solitary and very perilous path through which he might be able to guide them. The enemy's watch-fires enabled him to see from the Balsille that there was no other outlet for them. "It was," says the history, "along a frightful precipice." But how were they to get out of the Balsille and reach it, under the universal fire which they might expect from the enemy? "Precisely," says Arnaud, "at the moment which seemed fatal with a cruel and appalling death, a thick mist (such is common in these mountains) fell upon them," and rendered their movements invisible to the enemy. They marched silently out of the Balsille, under their mountain guide, Captain Paulat—"under the protection," continues Arnaud, "of heaven and the guidance of this brave captain." Stealthily they crept along the precipice of the ravine, "on hands and knees, taking hold of shrubs to rest at moments and take breath; those in front carefully feeling the way with feet and hands to be sure of safe footing." Paulat had to order them to take off their shoes, lest the enemy's outposts should hear them, for they had to pass close by some of these. A slight noise actually brought back the challenge of a sentinel, "Who goes there?" It was a critical moment for them; they maintained breathless silence, and the sentinel, hearing no reply, supposed he had deceived himself, and did not repeat his *qui vive*. They pressed forward, scaling a part of the Guigneverte, and drawing toward Salse—the friendly mist still covering them until ten o'clock in the morning, when they were out of danger. They had encountered an outpost of the enemy on a slope of the Guigneverte, but

the alarmed soldiers fled in all haste to their main force: for no one knew what to make of them, all supposing the Vaudois to be hermetically sealed up and doomed in the Balsille. Unutterable was the mortification of the French when, at the rising of the mist, they approached the Balsille to take it, and found that their expected prey had all escaped. "Looking," says Smiles, "across the valley, far off, they saw the fugitives thrown into relief by the snow, amid which they marched like ants, apparently making for the mass of the central Alps." The enemy had written to the city of Pignerol that they might look there for the Vaudois as prisoners to be hanged the next day: the expectant people saw arrive instead only wagons loaded with wounded and dying.

This was the grand crisis of the *Glorieuse Rentrée*—its climax. After many fights in most of the valleys, after repeatedly hurling back the combined forces of Italy and France from the Balsille, through long months, they still stood triumphant on their mountain tops.

No man of them could now doubt that the God of armies was leading them, and would lead them, however mysteriously, to a successful issue. And yet they could discern no signs of that issue. Their country was still thronged with armed enemies. They themselves were but a handful—though apparently invincible. What next? was the anxious question. But that belonged to the responsibility of their Divine Commander. They must leave it to him: what they had to do was still to pray, march, and fight. They go on, mounting precipices by steps which they cut in the hard snow. On the summit of Mont Galmon they pause for rest, review their forces, and, sending their sick and wounded under care of a surgeon to a secret shelter, descend hastily into concealment in the woods of Serreleni to await the night. Another thick mist providentially covering them, they resume their march, and attain a height: where they expected to find water with which to boil their food, for they have fasted long: but there is none there. "Heaven," says Arnaud, "seeing our need, compassionately sent us rain." The next day, having early extinguished their fires that the enemy might not discover them, they advance to Prafen, where they conceal themselves in deserted barns for rest, but without daring to make fires; there, after prayer by Arnaud, a spy is

sent out to see if troops are near; he finds them at Rodaret. Another fog favoring them, they hasten forward; at intervals, when it breaks, they lie extended on the earth till it thickens again, and thus make their way to Fayet by midnight, having "suffered incredible pains, creeping along dangerous precipices, and holding on to bushes to prevent falls into the abysses."

They afterward descended into the village of Rûa, where they found the enemy with all the inhabitants intrenched in the church cemetery. Arnaud led an attack upon them, slaying fifty-seven, taking their commander, the Sieur de Vignaux, and three lieutenants, prisoners, and burning down the village. The Vaudois supplied themselves here abundantly with cattle, and marched on to the mountain of Angrogone. There, with no apparent end to their perplexities and conflicts, but equally no end to their resolution, astonishing news reached them. The God in whom alone they trusted had confounded all their enemies. The two sovereigns who had combined to exterminate them, given up to "judicial blindness," had quarreled, and had declared war against each other. A strange, an incredible providence it at first seemed, even to these praying heroes, whose faith, like their valor, had hitherto seemed superior to any surprise. Now messages were sent from each hostile party, entreating their alliance and aid. They took sides with their own sovereign, badly as he had treated them. The Italian officers were soon with them, hearty in congratulations and friendship. The remainder of their fighting was side by side with their late Italian foes, against the French, and it was not long before they swept the latter out of all their mountains. Arnaud hastened down into Italy, to the camp of his sovereign, where he was received with honors. All the Vaudois prisoners, both in the mountains and below, were set free and rejoined their brethren to fight the French; "and our joy was redoubled," says the history, "when one of them brought word that, among other kind things said to them by the duke, he assured them that henceforth they might preach their faith every-where, even in his capital of Turin." "It is the work of God," exclaimed Arnaud; "to him alone be the glory!" "Eight persons out of every ten who hear these surprising and miraculous things will," he later wrote, "consider them as fables and tales of the old times."

A remarkable historic coincidence had been taking place. William of Orange, the friend of these heroes, had ascended the throne of England, and, while they were confounding with miracles of faith and valor the troops of the royal author of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in these mountain heights, their Huguenot brethren, refugees from France, led by Marshal Schomberg, himself a refugee, were fighting for William, in Ireland, against the attempt of Louis XIV. to restore the Stuarts and Popery in England. On the very day in which Arnaud stood in the camp of his reconciled sovereign, the representative of his delivered people, the battle of the Boyne was fought, July 1, and the hopes of the Stuart dynasty extinguished forever.

On July 5 Arnaud was in the capital, Turin, and wrote to a friend in Switzerland: "His royal highness gives us complete liberty, and desires only the peace of the country. We wish, therefore, all our people immediately to return. Great miracles has God wrought for us in the last ten months. None but he alone knows, or ever can know, the struggles we have had, the horrible combats; but our enemies have failed; when they supposed we were theirs, the great God of armies has always given us the victory. We have not lost thirty men in these battles; our enemies have lost about ten thousand."

Their friends and most of the outer world had known little or nothing of their fate during much of the time, but supposed they must perish. One of them, who had kept a journal of their movements, had been captured and sent to prison in Turin. His journal was secretly conveyed to Switzerland, and excited such enthusiasm that an army of a thousand Protestants, ambitious to share in their heroic deeds, was soon moving to fight its way to them in the mountains; but it failed, and was not needed.

The victorious mountaineers had sustained at least eighteen distinct attacks. But three hundred and sixty-seven of them held the Balsille during the eight months' siege, "shut in," says Arnaud, "by ten thousand French and twelve thousand Piedmontese, living on little bread and herbs," hurling back assault after assault, and at last escaping, "when the enemy had provided executioners and mules loaded with cords in order to hang them."

But the trial was over; the *Glorieuse Rentrée* was accom-

plished. The "Israel of the Alps" was saved. The Vaudois families returned from Switzerland, Germany, Holland. Their temples and schools were re-opened, and their mountains echoed again their ancient hymns. Their own sovereign, suffering at first reverses in his war below, had to fly to them for refuge, and was loyally protected in their valleys. Their Catholic country had reason to be proud of them. In 1848 a petition was signed by Cavour, Balbo, d'Azeglio, and hosts of other Italian patriots, demanding and procuring their complete enfranchisement, for they were among the best citizens and best soldiers of the country. With the emancipation and unification of Italy they commenced what seems to be their great destination and mission, the design of their unparalleled history—the evangelization of the peninsula. They have been marching down from their mountains, planting Churches and schools all over the land, from Piedmont to Sicily, from Genoa to Venice. They have chapels, Sunday-schools, week-day schools, charity schools, hospitals, a printing-house, a theological seminary, and periodicals. Palaces have been given them for their theological school and printing operations, and, in some cases, for chapels. They have districted the whole country into five sections, that of Rome and Naples comprising eleven stations. They are the most legitimate religious reformers of Italy. Their remarkable story affords a lesson to the Church in all the world and for all ages. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches."

ART. II.—EQUATORIAL AFRICA.

LONG: *Central Africa*. Harpers. 1877.

CAMERON: *Across Africa*. Harpers. 1877.

STANLEY: *Through the Dark Continent*. Harpers. 1878.

AMONG the most recent books on Central Africa are the three placed at the head of this article. The first two might be characterized as records of failure as to the objects proposed, yet both furnish agreeable reading and valuable information. Neither Long nor Cameron added much to what readers of Burton, Speke, and Livingstone already knew about Victoria and Tanganyika lakes, and Stanley superseded both with later and fuller

information; yet the observations of both have a comparative value as confirming or differing from the pages of Livingstone, Stanley, Baker, and Linant.

C. Chaille Long is an American—Southern, Frenchized, Egyptized, *jeune et brave*, an officer in the Egyptian army, “more a soldier than a *savant*,” “chief of staff to the expedition of Colonel Gordon, Governor-General of the Equatorial Provinces,” “the territories surrounding the Victoria and Albert lakes,” “annexed to Egypt” by Baker in 1872, after the most approved style of English and American annexation (or appropriation) of the lands of the semi-civilized or savage. In the spring of 1874 official duty called him, in company with Colonel Gordon, to Gondokoro, where, after the return of his chief, he philanthropically determined to gratify “the impatient desire of the world to know something of that mysterious region, the source of the Nile,” “to connect the two lakes, Victoria and Albert, the unfinished work of Captain Speke,” and to “visit and confer with that great African king, Mtésa or M'Tsé, of whom only vague accounts had been given by Speke.”—P. 36. It is six hundred miles from Gondokoro to Victoria Nyanza the first two hundred and fifty of which, to the frontier outposts Fatiko and Foueira, he had military escort. This far Baker had penetrated. Beyond this Long wended his way almost alone, with one indifferent white companion, two black soldiers, and a few porters, to the capital of Uganda, on the northern shore of the now famous lake. He traveled during the rainy season, and his account of his fifty-eight days' trip is as lugubrious as the season. His itinerary runs, “rain and misery by day, and misery and rain by night;” “perpetual rain, fever, and misery;” “the route lay, day after day, through rain, bog, slime, and marshy earth, ravine, and slough, from whence the foulest odors arose, that nearly asphyxiated us.” He “cannot concur in Sir S. Baker's eulogy of the Fatiko country as the ‘Paradise of Central Africa.’” He has “never seen in all Africa any views of landscape that merit notice except the scenery on Lake Victoria Nyanza.” “Central Africa is a deadly, pestiferous country (“a hell on earth,” he says in one place) in spite of the ‘trumbash’ to the contrary of travelers,” who “bid for sympathy for the negro”—“a popular theme”—and who “must ‘keep up with the procession,’ though

it be at the sacrifice of truth." Much of the book wears this tone of bilious depreciation of Africa, of the negro, of other travelers, of the efforts of African philanthropists, of things in general, except self, of whom, on all suitable occasions, the author is, of course, modestly laudatory. To captivate our candor he titles his volume "Naked Truths of Naked People," oblivious to the fact that the civilized have no special fondness for nakedness, but prefer, like the natives of Uganda, to see full dress, and do not object to a traveler's furnishing a reasonable amount of clothing to hard realities. Nature riots in imaginings, and clothes creation with a thousand deceptive appearances in motions, parallaxes, refractions, and complementary colorings. Long himself colors or rough-sketches, clothes or leaves naked, as suits his subject or his humor.

There is a good deal of good reading in his easy, unpretending narrative, open as it is to criticism. Why he should call the Mississippi muddy and the Missouri limpid, (p. 23,) or write Uganda when every other author has Ugannda, is not evident. That he knew nothing of the beautifully ingenious structure of the languages of Central Africa, affording by a few simple sound-prefixes to words an infallible key to their meaning, would be no disparagement to him and no blemish to his book had he not unfortunately attempted, on page 119, to enlighten his readers on this subject. "The Ugannda," he says, calling the people of the country by the name of their country, "prefix M—M'Ugannda, to designate the 'country of.'" (!)

The most cursory reader of books on Africa that have been for a dozen years before the English-speaking public knows that "U" prefixed signifies "country of;" "Wa" prefixed means "people of;" "M" prefixed, "a person of;" "Ki" prefixed, "language of." Take an example from Speke, and find a similar one in Stanley, "Through the Dark Continent," vol. ii, Appendix: "Ugogo signifies the country of Gogo; Wagogo means the people of Gogo; Mgogo is a man of Gogo; Kigogo, the language of Gogo."

The differences between Long and Stanley in putting Uganda words into English letters, or the endeavor to express African sounds by English vowels and consonants, are no greater, perhaps, than those of the inextricable jumble of orthographies given to Indian words by the first settlers of this country, or to

Chinese words by the makers of Anglo-Chinese vocabularies. Besides the vocal differences that no written signs can express, there is, in human hearing and in human judgment of phonetic differences, something that is analogous to color-blindness, which wholly incapacitates some individuals for distinguishing sounds and rendering them into their nearest English equivalents. Comparing Long's vocabulary of "Uganda" words with Stanley's after the above abortive attempt at philology, we should naturally incline to give Stanley's the preference.

We smile when he writes, on his arrival at the court of the sable chieftain, Rionga, "At night a dance was given in my honor," with as much complacent gravity as if he were reporting a grand ball in honor of an ambassador of the Khedive at the Court of St. James; but he taxes our credulity when he would have us believe that the Emperor of Uganda struck off thirty heads, by his executioners, "to crown in blood the signal honor of the white man's visit to M'tsé!"

We are obliged to Colonel Long—breveted "colonel" by the Khedive for his valor and enterprise—for some glimpses along the Nile made familiar by other voyagers, from Khar-toom to Gondokoro, and from Gondokoro to Lake Victoria, ground traversed in part by Burton, Speke, and Baker, as well as for confirmation of Schweinfurth in the West, on the Mittoo and Niam-Niam.

In June, 1874, Long made his entrance into "Uganda," where, being the first man ever seen on horseback, he was regarded, like Cortez in Mexico, a veritable centaur. Speke and Grant visited this despot of Central Africa in 1862, twelve years earlier, and Stanley and Linant in 1875, ten months later. Here, then, we reach ground where comparison is possible. As long as a traveler describes regions and tribes which he alone has seen we have no means of testing the accuracy of his statements. Here we have descriptions of Uganda and likenesses of the "son of Suna" by different hands, bearing a general resemblance, but colored and shaded according to the taste of the individual artist, and displaying the relative powers of the limners for sketching and picturing.

February 19, 1862, Speke writes: "One march more, and we came in sight of the king's palace. It was a magnificent sight,

a whole hill covered with gigantic huts such as I had never before seen in Africa."

June 20, 1874, Long says: "Ascending a high hill, I stood facing an elevation not five hundred yards away, the palace of M'tsé, King of Ugunda."

April 10, 1875, Stanley says: "We saw the capital, crowning the summit of a smooth rounded hill, a large cluster of tall, conical grass huts, in the center of which rose a spacious, lofty, barn-like structure. The large building was the palace, the cluster of huts the imperial capital."

Speke, the first white visitor to this capital, in the youth and regency of this usurping and bloody chieftain, was assigned to remote and uncomfortable huts outside of the royal premises, and had great difficulty in getting near the court, perhaps on account of mingled fear and jealousy of so singular a visitor. Mtesa is now better acquainted with white men. Long and Stanley, with their suites, seem to have been at once assigned to pleasant quarters within the royal inclosure. The semi-civilization of this born barbarian, his aroused ideas, his rude reachings after something better and higher, his desire to learn, his anxiety to know about every thing foreign, seem to have impressed most profoundly the few travelers who have hitherto visited him. Each has given us a pen portrait. Speke penciled him, Stanley photographed him, and wood-cuts have made us as familiar with his form and features as we are with Schweinfurth's King Munsa. Speke, at his first interview with African royalty, describes "a good-looking, well-figured, tall young man of twenty-five." Long's portrayal is, "A man of majestic mien, scarcely thirty-five years of age; more than six feet high; face nervous, but expressive of intelligence; large, restless eye, from which a gleam of fierce brutality beams out that mars an otherwise sympathetic expression; features regular; complexion a light copper tint." Stanley pictures the "foremost man of Central Africa," at first meeting, as "a tall, clean-faced, nervous-looking, thin man, probably six feet one inch high, and slender; intelligent, agreeable features; fullness of lips; general expression of amiability blended with dignity; large, lustrous, lambent eyes; color dark red-brown; of a wonderfully smooth surface; interested in the manners and customs of European courts, and enamored of the wonders of civilization;

ambitious to imitate the ways of the white man, according to the best of his ability." Long betrays jealousy and is guilty of injustice when he says "only vague accounts" were given of Mtésa by Captain Speke. The discoverer of Victoria Nyanza, Ripon Falls, and the lacustrine sources of the Nile, spent over four months of chafing captivity with this capricious chief, and devotes over one third of a volume of five hundred and fifty pages to a minute diary of his stay in Uganda.

Long was there one month; let him tell us how: "Ill and helpless;" "so weak as to be scarcely able to walk; flesh nearly transparent; once muscular arms and legs mere skin and bone." Arrived June 21, and on the 25th "ill and suffering, and, supported by two soldiers, responded to a pressing invitation of M'tsé to go to the (straw) palace." So sick as to be unable to stand, he was invited to sit in the presence of the king, "an honor never before accorded to any mortal!" On the 29th, "fever and dysentery merged into delirium;" "till the 6th of July unable to move from my hammock." Is it any wonder that he dipped his pen in the bile of his own liver, and wrote, "The country has nothing, absolutely nothing, of that grand and magnificent spectacle depicted by the pens of some enthusiastic travelers, who would make, to willing readers, a paradise of Africa, which is, and must ever be, a grave-yard to Europeans?"

Long's great object was to get to the lake. Speke and Grant had seen it at a distance, and skirted its edges, but no white man had been permitted to survey it or to float freely on its bosom. Mtésa at last granted his request, and rounded off his permission with the butchery of seven men, "the bloody price paid that the world might know something of this mysterious region!" It is hard to believe this. Livingstone did not credit Speke's reports about the bloody brutality of Mtésa, and Long takes credit to himself for vindicating Speke at the expense of Livingstone.

Like all Asiatic and African despots from the earliest times, Mtésa held public court, daily or periodically, and the subjects of the autocrat were brought before him for judgments, accused of various crimes, as before a police judge holding his court in London or New York city. No troublesome jury intervened; there was seldom any defense attempted or allowed,

the interval between the accusation and the sentence, and between the sentence and its execution, was brief, often only a moment. Fines and imprisonments were rare; capital punishments for what we deem venial offenses were rife, as under the Jewish or old English law. Long's hallucination, fostered by lying interpreters, was connecting all these executions of public offenders, State criminals, with himself!

There is no doubt that but little value is set upon human life in Africa; no doubt that power of life and death is regarded as one of the prerogatives of royalty by both kings and people. Mtesa told Speke he had "killed a hundred in a single day." Men, women, officers and private subjects, wives, concubines, were ordered to execution for trifling offenses. On one occasion the impatient king "took upon himself the executioner's duty, fired at a sentenced woman, and killed her outright." In Speke's time, when firearms were new to him, he "gave a loaded carbine to a page and told him to go out and shoot a man in the outer court," a wanton "affair that created hardly any interest." Long, to show how little progress Stanley had made in civilizing and christianizing this heathen monarch, quotes Linant as saying that after the departure of Stanley the brutal "Mtesa, to show the accuracy of his aim, leveled his gun deliberately at one of his female attendants and blew her brains out!"

As the outcome of a good deal of urging and petitioning, Long was at length allowed to spend a day or two on the lake. "Twelve hundred men were detailed to escort me." Was this a traveler's guess, or did he see the muster-roll of this merry regiment? In vain he tried to induce the racing blacks to row across the lake. "Weak and in an almost dying condition," he could not break away from his escort and solve the lake question alone, and so its solution was delayed for another year and reserved for another hand.

Colonel Long made some interesting observations on his way back to Foucira, and sums up "the following results, submitted [by him] to the Government of Egypt."

1. "M't-é, King of Ugunda, had been visited, and the proud African monarch made a willing subject, [astounding statement!] and his country, rich in ivory and populous, created the southern limit of Egypt!" [Annexation with a venge-

ance! entering a man's house as a guest, and claiming his premises as your own!]

2. "The Lake Victoria Nyanza had been partially explored; not thoroughly, owing to my helpless and almost dying condition at the time."

Nyanza explored! Much as a hospital patient would explore Cape Cod bay or the Chesapeake by paddling a day in the harbor of Boston or Baltimore!

The sum of this Americano-Egyptian traveler's observations is that "Central Africa is no paradise, but a plague-spot, and that the negro, the product of this pestilential region, is a miserable wretch, often devoid of all tradition or belief in a Deity, which enthusiastic travelers have endeavored to endow him with. This is the naked truth, in contradiction to all those clap-trap pæans which are sung of this benighted country."

From these dismal views we turn to the more hopeful Stanley. His title is shadowy—"Through the Dark Continent"—but his pages are sunshine. Few men are more sanguine, cheery, and full of abounding life, than Henry M. Stanley. The exuberance of his spirits communicates itself to his style, which is rather that of the off-hand newspaper reporter than of the thoughtful book-maker for the reading of thoughtful men. Descriptive, overflowing with good feeling, conversational, declamatory, dramatic, and poetic by turns, his is just the style for popular use, while the grand achievements to which he was providentially led would atone for any defect in the telling, and make stupidity itself eloquence. His "tale would cure deafness."

The definite settlement of the Nile sources, the open problem of twenty centuries, and the determination of the course of the Congo, known only at its mouth for the last four hundred years, are the great geographical feats of the century. They place Stanley in the first rank of explorers. A traveler needs two things—power to see, and power to make others see what he has seen; and both these Stanley possesses in a remarkable degree. Favorable circumstances and a rare combination of personal endowments have made of a New York newspaper reporter the foremost African discoverer of the age. A holiday expedition with General Napier to Magdala, the mountain

stronghold of the fierce Theodore in 1868, his trip in search of Livingstone to Ujiji in 1871, his venturous raid with Sir Garnet Wolseley into malarial Coomassie in 1873, were Stanley's apprenticeship in African travel, customs, climate, and adventure.

It is one of the incidents of the times that an enterprise which in former times would have required the patronage of royalty and princely treasures was boldly undertaken by a couple of daily newspapers. Bennett, of the "Herald," spent twenty thousand dollars in the expedition to find Livingstone. In May, 1873, Livingstone died on the southern shore of Lake Bangweolo,* and a year later his remains were buried in Westminster Abbey. Stanley was one of the pall-bearers at the funeral, and here we have the inception of his last great enterprise. The first few sentences of "Through the Dark Continent" tell the story of the inspiration, how he caught the falling mantle of his revered predecessor and model. Livingstone was Stanley's ideal moral hero. All through his volumes one cannot help noticing how thoroughly the sturdy Scotchman had impressed himself upon the sanguine and enthusiastic young American. The half-divine man of your imagination draws to himself your love and reverence, molds your being, shapes your future, invests your spirit with his spirit, becomes one of whom you think at every new fork in the highway of life, and of whom you ask, as Stanley was ever asking of Livingstone, "What would he think of my course, and which road would he in similar circumstances have chosen?" Stanley writes: "Livingstone was dead, and the effect which this news had upon me was to fire me with a resolution to complete his work. I bought over a hundred and thirty books on Africa, and studied the subject night and day with the zeal of a living interest and the understanding of one who had already been four times on the continent."

Zeal is infectious, and the editor of the "London Daily Telegraph" caught a portion of Stanley's enthusiasm, the result of which was consultation with the "New York Herald," and the origination of an expedition with three specific objects in view: 1. To explore and map Lake Victoria Nyanza, and con-

* Long, with his accustomed accuracy in African matters, writes the name of Lake Bamba "Eageolowe."

nect its waters with the Nile, not by hearsay and conjecture, as heretofore, but by positive information. 2. To finish the coast circuit of Lake Tanganyika, and settle the question of outlet. 3. To follow Livingstone's Lualaba, and see whether it eventuated in the Nile, in the sands of the desert, in some central lake, or in the Congo, each of which had been conjectured or foretold by easy-chair, stay-at-home geographers, whom Livingstone sarcastically calls "theoretical discoverers" and Speke "hypothetical humbugs." No expedition, except perhaps Baker's, at the expense of the creditors of the lavish Khedive, was ever more generously fitted out. For his march to Ujiji, in 1871, Stanley started with six tons of African pocket money, wire, cloth, beads, etc., loads for one hundred and sixty porters. In 1874 the total weight of goods, stores, tents, ammunition, boat and fixtures, photographic apparatus, scientific instruments, and articles too numerous to mention, was over eighteen thousand pounds, nine tons, requiring three hundred carriers. In the absence of the trained elephant, buffalo, giraffe, zebra, Africa's own hints at future burden-bearers, human porters, supplemented by a few asses, are the traveler's only dependence, his prime necessity. In the Anglo-American expedition, as it set out from the coast, were six riding asses, five dogs, thirty-six women, wives of porters or soldiers, ten boys, three Europeans, Fred. Barker, Frank and Edward Poccocke, (Thames boatmen,) soldiers, and porters—in all three hundred and fifty-six souls. Stanley is his own historian. Making all due allowance for the sanguine pen of a good-natured, good-hearted, imaginative young man, bubbling over with philanthropy and thoroughly saturated with reverence for Livingstone, bound to make the best of every thing and to tell the best side of every story, the reader of Stanley cannot help feeling, in view of what he accomplishes, that he is a born organizer, a brave and skillful leader, Bonapartish in rapid decision, energy and skill, and Wellingtonian in his power and management of detail. With all the resources of modern science and invention at his disposal, he is to act the scientific explorer; to mark the course and rate of travel; the course, depth, and velocity of rivers; the geology, geography, botany, and natural history of the countries traversed: he has to be astronomer, linguist, photographer, cartographer, meteorologist, journalist,

doctor, nurse, director of all, sympathizer with all, father of all, brains for all. Above all, he is to bear a charmed life, one of those favored ones whom Providence permits to open new doors to human knowledge, who succeed where others have failed, and who are immortal till their special mission is accomplished. Discovery is successional. Revelation is an eternal process. Not to any one man is it vouchsafed to turn more than a single leaf, to show his fellows more than a single new page. Livingstone, the prince of African explorers, spent as many years on the continent as others spent months, and died, a veteran, with his hands full of works completed, and as many problems unsolved. Neither Livingstone nor Cameron could get beyond Nyangwé. Stanley was commissioned to bear a torch "through the Dark Continent." The five small maps with which his volume opens tell the whole story of African discovery for the last two hundred years. They show how crude were our ideas of inner Africa down to the last twenty years, and how rapidly discoveries have multiplied within that period.

Starting from Bagamoyo November 17, 1874, Stanley followed the beaten track toward Ujiji till he reached Ugogo, two hundred and eighty miles from Zanzibar, and then (January 1, 1875) struck off to the north-east, in the direction of the Victoria Nyanza. Here the expedition met the first severe penalties of African travel. "The cold winds, chilly atmosphere, feverish feeling, the extortions of the natives and their insolence, all combine to render the land of Ugogo hateful and bitter to the mind."—Vol. ii, p. 517. Just two months from the date of starting they experienced their first severe reverse in the death of young Edward Poocke. A week later, in the midst of sore famine and distressing sickness, they were attacked by the natives of Ituru, and lost twenty-one men in a single day. Stanley prefaces his account of this "three days' fight" with the remark, often repeated in substance, "We were strong disciples of the doctrine of forbearance, for it seemed to me then as if Livingstone had taught it to me only the day before."

The 27th of February they entered a "wretched-looking, rude village" on the borders of the lake, where, after making his men comfortable in camp, under the control of Fred. Barker and Frank Poocke, and enlisting a crew for the "Lady

Alice" of ten men and a steersman, Stanley boldly set out on a voyage to trace the outline of the unknown lake. Coasting along the southern shore, the first important object was the mouth of the Shimeeyu River, "the extreme southern reach of the Nile waters." The total length of this southern and second principal affluent of the Nyanza, "as laid out on the chart, is three hundred miles, which gives the course of the Nile a length of four thousand two hundred miles: making it the second longest river in the world." The whole of the month of March was consumed in coasting along the eastern and north-eastern portion of the lake, and, after a variety of adventures and a skirmish or two with hostile natives, the voyagers reached Ripon Falls and saw the northern outlet of the lake into the Nile, and shortly after entered Uganda, the empire of Mtesa, where, says Stanley, the voyager "is as safe and as free from care as though he were in the most civilized State in Europe."

Mtesa and his subjects appear to have been a genuine surprise to Stanley, and his stay and seven months' acquaintance with this "extraordinary monarch and extraordinary people" an agreeable episode, quite unexpected, and not thought of in his original programme. After months of intercourse with pure barbarians, scantily clothed or absolutely naked, armed with spears or bows and arrows only, he comes suddenly upon "six beautiful canoes," manned with rowers "dressed in white," the commander arrayed in "a bead head-dress, above which a long cock's feather waved, and a snowy white and long-haired goat-skin, while a crimson robe depending from his shoulders completed his full dress." "As we neared the beach volleys of musketry burst out from long lines of military dressed in crimson and black and snowy white, while two hundred or three hundred heavily loaded guns announced to all around that the white man had landed." "Numerous kettle and bass drums sounded a noisy welcome, and flags and banners and bannerets waved," and "thousands of people" "gave a great shout." He is naturally "very much amazed at all this ceremonious and pompous greeting."

Linant's reception, a week later, described by himself, was similar to Stanley's. "On entering the court of Mtesa's palace I am greeted with a frightful uproar, a thousand instruments,

each one more outlandish than the other, produce most discordant and deafening sounds." "At each pillar of the grand reception-room a narrow hall, sixty feet long by fifteen feet wide, stands one of the king's guard, wearing a long red mantle, a white turban ornamented with monkey skin, white trousers, and black blouse with a red band. All are armed with guns."

Long, gotten up in "gold lace" "tunic and red pantaloons," a "howling swell," and mounted, "was greeted by shouts of enthusiasm, that were re-echoed by the distant hills now covered with human beings," and, "at the head of an immense *cortège*, preceded by banners and music and the general-in-chief of the army, proceeded to the royal palace, where he was met by Mtesa, "dressed in a long cloak, the texture of blue cloth, trimmed with gold; around his head, in graceful folds, was wound a white turban; his waist encircled by a belt in gold, richly wrought, from which is suspended a Turkish cimeter; his feet encased in sandals of Moorish pattern procured from Zanzibar." "The din and noise from horn and drum were deafening."

On his first introduction to this extraordinary monarch Stanley's enthusiasm was kindled to flame. The same evening he wrote in his diary, what subsequent intercourse seemed to him fully to confirm, "Mtesa has impressed me as being an intelligent and distinguished prince, who, if aided in time by virtuous philanthropists, will do more for Central Africa than fifty years of Gospel teaching unaided by such authority can do. I think I see in him the light that shall lighten the darkness of this benighted region; a prince well worthy the most hearty sympathies that Europe can give him. In this man I see the possible fruition of Livingstone's hopes, for with his aid the civilization of Equatorial Africa becomes possible."

In his diary on the spot, in letters written to the newspapers in 1875, and in his volumes published in 1878, since his return, Stanley pursues the one theme with sanguine zeal and expectation, the conversion to Christianity of Mtesa, who has already been converted from paganism to Mohammedanism.

Colonel Long has no faith in the convert or the missionary. He intimates that Stanley was "the dupe of the artful savage." He believes that Egypt is Africa's hope for civilization. "Egypt alone has within her domain a population fit for the

perilous service of exploration of these countries; and it is to this element rather than to costly foreign expeditions, whose sacrifice of life and money are (is?) greatly in disproportion to results obtained, that recourse must be had by the ruler of Egypt, by the philanthropist, and by the trader. If Providence has ordained that the regeneration of Central Africa is to be wrought by human means, it is thus, and thus only, it can be accomplished."—Pp. 314, 315. Colonel Long is not alone in the opinion that the route to conversion for the African is through Moslemism to Christianity.

Stanley disclaims being, in any sense, Mtesa's "dupe." He regards the savage chieftain as a "most fascinating and peculiarly amiable man, and should the traveler think of saving this pagan continent from the purgatory of heathendom, Mtesa must occur to him as the most promising to begin with, as his intelligence and natural faculties are of a very high order, his professions of love to white men great, and his hospitality apparently boundless."

His "conversion," like that of pagan Constantine in the fourth century, is not very deep or thorough. "A few months' talk about Christ is not enough to eradicate the evils of thirty-five years of brutal, sensuous indulgence," only "the paternal watchfulness of a sincerely pious pastor," an "earnest, patient, assiduous, zealous, self-denying missionary," can effect this work. "The grand, redeeming feature of Mtesa is his admiration for white men." Yet white men, as yet, appeal only to his self-interest and greed. They trade, like the Arabs, or give boundless presents, like Speke and Stanley. To the self-denying resident missionary only "Mtesa would bend with the docility of a submissive child, and look up with reverence and affection." "Mtesa is the most interesting man in Africa, and one well worthy of our largest sympathies; and I repeat that through him only can Central Africa be Christianized and civilized."

We must take Mr. Stanley's opinion for what it is worth. It is the opinion of those, and they are many, who believe that the heathen are to be approached with a gospel of materialistic betterment; that improvement of physical condition must precede or accompany spiritual instruction; that savage races must be taught to clothe and feed the body before attending to the wants of the soul, all of which is measurably true. To Asiat-

ics and Africans, white Christians, particularly European and American Protestants, the leaders of the van of modern civilization, are bringing a gospel of steamers, clipper ships, railroads, telegraphs, comfortable houses, rich clothing, gold and silver watches, and infinite treasures in iron, steel, wood, glass, spinning-jennies, power-looms, and friction matches.

“How long,” soliloquizes Stanley, (vol. i, pp. 222, 223,) “shall the people of these lands remain ignorant of Him who created the gorgeous sunlit world they look upon? . . . How long shall their untamed ferocity be a barrier to the Gospel, and how long shall they remain unvisited by a teacher! when shall all the land be redeemed from wildness, the industry and energy of the natives stimulated, the havoc of the slave-trade stopped, and all the countries round about permeated with the nobler ethics of a higher humanity! O for the hour when a band of philanthropic capitalists shall rescue these beautiful lands, and supply the means to enable gospel messengers to come and quench the murderous hate with which man beholds man in the beautiful lands around Lake Victoria!”

After two weeks' detention in Uganda Stanley re-embarked in the “Lady Alice” to finish the exploration of the western coast of the Victoria Lake. We cannot dwell upon his conflict with the treacherous natives of Bumbireh, the publication of which caused such howls of disapprobation when his letters from the Nyanza first appeared in the public prints, nor how he conducted his expedition to the eastern shore of the still unknown sheet of water called the Muta Nziga, and how he was here turned back, as so many luckless African travelers have been turned back, from the very threshold of discovery by the duplicity and faithlessness of the natives, which all the threats and commands of Mtesa were powerless to prevent. During his absence another of his white men, Fred. Barker, died and found a grave on the shores of the Nyanza.

Speke estimated the surface of the Victoria Nyanza at 29,000 square miles. Stanley made it, by actual survey, 21,500 square miles, half the size of Lake Superior, the greatest of all the known fresh-water lakes. Baffled at Muta Nziga, he made his way to his second objective point, Tanganyika, devoting one whole octavo volume of five hundred pages to the Victoria Nyanza and its surroundings.

Another chieftain, remarkable in his way as Mtesa, one who held the Arab traders at bay, and inflicted on them, as well as on other African chiefs and tribes, immense damage, was Mirambo, whom Stanley met on his route to Tanganyika. He came with about twenty-five of his principal men. "I shook hands with him with fervor, [characteristic of Stanley,] which drew a smile from him as he said, 'The white man shakes hands like a strong friend.' His person quite captivated me, for he was a thorough African gentleman in appearance, very different from my conception of the terrible bandit who had struck most telling blows at native chiefs and Arabs with all the rapidity of a Frederick the Great environed by foes." "I had expected to see something of the Mtesa type, but this mild, inoffensive man presented nothing of the Napoleonic type except the eyes, which had the steady, calm gaze of the master."

Mirambo "preferred boys or young men in war. He never took middle-aged or old men, as they were sure to be troubled with wives or children, and did not fight half so well as young fellows, who listened to his words. Young men have sharper eyes, and their young limbs enable them to move with the ease of serpents and the rapidity of zebras, and a few words will give them the hearts of lions. In all my wars with the Arabs it was an army of youths that gave me victory, boys without beards. Fifteen of my young men died one day because I said I must have a certain red cloth that was thrown down as a challenge. No, no; give me youths for war in the open field, and men for the stockaded villages."

"On the 27th of May, 1876, at noon," writes Stanley, in closing the first volume of "Through the Dark Continent," "the bright waters of the Tanganyika broke upon the view, and compelled me to linger admiringly for a while, as I did on the day (November 10, 1871) when I first beheld them." There were few changes in Ujiji. "The house where Livingstone and I lived has long ago been burned down, and in its place there remain only a few embers and a hideous void. The lake extends with the same grand beauty before the eyes as we stand in the market-place. The opposite mountains have the same blue-black color, for they are everlasting. The surf is still as restless and the sun as bright; the sky retains its glorious azure and the palms all their beauty; but the grand old hero whose

presence once filled Ujiji with such absorbing interest for me was gone!"

Stanley's discovery of Livingstone, in 1871, and safe return to Zanzibar, broke up a well-organized and well-furnished British "search expedition" starting out from the coast with the object in view which he had by stealth so successfully accomplished. Out of the wreck of that expedition, in order to use up the material collected and the means subscribed, grew another, commanded by Lieutenant Verney Lovett Cameron. Cameron left Zanzibar February 2, 1873, accompanied by Lieutenant Murphy, who turned back before reaching Ujiji, Dr. Dillon, who shot himself in delirium of an African fever within ten months after starting, and a grandson of the veteran South African missionary and father-in-law of Livingstone, Dr. Moffat, who also fell an early victim to the terrible African climate. Alone, after fearful sicknesses, after meeting the dead body of Livingstone in its route from Lake Bemba to the coast, and in the teeth of difficulties almost innumerable, Cameron reached Ujiji February 18, 1874, and circumnavigated the southern arm of Lake Tanganyika.

Burton and Speke had discovered this lake just fifteen years before: Livingstone and Stanley had tracked out portions of its coast, and two years later Stanley was again on its waters, making the "Lady Alice" do the same duty she had done on the Victoria Nyanza. We need not follow the detail of the circumnavigations. Cameron thought he had found an outlet to the lake in the Lukuga creek or river, a channel which would lead any excess of water into the Lualaba, a hundred and fifty miles distant. Cameron's conclusion is that "in the dry seasons, or when the lake is at its lowest level, very little water leaves by the Lukuga." Stanley opines that the Tanganyika is "steadily rising," and that when it has risen three feet above its present level its waters will flow out to swell the volume of Lualaba, *alias* Livingstone, or Congo. Cameron, page 191, says, "According to the accounts given me by the guides, the lake is constantly encroaching upon its shores and increasing in rise." Instead of being connected with the Nile—as was suspected before Livingstone and Stanley, in 1871, found the Ruzizi river flowing into the northern end of the lake—Tanganyika promises to be one of the future lacustrine feeders of the

Congo. Of the singularly bold and picturesque scenery of the mountainous coast of Tanganyika the reader will find effective illustrative cuts from drawings and photographs in both Stanley and Cameron. The healthful upland regions of inner Africa seem destined at no distant day to become centers of missionary operations, like those already inaugurated in Uganda.

From Tanganyika, Cameron, and two years later Stanley, followed Livingstone's route north-east to Nyangwé, on the Lualaba, "a mighty river," says Livingstone, "three thousand yards broad and always deep, current about two miles an hour to the north," "color very dark brown." (March 31, 1871.)

August 1, 1874, Cameron, "after two marches, came in sight of the mighty Lualaba . . . a strong, sweeping current of turbid yellow water fully a mile wide, and flowing at the rate of three or four knots an hour."

October, 1876, Stanley came suddenly upon the "majestic Lualaba, about fourteen hundred yards wide, a broad river of a pale gray color, winding slowly from south and by east."

"At last," says Cameron, "I was at Nyangwé, and now the question before me was, what success would attend the attempt at tracing the river to the sea?"

Stanley, two years later, with characteristic confidence, writes: "A secret rapture filled my soul as I gazed upon the majestic stream. The great mystery that for all these centuries Nature had kept hidden away from the world of science was waiting to be solved. For two hundred miles I had followed one of the sources of the river, and now before me lay the superb river itself! My task was to follow it to the ocean!"

Cameron, like Livingstone, in the wish and endeavor to explore the Lualaba, was destined to disheartening defeat. "I tried every means to persuade the people to sell me canoes, but without avail." Unable to go north, Commander Cameron, by the aid of natives, Arabs, and Portuguese, ultimately found his way to Benguela, crossing, at Lake Dilolo, Livingstone's track *en route* (1854) for St. Paul de Loanda, being the first white man that had ever crossed Africa from east to west. Pluck, common sense, disposition and ability to make the best of circumstances, a plain, full style, scientific and cultivated tastes, and thorough gentlemanliness, characterize Cameron and his narrative. His recorded experiences and observations form a

valuable chapter in African exploration, and his name will go down to posterity as a bold and energetic explorer.

"The greatest problem of African geography," says Stanley, "was left by Cameron exactly where Livingstone had left it. Neither could obtain canoes." "Want of canoes, and the hostility of the savages, and the reluctance and indifference of the Arabs, were the causes that prevented the exploration of the river." How was Stanley to overcome these difficulties? His first operation was to secure the escort of an Arab caravan down the river north, sixty marches for \$5,000. The natives of Nyangwé will not sell canoes; he hopes to come across a tribe lower down the stream who will. If not, we will buy up axes and "make our own canoes."

He consults his only remaining white companion, Frank Poocke. Frank proposes to "toss up," and the coin six times forbids. Straws drawn as lots were all against the trip into the dark unknown. At the end of the protracted game of lots, so frequently resorted to by John Wesley, all the Stanley came out in the explosive words, "It is of no use, Frank! in spite of rupees and of straws we will face our destiny. I will follow the river!" The contract with the Arabs was completed. About one hundred and fifty people, constituting the expedition, mustered, and on the 5th of November, 1876, the momentous start was made. "The object of the desperate journey is to flash a torch of light across the western half of the dark continent. Eastward, "along the fourth parallel of south latitude, are some eight hundred and thirty geographical miles discovered, explored, and surveyed; but westward, to the Atlantic Ocean, are nine hundred and fifty-six miles which are absolutely unknown."—Vol. ii, p. 127.

On the 6th of November they "drew near to the dread, chill, black forest, and, bidding farewell to sunshine and brightness, entered it." In ten days' time the fearful struggle with innumerable obstacles so disheartened the Arab escort that they wished to annul the contract. It was modified from sixty marches to twenty. The terrors and difficulties of the forest were braved for a few days longer, when, all of a sudden, as if it had been a new revelation, the idea strikes Stanley in one of his sentimental meditative moods, "Why not build canoes and take to the water?"

“It is our work! It is the voice of fate. The One God has written that this year the river shall be known throughout its length; we will have no more forests and hideous darkness. We will take to the river and keep to the river. To-day I shall launch my boat on that stream, and it shall never leave it until I finish my work. I swear it!”—Vol. ii, pp. 149, 150.

With Stanley to resolve was to perform, and the “Lady Alice” was taken from the shoulders of discouraged and worn-out bearers and launched in her own element, to run the gauntlet of poisoned arrows, spears, cataracts, and cannibals, and be laid up on the rocks when the expedition again took to land-journeying within hail of Atlantic civilization. The very outset of their perilous voyage was greeted with the savage war-cry, and they were at once plunged into stern conflicts with cannibals, which in most cases could be settled or terminated only by the successful issue of battle. A desperate fight with the natives, in which they had four killed and thirteen wounded, put them in possession of over twenty canoes. They parted with their Arab escort and embarked Dec. 28, 1876, and paddled toward the unknown “wide open to us. Away down, for miles and miles, the river lay stretched in all the fascination of its mystery.” From the hour when the Anglo-American expedition was fairly afloat on the face of the Congo, few romances possess such thrilling interest as attaches to the narrative of their adventures. The barometer told a startling tale. They were, according to its record, sixteen hundred and fifty feet above the sea! Will the river take a mighty sweep to the northward and westward and descend into the Congo, or is it the Niger, or is it the Nile? “If the Congo, there must be many cataracts,” and cataracts they found; but, before the cataracts, hordes of murderous cannibal savages! There was no end to Stanley’s ingenuity, expedients, and devices. By saving the shields of the savages they converted their canoes into floating forts. The natives beat their war drums, sounded their war horns, and shouted their cannibal cry, “Meat! meat!” but the peaceful expedition answered, “Peace! peace!” sometimes with pacific effect, but oftener with no effect at all other than to embolden the barbarians by show of non-resistance and forbearance. Some of the tribes were peaceful, but most of them were hostile. Sometimes they obtained food in exchange

for cloth, beads, or wire, and sometimes they were hungry to the borders of starvation. By the 29th of January, a little more than a month after leaving the Arabs, they had "fought twenty-four times! and had captured sixty-five door-like shields, which, in fights upon the river, the women raised, so that forty-three guns were of more avail than one hundred and fifty riflemen unprotected." "In these wild regions our mere presence excited the most furious passions of hate and murder."

February 3, 1877, Stanley writes in his Journal: "Livingstone called floating down the Lualaba a fool-hardy feat. So it has proved, and I pen these lines with half a feeling that they will never be read by any man; still, as we persist in floating down according to our destiny, I persist in writing, leaving events to an all-gracious Providence. Day and night we are stunned with the dreadful drumming which announces our arrival and presence in their nation. Either bank is equally powerful. To go from the right bank to the left is like jumping from the frying-pan into the fire. As we row down among the islands, between the savage countries on either side of us, it may well be said that we are 'running the gauntlet.'"—Vol. ii, pp. 280, 281.

February 6, "the river," which had for hundreds of miles held a northerly course, "for the first time deflected west."

February 8, they heard for the first time the welcome name "Congo."

February 14, they beat off the "Bangala," the "Ashantees of the Livingstone River." A few days before they had "discovered four ancient Portuguese muskets, at the sight of which the people of the expedition raised a glad shout." It was an intimation of the sea. Musket shots now took the place of the whizzing of arrows and spears, but the weapons were old and the gunners awkward; they were no match for Snecider rifles, elephant guns, and explosive balls.

February 18, 1877. "For three days we have been permitted, through the mercy of God, to descend this great river uninterrupted by savage clamor or ferocity."

February 19. "Regarded each other as the fated victims of protracted famine or the rage of savages."

March 15. "The people no longer resist our advance. Trade has tamed their natural ferocity, and they no longer re-

sent our approach like beasts of prey." Henceforth, falls and cataracts; canoes over falls and down plunging cataracts; canoes hauled over land around falls and cataracts; through forests and over mountains; Kalulu, the boy taken by Stanley to England, precipitated over a dangerous fall in a canoe and lost; and, worst of all, Frank Poccocke, the young Englishman, fellow traveler over three fourths of a continent, drowned June 8, 1877, in the fool-hardy attempt to shoot a fall! All these fatalities Stanley chronicles with a dramatic pen. Abating something for exuberance of fancy and expression, his versatility as a describer is equal to his versatility as a leader or commander. The last pages of "Through the Dark Continent" read like the concluding act of a tragedy. It is impossible to read them without tears. "Fatal June, 1877," writes Stanley:

"The full story of the sufferings I have undergone cannot be written, but is locked up in a bosom that feels the misery into which I am plunged neck-deep. O, Frank! Frank! you are happy, my friend. Nothing can now harrow your mind or fatigue your body. You are at rest for ever and ever. Would that I were also!"

July 28. "The freshness and ardor of feeling with which I had set out from the Indian Ocean had by this time worn quite away. Fevers had sapped the frame, overmuch trouble had sapped the spirit, hunger had debilitated the body, anxiety preyed upon the mind. My people were groaning aloud; their sunken eyes and unfleshed bodies were a living reproach to me; their vigor was gone, though their fidelity was unquestionable; their knees were bent with weakness, and their backs were no longer rigid with the vigor of youth, life, strength, and devotion. Hollow-eyed, gaunt, sallow, unspeakably miserable in aspect, we yielded to imperious nature, and had but one thought only—to trudge on for one look more at the blue ocean."—Vol. ii, p. 435.

July 31. "We received the good news that Embomma was only five days' journey from us." "As the object of the journey had now been attained, and the great river of Livingstone had been connected with the Congo of Tuekey, (1816.) I saw no reason to follow it further, or to expend the little remaining vitality we possessed in toiling through the last four cataracts." "At sunset we lifted our brave boat, the 'Lady Alice,' and

carried her to the summit of some rocks five hundred yards north of the fall. After circumnavigating Victoria and Tanganyika lakes, and floating down the Congo fourteen hundred miles, and after a journey of seven thousand miles over broad Africa and its waters, she was consigned to her resting-place above the Isangila Cataract, to bleach and rot to dust."

August 4 every thing useless was abandoned, and they began their last overland journey, "a wayworn, suffering, feeble column, nearly forty men sick with dysentery, ulcers, scurvy—the victims of the latter disease steadily increasing." "Only three days off from food!" "Next day, when morning was graying, we lifted our weakened limbs for another march. Up and down the desolate, sad land wound the poor hungry caravan; in melancholy and silent procession, voiceless as sphinxes, we felt our way down into a deep gully, and crawled up again and camped. It was night before all had arrived." They could go no farther, apparently. In this extremity Stanley resolved to send a letter to the coast, and three of his men volunteered to carry it. In two days an answer came from the residents of Boma, and with the answer, food for the starving expedition. They were saved, and the solution of the problem of the centuries was revealed to the civilized world.

Stanley and Cameron had each a similar experience as they approached the Atlantic coast. Stanley converts it into drama; Cameron tells the tale of suffering and deliverance in his usual matter-of-fact way.

"The marching powers of my men had gone from bad to worse, and I saw that some decisive step must be taken or the caravan would never reach the coast, now only one hundred and twenty-six geographical miles distant. Upward of twenty men complained of being unable to walk far or to carry any thing, swelled legs, stiff necks, aching backs, and empty stomachs being the universal cry." He resolved to throw away every thing, tent, boat, bed, every thing but books and instruments, and, with a few picked men, make his way to the coast, and send back relief for the remainder. After a few days of forced marches the forlorn hope came in sight of the sea, and, when utterly exhausted and worn out, he dispatched a note to Katombéle, and received as hearty a welcome from the residents as Stanley received from the merchants at Boma. Cameron,

nearly dead of scurvy, sent his men in a schooner to Zanzibar by way of Good Hope, and himself took passage for England.

Stanley accompanied his expedition, or the relics of it, back to Zanzibar, every-where lionized, at Embomma, at St. Paul de Loanda, at Cape Town, at Zanzibar, in England, and in America. It is with just pride that he records, in the Preface to his volumes, the honors showered upon him by every learned Geographical Society in Europe, and that his achievement was crowned by a unanimous vote of thanks by both Houses of the Congress of the United States, an "honor more precious than all the rest." Of the expedition one hundred and fourteen died; eighty-nine were returned to Zanzibar; fourteen were drowned; fifty-eight died in battle. Small-pox and dysentery were the two most destructive disorders.

On the 17th of November, 1874, the expedition took the "first bold step for the interior; on the 26th November, 1877, the relics of it went ashore at Zanzibar." How did Stanley part with his black followers? "Sweet and sad moments those of parting." "Through what strange vicissitudes of life had these men not followed me!" "What noble fidelity these untutored souls had exhibited! The chiefs were those who had followed me to Ujiji in 1871." "For years to come there will be told in many homes in Zanzibar the great story of our journey, and the actors in it will be heroes with their kin. For me, too, they are heroes, those poor ignorant children of Africa, for, from the first deadly struggle in savage Ituru to the last staggering march into Boma, they rallied to my voice like veterans, and in the hour of need they never failed me." Stanley has unbounded faith in the future of the black man. He is (at this writing) again in Africa. What is his errand? He has told no one. Something he will doubtless accomplish, and African soil may yet become the resting-place of the mortal remains of the indefatigable traveler.

Present appearances afford just ground for hope that the nineteenth century will not close without adding to its numberless triumphs in science, art, discovery, wealth, and civilization, the thorough exploration of the entire continent of Africa, said by Malte-Brun to be the "last portion of the civilized world which awaits at the hands of Europeans the salutary yoke of legislation and culture." Savage Central Africa is being

brought to the knowledge of geographers, bit by bit, with a rapidity paralleled in our own West, so rapidly that we need not be ashamed of ignorance of the latest phase of African discovery if an intelligent Bostonian could innocently ask "in what State Montana is situated!" Let the remaining twenty years of the century be as fruitful in discovery as the last twenty, and but few of the squares made on the map by intersecting meridians and parallels will longer tantalize by their blank whiteness; lake coasts, mountains, and rivers will not longer be laid down from unreliable native and Arab information, the dotted lines of doubt will be replaced by the firm tracings of actual survey or personal inspection.

Railroads and telegraphs will intersect the lands. Slavery will be blotted out. Munsas, Mtesas, Mirambos, and Riongas will be civilized by the united influences of commerce and Christianity. The three great enemies to the progress of Christianity in Africa are slavery, rum, and gunpowder. Mohammedanism, with its slavery and polygamy, is but a slight advance on pure heathenism. To the Christian Africa is one of the most interesting portions of the globe to-day. Some of its tribes are quite advanced in civilization and the arts; and some are fearfully low and degraded. Arab slavers have cursed one side of the continent, and Portuguese the other; but slavery is coming to an end. Probably but few more costly exploring expeditions will be fitted or needed to settle the few geographical questions that still remain unsettled. Merchants and missionaries will gradually extend the area of geographical knowledge, and colonies may yet be projected on the borders of interior lakes and rivers, and the African, in the providence of God and the order of events, will yet emerge from childhood, and develop all the powers and capacities of the fully civilized man.

ART. III.—THE BASLE SESSION OF THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

Siebente Hauptversammlung der Evangelischen Allianz, gehalten in Basel vom 31. August bis 7. September, 1879. Berichte und Reden herausgegeben in Auftrag des Comité der Allianz, durch CHRISTOPH JOHANNES RIGGENBACH, D.D., 2 Bände, Seiten 1054. Basel, 1879.

THE small is always bringing to pass the great. Christianity, with its measureless productive power, seems to delight in its easy potency to measure the long distance between the little mustard seed and the great sheltering tree. One day in May, 1839, while the New York anniversaries were in progress, a few persons met in a room of the American Tract Society, and formed themselves into a group for the purpose of promoting brotherly union among all evangelical Christians. Having taken an organic shape, the society purchased several hundred copies of a thin volume with the title, "Fraternal Appeal to the American Churches," which were distributed gratuitously among leading ministers and laymen in the various Churches of the country. The association was short-lived. It lacked cohesive power, and its plan seemed at least visionary. But it was the first effort of which there is any record, in any country, of an attempt to group the Protestant Churches into a sisterhood, with the avowed object of accomplishing work and realizing results desirable alike by all. Good thoughts never die, and this one crossed the Atlantic, and took shape almost simultaneously in England, Germany, and France. Even the failure of the first attempt in New York did not discourage further effort at organization, for, in 1845, the late Rev. Dr. S. S. Schmucker prepared an address on Christian Union, and, having obtained the assent and promise of co-operation of about fifty ministers and laymen, placed their names to his address, which he termed an "Overture for Christian Union," and called a meeting during the anniversary week of 1846.

Meanwhile a society had been formed in London, in the Wesleyan Centenary Hall, in February, 1845, and in June following held its first public meeting. Arrangements were there made for the first general meeting, to be convened in London in August, 1846. Invitations were extended to the American Churches to co-operate, and these were promptly accepted.

The conference called by Dr. Schmucker in New York did not take place, but was dropped by common consent, as not now necessary. When the London meeting occurred, it was found that the leading European Churches were represented, that there were delegates from the United States, and that the popular interest far surpassed all expectations. It was at this gathering that a confederation was formed, bearing the name of the Evangelical Alliance. From that time to the present its object has been definite and unchanged, and the work it has accomplished has entered into the positive gains for our common Protestantism.

The doctrinal basis of the Evangelical Alliance was laid down at the first general session of the Alliance in London, and was afterward approved by all the European branches, and by the American branch in January, 1867. It is as follows: 1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the holy Scriptures. 2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of holy Scripture. 3. The unity of the Godhead, or the trinity of the persons therein. 4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall. 5. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign. 6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone. 7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner. 8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked. 9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

There have been thus far eight general sessions of the Alliance: London, August, 1846; Paris, August, 1855; Berlin, September, 1857; Geneva, September, 1861; Amsterdam, August, 1867; New York, October, 1873; and Basle, September, 1879.

The Basle session was different in many respects from all its predecessors. There was a degree of confidence and hopefulness as to the work to be done, and the part to be taken by the Alliance in the great future of Protestantism, which could hardly be expected of the body in its earlier period. As might

be expected, the Basle session was far more cosmopolitan than the one in New York, which, by general consent, had exceeded all others in popular enthusiasm. But there was comparatively a small representation of Europeans in New York, owing chiefly to the hesitation of the continental theologians to cross the Atlantic. At Basle there was not this defect. No Protestant field in Europe was without its strong delegation. The very place itself served to add to the interest of the occasion. The rich historical associations impressed the stranger at once. The quaint buildings, the narrow, winding streets, and the antique character of the older part of the city, contrasting strangely with the rapid flow of the ever-youthful Rhine, seemed to suggest that ancient Basle (Basileia) had yet its queenly work to do for the great present and the greater future. It was not forgotten that away back in the mediæval period a Council had been held there for the reform of abuses in the Roman Catholic Church, and that it had spoken the strongest words ever uttered by a papal body in favor of purity of life and doctrine.*

The Roman Catholics, as a body, have endeavored to give a spurious character to the Basle Council, and it actually adjourned without a positively beneficial bearing on the body which had convened it. But it performed one permanent service to Switzerland and to Europe. It filled the air with a hunger for greater purity. Moreover, it inaugurated measures for the founding of a university which was in full progress when the Reformation began, which passed promptly over to the Protestants, became one of the disseminating forces of Protestant learning for all Europe, and for three centuries and a half has been the leading evangelical university south of Germany.

* The Basle Council passed decrees for freedom of election in Churches, against expectancies, usurpations of patronage, reservations, annats, and other exactions by which Rome drained the wealth of the Church; against frivolous appeals, the abuse of interdicts, the concubinage of the clergy, and the burlesque festivals and other indecencies of the Church service. It laid down rules for the behavior of the Popes. The Pope was to make his profession with some additions to the form prescribed at Constance, and at every celebration of his anniversary it was to be read over to him by a cardinal at the service of the mass. The number of cardinals was limited to twenty-four, and they were to be taken from all Christian countries, and to be chosen with the consent of the existing cardinals. All nephews of the reigning Pope were to be excluded from the college. Comp. Robertson, "History of the Christian Church," vol. iv, p. 423.

At the Alliance there was hardly a delegate from any country to whom the city did not suggest very precious memories. The Spaniard could not forget that, in that same Basle, Francis Enzinas, a born Spaniard, had lived a length of time, and had translated and published his Spanish New Testament, which was sent to Spain, distributed throughout the country, and did invaluable service in propagating Protestantism. The representatives from New Italy were reminded that they were treading the streets of a city which, three centuries before, had been a hospitable place of refuge for exiled Reformers from the plains of Lombardy, and even the banks of the Tiber. The German knew he was in the adopted home of his own *Ceolampadius*, who had preached Protestantism fearlessly to Swiss hearers, and had brought it to pass in the very church where the Alliance was holding its sessions. The Dutchman thought of his own great *Erasmus*, who had studied long in the cathedral cloisters, and had prepared in Basle his version of the Greek Testament, which became the textual foundation of the Reformation in every European land. The Frenchman could hardly forget that, three hundred years previously, that same city had welcomed a band of foot-sore Huguenots, who were fleeing for life from the far-off banks of the Moselle; and the President of the Alliance during its session in Basle, Mr. Carl Sarasin, was a direct descendant of one of those way-worn Protestant fugitives. The Englishman could call up many bonds of union between his country and Basle, and especially the fact that when Mary came to the throne this Swiss city welcomed and entertained a large colony of English refugee Protestants, and that such Englishmen as John Hooper, Thomas Lever, John Burcher, Lawrence Humphrey, and John Fox, author of the "Book of Martyrs," made Basle their second home.

Basle, too, was a reminder of one of the universal laws of religious history, that welcome to a fugitive for conscience' sake proves a blessing to him who extends it. When this Swiss city gave a home to the exiled Huguenots, the question was, What could they do toward their own support? They were silk weavers at their old home, and might be in this new one. So they began in a humble way, just to get bread, the weaving of silk ribbons, which, in time, developed into a vast

industry, and for many years has been the chief source of financial prosperity to the whole city and suburbs of Basle. When Hanau, in the Valley of the Main, one day entertained the tired and hungry Dutch Protestant fugitives from the cruelty of the heartless Spanish Alva, it little dreamed that these men had the rare skill of working in gold and silver, and much less could it prophesy that down to the last of the nineteenth century this industry would be the chief employment of the working people of Hanau, and that the gold and silver ware from this place would find its way along the arteries of commerce throughout the world. Even England is not without this lesson. The Dutch led the trade of Europe in the manufacture of cutlery, and when a number fled for safety to England they went as far north as Sheffield, and established the manufacture of cutlery there. From that time the Sheffield cutlery has taken the lead in all lands, while in Sheffield itself one can still see on the sign boards, over the places of business, (the Wostenholms, for example,) the traces of the welcome to the Dutch cutlers in the sixteenth century.

The proceedings of the Alliance were introduced on Sunday evening, August 31, by a reception of members and fraternal salutations, in the great Hall of the Vereinshaus, which corresponds to our Young Men's Christian Association Building. The addresses were in different languages, Pastor Ecklin, of Basle, opening the cordial salutations in the German; Pastor Viguier, of Lausanne, in French; and Rev. Dr. Schaff in English. On Monday, September 1, however, the formal session began, with Councilor Carl Sarasin as President. The day was devoted to representations of the religious condition of the various countries of Christendom. Switzerland was described by Dr. Güder, of Berne. This little country has 2,500,000 inhabitants, of whom 1,500,000 are Protestants. There are twenty-two independent districts or cantons. Seven of these are Roman Catholic, twelve are divided between the Protestants and Roman Catholics, and three are exclusively Protestant. Each canton has its separate constitutional and cantonal government, and none can interfere with its neighbor. Three languages are spoken, according to the geographical position—the Italian, German, and French. In the Engadine Valley there is still a fourth, the Romance language, which is the nearest

living remnant of the old Latin tongue, and which has several local newspapers, and a limited, curious, and overlooked literature. The pastors in Protestant Switzerland are chosen by the congregations for a period of four to six years, after which they can be retained or dismissed by a similar vote. Within the last twenty-five years an important change for the worse has taken place in Swiss theology. Until about 1850 the tone was evangelical, and in harmony with the opinions of such men as Nitzsch, Tholuck, Dorner, Julius Müller, Hagenbach, Hundeshagen, Schneckenburger, and Vinet. But shortly afterward the shadows came. Rationalistic preachers and laymen gained the upper hand in nominations for vacant professorships and pastorates, and separate theological groups began to organize themselves. These are three in number, and have continued down to the present time. The *Reformers* deny the authority of the Scriptures, reject the supernatural, and regard the Church as chiefly a good moral agency for the conservation of society. Their organ in German Switzerland is the "Zeitstimmen," (Voices of the Times,) edited by H. Lang, in Zurich, and in French Switzerland the "Alliance Libérale," (Liberal Alliance,) published in Geneva. The *Mediators* seek a harmony between science and revelation, and, while making too important concessions to the prevailing skepticism, endeavor to secure a popular support for evangelical sentiment. Their organ is the "Volksblatt für die Reformirte Schweiz," (Popular Journal for Reformed Switzerland.) The *Evangelicals* adhere to the old Helvetic Confession, allow no laxity in the interpretation of the Scriptures, believe in a divine call to the ministry, and claim a supernatural origin for the Church. Their organ for German Switzerland is the "Kirchenfreund," (Church Friend,) and for French Switzerland the "Semaine Religieuse," (Religious Week.)

The Reformers have both extremes of society on their side. The politicians are with them, and the legislature is in their interest. The illiterate are likewise skeptical. Among the common people are frequently heard such expressions as: "My heaven is six feet below the ground," "I give my money for schnapps instead of for the Bible," and "I do not keep my Sunday in church, but in bed, in the forest, and in the beer-shop." The churches are scantily attended. The highest rate in the attend-

ance at church is one in every ten of the population. The communion service is sadly neglected. The sentimental socialism of the Russian type is in great force still. For example: In 1876 there were 1,102 cases of divorce; in 1877 there were 1,036. By comparison, it is found out that there are five per cent. more divorces than in any other country in Europe.

This is a sad picture of religious life in Switzerland. One would suppose that an evangelical Christian would be glad to welcome to the vales and mountains of the land of Calvin and Zwingli and Farel an earnest worker from any part of the Christian world. Yet not so with even the evangelicals, of whom Dr. Güder reckons himself one. He pays a very unwilling compliment to the energy and success of our Methodist preachers in that country when he says: "The Methodists, with that disturbing vulgarity peculiar to them, have in twenty years gained a very respectable footing in the midst of the State Churches. In every large city they have a very handsome chapel, and in the rural regions they have very neat places of prayer and hired places of worship." With such a testimony to the results of our labors in two decades we can afford to pass by the charge of vulgarity.

Germany was described by Dr. Cremer. His picture was not encouraging. Scepticism reigns supreme in many classes, and only in certain directions are there traces of the coming light. The thinking of the masses is unchristian, while the Roman Catholic Church is actually making inroads on German Protestantism. The skeptics welcome the Roman Catholics, as calculated to aid them in the general disintegration. Socialism is of incalculable injury to evangelical Christianity. Still, there are hopeful indications. There is greater unity than heretofore among Protestants. In the universities there is a more decidedly evangelical sentiment than in former years. France was represented by Pastor Babut, of Nimes. In the republic there are 650,000 Protestants. They have had to contend with great opposition on every side, but have made decided progress during the present century. In 1806 there were only 171 Protestant pastors, and the Protestant Church had no schools or religious or charitable associations. To-day it has 850 pastors, and, if Alsace and Lorraine were still French, would have 1,100. There are 1,250 Protestant schools and 30 religious journals.

M. Lelievre, the Wesleyan editor of *L'Evangeliste*, reported on the evangelistic movement now in progress in France. He groups the Protestants into six classes, as follows: The Reformed Church, with its membership of 560,000; Church of the Augsburg Confession, (Lutheran,) with its 80,000 members; the English Free Church, with 43 church edifices and 5,000 members; the Wesleyan Methodist Church, with its 28 pastors, 18 evangelists, its theological seminary, at Lausanne, and 175 preaching places; the Baptist Church; and the English Society of France. His account of the evangelistic work of Mr. and Mrs. M'All reads like a romance. A few days after the disasters of the Commune in Paris, in 1871, these two English people went about Paris, and witnessed the wretchedness of the common people, and especially the religious destitution of the *ouvriers*, or working people. They held a little meeting, and during its progress a voice spoke out in broken English: "Sir, I have something to say to you. Every-where in this quarter there are thousands and thousands of workmen. We wish no more Romanists. We cannot accept a commanded religion. But if any one will come to us and tell us of another religion, a religion of liberty and equality, many among us are ready to hear." This Macedonian cry struck deeply. Mr. and Mrs. M'All returned to England, expecting to remain, but could not do so. God called them back again to Paris. They began to organize meetings among the *ouvriers*. At the first meeting there were 45 people; at the second 100, and at every additional meeting the number increased. During the year 1878 not less than 85,000 people attended the services. At the Sunday-schools there are 13,000 teachers and 42,000 scholars. Already the work has spread beyond Paris, into the remote parts of the country. The movement is under the protection of the government, inasmuch as there is no disposition to found a Church, but only to promote morality among the laboring classes, "*moraliser les ouvriers*," as it is mildly called by the government and the police.*

The religious state of Great Britain was described by Rev. E. V. Bligh. Ritualism, according to him, is only skin-deep. In all parts of the country there are hopeful indica-

* For a minute account of M'All's great religious work in Paris and elsewhere in France, see Bonar, "White Fields of France." New York: 1879.

tions. Even in Ireland there are signs of returning spiritual life. All over England efforts are made for the evangelization of the masses. Street-preaching is frequent in all the larger towns. The labors of Moody and Sankey produced permanent effects. In Glasgow alone there are to-day 7,000 members of Churches as fruits of their meetings. The home mission in London is of great scope and success. The Sunday-schools are constantly increasing in numbers and spiritual influence. The Sabbath is observed as a sacred day, and there is no disposition to compromise it. In Holland, according to Dr. Van Oosterzee, Rome is making rapid progress, and is lavishing her gold in every part of the Netherlands. Even the architecture is taking on the Roman Catholic type every-where. The priesthood are making their threats that Dutch Protestantism is at last dying out. Close beside Romanism, as a bitter foe of Protestant faith, stands the cold spirit of Rationalism. Its advocates call themselves the *Moderns*. Many of them have a moral seriousness, but reject the supernatural basis of Christianity, and are terribly afflicted with the fear of doctrines. Large groups of them are discussing the question whether Jesus or Buddha is deserving of the higher veneration. The *Middle Party* consists of the modified continuation of the Gröningen theology. They stand on supernatural soil, but are distrusted by the evangelical theologians because of their warm sympathy with the Moderns. The *Orthodox School* is too extreme, and goes over into narrow literalism. It stands upon the decrees of Dort, adheres to Calvinistic predestination, and "Christ for the elect." A mechanical and literal inspection is its shibboleth. Dutch theology, as a whole, is not encouraging. The Church is on the defensive, and so great is the scarcity of clerical candidates that one half of the pulpits are without pastors. Christian life here presents some hopeful indication.

The Rev. Dr. Schaff, of New York, presented an account of Christianity in the United States. His remarks needed to be compressed into a half hour, but in published form they make a rich pamphlet of sixty-seven octavo pages.* America is a continuation of the better Europe. The nationalities of the Old World have commingled in the New, and thrown off many

* "Christianity in the United States." Document XIV of "The Evangelical Alliance." New York, n. d.

of the worse features of European life. The American Republic has solved the problem of a free Church in a free State. It has had a Christian coloring from the beginning. Marriage is a civil contract. Sunday is regarded as both a civil and religious institution. The public schools are a part of our civilization, and will never be given up. The denominationalism of the United States is a normal type of ecclesiastical life, best suited to our civil polity, and only possible to American conditions. The Protestant evangelical denominations rank as follows, in the order of numerical strength: Methodist Episcopal family, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Protestant Episcopal and Reformed Episcopal, Lutheran, Friends, Irvingites. Then comes the Roman Catholic Church, and, after it, the Heterodox communions—Unitarians, Universalists, Christians, Swedenborgians, and Mormons. Our theological schools are constantly gaining in strength, and especially in the power of original production. No important theological movement abroad fails to receive just attention here. The American Sunday-school has undergone a marvelous development. The American Churches of America spend more men and money for the conversion of the heathen than those of any other country except England. Our religious press is of great power, and is worthy of the influence it wields. The temperance reform belongs to the more remarkable phenomena of our late Church life, and is destined to continue its successful operation. The work of caring for the Freedmen, the Indians, and Chinese is carried on with sacrifice and energy. The Church of the United States has great burdens resting upon it, but shows no lack of spirit to bear them well.

The account of the religious state of Scandinavia was given by Dr. Von Scheele, of the University of Upsala. The chief Church government consists of sixty members, half lay and half clerical. Its sessions are irregular. It has convened but three times since 1865. Professor O. F. Myrberg, of the University of Upsala, represents the skeptical movement now going on in Sweden. He rejects the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and selects what he pleases from the Bible as worthy of credit. He goes on in his work as professor, and neither Church nor State interferes with him. For a time Walderström was a warm evangelical leader, but he has recently veered round, and

now denies the atonement. The missionary spirit is on the increase, especially in behalf of the Lapps. A new Swedish translation of the Bible is at present in progress, under the direction of Professor C. A. Toren. The attendance at the universities is increasing. In Upsala, for example, there are 1,400 students, of whom 400 study theology. In Norway there is some progress in Christian life, though the skeptical preachers are doing all in their power to sow the seeds of doubt. There are the same general classes of unbelief as in Sweden. Singularly enough, there has been a resolution adopted for the employment of lay preaching throughout the country. This is a great innovation upon the old conservatism of the country. In Denmark there is considerable religious activity, and no little stir in the theological world. Martensen, Nielsen, Madsen, are the leading theologians.

Why do these representatives from Scandinavia—and we might say the same of those of Germany—not make a clean breast of the religious life in their countries? Why do they not also say that their decrepit State Churches are in a desperate condition, and that the chief signs of real religious life are from the “hated sects” that have come in from abroad? Take away the Baptists and the Methodists from Sweden, and there is but little left from Hammerfest all the way down to Malnö that inspires hope for the future. Even the wiser minds are beginning to see this. Polenz, the author of that remarkable work on French Protestantism “*Der Calvinismus in Frankreich*,” wrote a pamphlet, which we have in our possession, in which he attempts to show that the only ground for expecting a more earnest religious life in the Fatherland, is that the sects which have come from America and Great Britain may be able to infuse their own fervor into the lame and halting Churches that are devoid of congregations and all popular confidence, and which would be without pastors if the State treasury did not furnish them with a salary. This silence at Basle, by the continental participants, as to the sublime part now taken in Germany by representatives of the Wesleyans in Great Britain, and the Baptist and Methodist Episcopal Churches of the United States, is highly significant. It means that the State Church theologians are not yet ready to acknowledge the service of these voluntary and successful workers for the Master.

By and by they will see that they are not Greeks, making a present of a fatal horse, but messengers of the word of life to their brethren in the bonds of religious indifference and skeptical darkness. The present generation is too near to take in the full measure of such far-sighted work as the American effort to aid Germany in reaching up to the light once more. But the time will come when justice will be done. There is an equipoise of justice, a calmer judgment on the great historic forces, which only the marring years can give. No man can measure the vastness of St. Peter's by sauntering over the great aisles, or standing on the piazza in front; but let him go to the Pincian Hill, or, still better, ten miles off, to the Rubra Saxa, where Constantine saw his vision of the cross, and then he will see the majesty and vastness of Michel Angelo's wonderful creation in mid-air.

The state of Italy was described by Professor Comba. Protestants from many lands have concentrated there, and especially in Rome. Since 1820 there has been a forward movement, Italy striving to revive herself. The States of the Church have passed from the map of the world for the first time and the last in a thousand years, and the Bible is printed and circulated in Rome itself. Seven Protestant denominations are represented in the city of Seven Hills, and their motto is, "Here we are, and here we shall stay,"—*Siamo a Roma, e ci resteremo*. The Waldenses, who stand to-day in the front line of heroes, with the scars of thirty persecutions on them, number in all Italy 56 churches, 32 mission stations, 15,000 communicants, a theological school, 55 pastors, 50 teachers, and 4,400 scholars in the Sunday-schools. The Free Church, founded in the volcanic year 1848, has 8 congregations and 30 stations. The Free Italian Church, beginning in 1865, has 10 pastors, 1 theological school, 606 scholars in Sunday-schools, and 1,649 communicants. The Wesleyan Methodist Church, formed in 1861, has 22 pastors, 6 helpers, 6 evangelists, 1,276 communicants, and 704 Sunday scholars. The Baptist Church, established in 1855, has 9 pastors, 155 members, and 5 Sunday-schools. The Methodist Episcopal Church began in 1873, and now numbers 6 pastors, 9 evangelists, 1 colporteur, 5 Bible readers, and 437 communicants. In Rome itself there are 53 Protestant schools of the various denominations. In the stormy theological part of the

session there was a gratifying absence of the critical spirit. The skeptics were less considered than the positive side of the truth. The speakers were intent on a steady advance over new ground, and instead of seeking foes, simply took them on the way in their straight march toward untrodden fields. They seemed to think with the Concord minstrel :

"Life is too short to waste
 In critic peep or cynic bark,
 Quarrel or reprimand :
 'Twill soon be dark ;
 Up ! mind thine own aim, and
 God speed the mark !"

The subject of Christian defense against skeptical attacks was presented by Prof. Orelli, of Basle, and Dr. Godet, of Neuchâtel. There was a decided contrast in these two men. The former, in his youth, represents the young evangelical sentiment of Germany and German Switzerland ; the latter, the veteran heroes who have been fighting for a half century against the knights of doubt. Orelli's address was the most inspiring part of the whole week's programme. He carried all hearts with him, and left an influence akin to an overwhelming awakening sermon. The gospel, he said, which the apostles proclaimed to the world, is established in Christ's atoning death and the resurrection, the former testifying to the accomplishment, and the latter being the pledge of our final salvation. To the atonement and the resurrection the Christian doctrine is bound indissolubly for all time, so that every estrangement of the doctrine from them prevents their saving effect on the soul. The Gospel of Christ has, at all times and in all departments of the human family, proved its saving power. The fact of sin and the sense of guilt are stamped on our humanity. Nothing but divine grace imparted to the soul can save from God's wrath and final perdition. While this line of thought was followed in a measure also by Godet, his treatment was rather from the stand-point of scientific theology than from that of experience. The permanence of the Gospel is dependent on the person of Christ. You cannot detract a particle from the personal divinity of the Saviour without violating the religious and moral force of the Gospel. Christianity, thus weakened, could never have triumphed over its two old enemies, pagan

materialism and Jewish deism. The duty of every evangelical Christian is, therefore, to give firm testimony to the personal divinity of the great Head of the Church.

The general subject of education in relation to the Church, and the special one of the final training of the Christian ministry, were treated by Zillisen, De Pressensé, Court-Praeher Baur, Bachofner, Wiese, Paroz, and Count Bismarek-Bohlen. The want of biblical instruction in the German schools was greatly lamented. To this source many of the evils of the present German Church were attributed. Bismarek-Bohlen, an earnest Christian man, cousin of Prince Bismarek, and a member of the personal staff of the Emperor William, said these strong words: "Not only in the common schools, but also in the higher schools and universities, an evangelical training should be firmly maintained. One of our greatest evils is that you can seldom find a gymnasium where a truly evangelical spirit prevails. Our youth are overcrowded with merely human knowledge, so that in the past year three young men have, in their despair, committed suicide. Had there been a vital Christianity in these schools, those poor young men could have borne their burdens safely. Pray, take this evil to your hearts! We must have a Christian State and a Christian school, for by this means alone can we solve many of our difficulties of faith!"

De Pressensé's address on the Christian and anti-Christian influence of the press was one of the most notable parts of the entire programme. He held that the Protestant Christianity of the nineteenth century must accept the fact of a necessary publicity of thought. Romanism adheres to secrecy and suppression, but Protestantism demands freedom and individuality of action in order to continue the great Reform of the sixteenth century. The Christian press must defend spiritual Christianity, and all the more so because of the gross materialism of the secular press. There must be no want of combative power in the press of the Church. It must oppose the despotism of monarchism and the papacy. See what Roman Catholics are doing to make the press subserve its unholy purposes! In Rome alone there is a congregation of the press, at whose head stands a cardinal. This man presumably controls two hundred newspapers, with the "*Civitta Cattolica*" as their leader.

“The Gospel and liberty”—this must be the watch-word of the Protestant printing-press.

In the intervals of the main discussions in the German and French languages in the St. Martin's Church, the sessions of the Anglo-American Department were held in the French church in the English language. This is a modest little building in the new part of Basle, and to the Americans and English it became a Bethel. Here they met in friendly Christian intercourse, exchanged salutations without much formality, and consulted as to the great common interests of Anglo-Saxon Christendom. Each of the papers was afterward discussed by voluntary speakers, and some of the formal addresses in the St. Martin's Church were here epitomized in English, and their strong points emphasized. Vischer Sarasin, in behalf of the general committee, made a touching address of welcome to his English and American brethren, in which he thanked the descendants of the first Christians of the British Islands for sending to Switzerland the men who evangelized her vales and mountains, and brought them within the Christian fold. Prebendary Anderson, of Bath, spoke on Christian brotherhood. Dr. Pope, of Didsbury College, was prevented by illness from presenting his paper on the same subject, but Dr. William Arthur took his place, and made an exceedingly touching address on the same subject. He was followed by Dr. Rigg, of London, on the “Present Condition of Religious Liberty throughout the Continent.” We have seldom heard a clearer or more powerful address from any rostrum than this one. The subject was vital to the interests and aims of the Evangelical Alliance. He gave a calm view of the continental countries in order, and finally came to the most delicate subject of the entire session, namely, the persecution of Protestants now going on in Bohemia. His charge against the despotism of Austria was simply terrific. He had something more than theories. He presented facts and figures. The Rev. Mr. Barrett, superintendent of the Wesleyan missions in Germany, sat at his left, and Dr. Rigg turned to him, and quoted him as his authority. Well he might, for Mr. Barrett, through the Wesleyan missionaries on the spot, had gathered up a great number of cases of persecution, and furnished them in writing to Dr. Rigg. This was unexpected testimony, and singularly corroborative

of the documentary testimony of other ministers in Bohemia, and the persecuted Protestants themselves, which had already been circulated in pamphlet form among the members of the Alliance, and were rapidly producing a sympathetic sentiment.

The culmination of this feeling took place on Saturday, the last day of the session. The Anglo-American Committee resolved to bring up the case before the general session, and test the sense of the Alliance as to protesting against the iniquity. Each of the speakers on Christian union to whom the programme gave the whole time of the last formal session—Plitt, of Germany; Fallot, of Paris; and Hurst—received on Friday evening a courteous note from President Sarasin, requesting them to abridge their addresses as much as possible the following day, as the grave question of Austrian persecution was to be presented. The sessions, contrary to expectation, had increased in interest from the beginning, but on the last day there was not even standing room for the vast multitude. The president read some letters relating to the persecution, and was followed by Drs. Schaff and Riggenbach, who urged the Alliance to take action in favor of the persecuted Protestants. When the charges against the Austrian government were presented there was a silent pause of some length. Permission was given, before a vote was taken, to hear any who might be disposed to defend the persecutors, and to give reason why the protest should not be made. No one said a word. It was a scene of intense interest. Then a vote was taken, when all on the great platform arose, and those in the immense congregation also who were sitting arose as one man, and stood for some time in perfect silence. Many wept audibly. Great numbers were descendants of the Huguenots and Dutch fugitives from Spanish intolerance, and they were now stretching forth a helping hand toward their brothers in sorrow in this late nineteenth century. When a negative was called for, not one person voted. The decision was thus unanimous, and a committee was appointed to wait in person on the Austrian Emperor, Francis Joseph, and protest against the continuance of the persecution. That committee has done its work. It had to go as far as Hungary to get an audience with the emperor. He promised to give the subject his careful attention. It remains to be seen whether

of the documentary testimony of other ministers in Bohemia, and the persecuted Protestants themselves, which had already been circulated in pamphlet form among the members of the Alliance, and were rapidly producing a sympathetic sentiment.

The culmination of this feeling took place on Saturday, the last day of the session. The Anglo-American Committee resolved to bring up the case before the general session, and test the sense of the Alliance as to protesting against the iniquity. Each of the speakers on Christian union to whom the programme gave the whole time of the last formal session—Plitt, of Germany; Fallot, of Paris; and Hurst—received on Friday evening a courteous note from President Sarasin, requesting them to abridge their addresses as much as possible the following day, as the grave question of Austrian persecution was to be presented. The sessions, contrary to expectation, had increased in interest from the beginning, but on the last day there was not even standing room for the vast multitude. The president read some letters relating to the persecution, and was followed by Drs. Schaff and Riggenbach, who urged the Alliance to take action in favor of the persecuted Protestants. When the charges against the Austrian government were presented there was a silent pause of some length. Permission was given, before a vote was taken, to hear any who might be disposed to defend the persecutors, and to give reason why the protest should not be made. No one said a word. It was a scene of intense interest. Then a vote was taken, when all on the great platform arose, and those in the immense congregation also who were sitting arose as one man, and stood for some time in perfect silence. Many wept audibly. Great numbers were descendants of the Huguenots and Dutch fugitives from Spanish intolerance, and they were now stretching forth a helping hand toward their brothers in sorrow in this late nineteenth century. When a negative was called for, not one person voted. The decision was thus unanimous, and a committee was appointed to wait in person on the Austrian Emperor, Francis Joseph, and protest against the continuance of the persecution. That committee has done its work. It had to go as far as Hungary to get an audience with the emperor. He promised to give the subject his careful attention. It remains to be seen whether

he will do it, or permit Romanism still to hound to death, in the Bohemian fastnesses, the descendants in faith of the brave John Huss. We believe this voice and outstretched hand of the Evangelical Alliance to persecuted Protestants cannot be without effect, and that the chains will be broken. The word that has delivered the many persecuted believers in Spain and Italy, the Protestants of the Baltic Provinces, and the Bulgarians in Turkey, is not likely to fall on deaf ears. No action of the Alliance, at any of its sessions, has been more important or farsighted than this. It means the unity of Protestants, and their readiness to defend their companions in doctrine and experience the world over.

All the sessions of the Anglo-American department were marked by well-considered addresses, and will be remembered longest by all attendants at Basle whose native language is the English. Dr. T. D. Anderson, of New York, and Sir Charles Reed, of London, spoke on Sunday-schools. Dr. E. A. Washburn, of New York, discussed the delicate subject of Socialism, and gave, as a solution of the dangers which threaten society at the present time, these three grounds of hope: free discussion of the present dangers by Christian men, sound home training and education in the schools, and a wise co-operation of all possible methods for relieving the working classes of the evils which oppose them. Drs. O. H. Tiffany and John Hall, of New York, presided at two of the Anglo-American sessions, and by their wise words and impartial supervision added largely to the success of the proceedings.

The subject of missions was treated in the general sessions by Drs. Theodore Christlieb, William Arthur, Pastor Barde, and Murray Mitchell. The first speaker presented the most voluminous paper of the whole week of the Alliance. It constitutes one hundred and sixty-four octavo pages in the published proceedings of the session. He compared the former condition of the heathen world with the present success of missions; and then described the missionary genius of the Christian Churches, first among barbarous peoples, and then in civilized nations, and closed with a statement of the great missionary task before the Church at this hour. Dr. Arthur had but a limited time to speak, but, brief as it was, he made the strong point that the success of missions in far-off lands depends upon

the spirit and life of the home Churches, which send out their men to lead the nations in darkness to Christ.

The closing day of the regular proceedings of the Alliance was Saturday, but a communion service was held in the cathedral on Sunday, and there was a fraternal leave-taking in the evening in Association Hall. This communion service was a remarkable meeting. The building itself was calculated to awaken lively memories of the heroic days of Swiss Protestantism. It dates back to A. D. 1010, and in a side room of the great edifice the secret sessions of the Council of Basle were held over four centuries ago. It was a stronghold of Romanism when its power was undisputed from the frozen North Cape to sunny, vine-clad Sicily. Its grotesque and lavish stone carvings; its stately and minute wooden figures; its dark crypt and stately pillars; its strange mixture of the Byzantine and Gothic orders of architecture; its double towers, that, in the sisterly companionship of the centuries, throw their shadows down into the hasty and cheerful Rhine; its stiff but significant mounted statues of Saints George and Martin, that tell the story of Hapsburg power, and have kept ward at the doorway through the long pilgrimage of both Roman Catholic and Protestant generations; and, above all, those rich cloisters, around whose quadrangle Erasmus loved to walk and think before he ever saw English Cambridge, and sauntered along the arcadian terrace of Queen's College, force one back to the elder days, in spite of the free and hopeful present. The music from the many voices and the great organ had more than the usual lesson of Christian love to teach. The sermon was preached by the senior pastor, Dr. Stockmeyer, after which the administration of the Lord's Supper began. About two thousand persons were supposed to participate in this singularly impressive communion. Preachers and laymen approached the altar together, and it was fully three hours before the service was ended. The only reminder of nobility which one could see was the single badge of the iron cross worn by Count Bismarek-Bohlen, who sat in the altar, with other members of the Alliance. The parting services in the evening called out such a large congregation that another meeting, in an adjoining room, had to be held. At the principal meeting the speakers were Drs. Riggenschach and Arthur, and Count Bismarek-Bohlen, in the

German language; Dr. Godet, in French; and Pastor Cocorda, in Italian. Here, as in all the preceding meetings, the hymns were sung from a book prepared especially for the session, and which seemed to be in every worshiper's hand. In this little volume the great singers of nearly all of the Protestant communions were represented. The hymns were in the four chief languages of Europe and America—German, French, English, and Italian. "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," "Grand Dieu, nous Te Bénissons," "There is a Fountain filled with blood," and "Del Forte di Giacobbe," were sung by Christian people from every quarter of the compass.

An important question in connection with the Alliance was the relation of the organization to the foreign Churches which are now represented by active operations and growing influence in Germany and Switzerland. The Wesleyans of England, and the Baptists and Methodists of the United States, have succeeded so far that now they are regarded as threatening forces to the power of the State Churches. The leading theologians in the latter manifest little sympathy with them, and look on their work with suspicion, and in many instances with a want of fraternal feeling. There was, however, at the Basle session a just recognition of the right of our American missionaries in those countries to participate in all matters that concern the common interests of the Church universal. The two resident ministers of our German and Swiss Conference, Rev. Clement Achard, presiding elder of the Basle District, and Rev. Heinrich Mann, pastor of our Church in Basle, were members of the local committee, and had their full voice in the arrangements for the session. Rev. Dr. L. Nippert, the director of our Theological Seminary in Frankfort-on-the-Main, was one of the regular speakers at a devotional meeting at Association Hall, with Court-Preacher Hoffman and others. No one can say that there was not a proper recognition of our representation at the Basle session. At one of the early morning meetings, which preceded the regular sessions at ten o'clock, some one expressed his inability to co-operate with the Alliance because of its admission of the "foreign sects" into relation with it. But this spirit was promptly rebuked. Dr. Nippert said a brave and strong word in defense of our work in the Fatherland, and no one could gainsay his statements as to the pure methods of

our work. Dr. Schaff also said that all hostile expressions relating to this subject were foreign to the spirit of the Alliance, and deserved rebuke. Count Bismarck-Böhlen, who was for the time the presiding officer, said that if men from abroad come into Germany, and preach a pure gospel, and the people are attracted toward it, they are worthy of all confidence, and that if the State Churches lose their power God will place it in other hands.

The personal appearance and characteristics of some of the leading members of the Alliance were matters of no little interest to Americans who had been reading their works for many years, and yet had never seen them. Van Oosterzee is a stout, short, florid Dutchman, who moves about quickly, and has a kindly word and strong grasp for any stranger who approaches him. He has grown much older in the last decade. Before his turn came to speak he sat a little nervously in his chair, and when announced, he started up briskly, took out his manuscript, and dropped into the chair at the speaker's desk. He rubbed the perspiration from his great, beaming face, and seemed about to read his paper, and ~~that~~, too, while sitting; but by a quick movement he arose, pushed aside his chair, laid his manuscript away from him, and proceeded to speak with great animation extemporaneously. His first utterances told the story at once of his being the chief orator of Dutch Protestantism. He warmed with his subject, gesticulated with subdued power, and his deep gutturals reached the furthest corners of the auditorium. He melted all hearts, and will be remembered as one of the most notable figures of the session. Orelli is a young man, not much beyond thirty, slender, pale, of great keen eyes. He wrote a book on "Through the Holy Land," which is rather sentimental than scientific. He is sustained at the Basle University by a salary given by a circle of evangelical friends and admirers. He used no manuscript, but spoke with an incisive force and emphasis, and with a spiritual unction, which produced a powerful impression. His address was a phenomenon, and from this distance of six months it stands out before us rather as a visible thing than a spiritual communication. May his slender frame stand the jostle and impulse of his masterly mind!

De Pressensé is of negligent utterance, and has grown aged

since 1866, when his now gray hair was coal-black, and his eyes were keen and piercing, instead of dull and cold, as they now are, save when the fire comes as he addresses an audience. His address on the freedom of the press was listened to with undivided attention by the multitude, who did not understand him, as he spoke in French. And yet there was something in his manner of speech that gave the audience a clear idea of what he was saying. We heard his strong words before we reached the church in which he was making his address, and when we entered the building it was difficult to get even standing-room near his desk. Pressensé represents the effort of reviving French Protestantism to get a hearing and assert its prerogatives. He threw himself into the heart of the humanitarian part of the late Franco-German war, and when peace came he became one of the national representatives. He has gained the confidence of all classes, and it is not unlikely that he will become a senator for life. Count Bismarck-Bohlen is tall and slender, and without the massive appearance of the prince, his cousin. He was attentive to all the sessions; calm, self-possessed, full of sympathy with earnest work by every believer and every denomination. Only once did he seem to possess the fire of the family, and that was when he made an address at the close of the session. His eyes flashed with a strange brilliancy, and his whole manner was animated and magnetic.

Dr. William Arthur has been suffering for years from a throat difficulty, but has now—at least so it seemed to his hearers—entirely recovered his tone of voice. His health is not firm, yet when he speaks one comes in a moment within the power of his old charm of voice and manner. His face and whole bearing are exceedingly captivating. When he illustrated the virtue of interdenominational comity by an allusion to the benefits that come to the human body by a judicious rubbing of the surface, every one saw the aptness of his analogy, and greatly enjoyed it. He is to be a visitor to our approaching General Conference, where many who remember his former visit here will again hear him, and those who have never heard him will have the privilege of listening to one who has long been an ornament to British Methodism. Ebrard is a short, genial gentleman; brusque, ready for conversation, and full of plans for his pen in the years to come. Godet is one of the greatest

Protestants south of the Rhine, and for his keen analysis of the fundamental thoughts of Scripture, and especially for his comprehension of John's Gospel, has no superior in Europe. Dr. Rigg is well known to Americans from his two visits to this country. He has marvelous executive power, and has lost no flesh because of the arduous duties that have fallen to him through his presidency of the British Conference. His relations to the non-Wesleyan leaders of England are of the most intimate character, and honorable alike to them and him.

Dr. Nippert stands in the front of our German ministers. He has all the vigor of his earlier years, and is destined to do great service in the years to come. He wields a strong polemical pen, and his new work on "Pastoral Theology and Homiletics" will still more extend his influence.

The social features of the Alliance were peculiarly Swiss—and that means an open heart and hand. It was not expected by the Basle people that many guests would be present, and when they were surprised by the large number they set to work to entertain them in the best possible manner. The national representation of members present was as follows: From Germany, 554; Switzerland, 522; Great Britain, 252; France, 68; Holland, 63; America, 61; Belgium, 9; Italy, 7; Austria and Turkey, 6 each; Spain and Africa, 5 each; Russia, 4; East Indies, 3; Denmark, Greece, and Canada, 2 each; Sweden, 1; and 600 other delegates unclassified.

The Committee of Reception met the delegates at the railway station, and did all in their power to make them feel at home. No pains were spared to contribute to the comfort and pleasure of the guests from the beginning to the end of the session. The British branch of the Alliance, thinking that the Swiss brethren would be overburdened financially, sent them a handsome sum of money to supplement their own gifts. But this has been returned intact, the Basle people saying that they wished the gratification of meeting all expenses themselves. Afternoon garden fêtes were held in the grounds of prominent citizens, where refreshments were served, and many thousands met in all the freedom of Christian brotherhood.

ART. IV.—DISTRICT CONFERENCES.

EVIDENTLY the problem of District Conferences is unsolved, and they have failed to be utilized as an arm of service in the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. An organization of this character was an imperative necessity, to develop a deeper popular interest in the affairs of the Church, and to strengthen the connectional bonds of the District. There ever has been a want of unity in our Conference system for the lack of a suitable body between the Quarterly and Annual Conferences, and the friction has increased with the growth of time. There are departments of Church work that are now almost obsolete and stagnant for the lack of using proper means to convert into practical use the vast power going to waste under the existing condition of things.

With the introduction of the District Conference, the regular gradation of Conferences seemed perfected; but the legislation establishing them was defective, and the usefulness of this new department was crippled at the outset, and it has since been imperfect in its operations, and is singularly weighted with objectionable conditions. First, in the gradation, is the Quarterly Conference, having supervision of a single Circuit or Station. Second, the District Conference, comprising all the charges in a Presiding Elder's District. The members of both bodies are the same, with the exception that only one Steward and one Superintendent of the Sunday-school are admitted as representatives in the District Conference, and Trustees have no standing in the body. In the Quarterly Conference all the Stewards, Trustees, and Superintendents of Sunday-schools in each are members. Third, the Annual Conference is composed exclusively of ministers, who are wholly under the control of the appointing power. Fourth, the Judicial Conference is composed of ministers elected as Triers of Appeals from the action of the Annual Conferences, comprising members of three different Conferences to secure impartiality of review in appeal cases. Fifth, the General Conference, which has supreme supervision as the highest ecclesiastical legislature, overshadowing all other departments of the Church; and, being purely representative by ministerial and lay delegates, it

is the highest exponent of the will of the Church in all vital interests. This gradation of Conferences gives a unity and completeness to our system of government that has established harmony in every part. Take out the District Conference, and the unity and harmony of the system are disturbed, and the gap between the Quarterly and the Annual Conferences is too wide; and the consequence is, the connectional interests of the Church are neglected and must suffer. While the former Conference is almost exclusively comprised of the lay element, the latter is wholly ministerial, and the need of the blending of the clerical and lay elements in the District Conference, or some other intermediate body that will fuse the interests of both for the general good of the Church, is obviously necessary.

Legislation that provided for District Conferences, purely for Local Preachers, in 1820, and of a general character in 1872, was forced, unnatural, and the outgrowth of a pressure, wholly diverse from the natural causes that were recognized in organizing other forms of Conferences. When Mr. Wesley instituted class-meetings, the necessity for "leaders' meetings" was imperative; and, with the advance of the Church, the Annual Conference was a creation of the Founder of Methodism. What we need, as an intermediate feature, called the District Conference, is represented in the English Wesleyan body by the District Meeting and Local Preachers' Meeting; the first being organized at the first Conference after Mr. Wesley's death, while the other was instituted in 1796, by the Wesleyan Conference, which directed the Superintendents of Districts "regularly to meet the Local Preachers once a quarter; none to be admitted but those who are proposed and approved at this meeting." What has been accomplished by the Wesleyans through these channels, enforced by method, system and rigid authority worthy of the followers of John Wesley, we have imperfectly attempted by the District Conference. The incomplete working of the General Conference at first arose because it was not a delegated body, which made it necessary to perfect the organization as it is now constituted, and its authority ever since is sustained by all the law-power inherent in the Church. So the constituting of the Judicial Conference was the outcome of a necessity, and its requirements are rigidly observed. But the District Conference presents the strange anom-

aly of being *optional* in its organization. It is to be created by the consent of the parties concerned, and may be dissolved by the action of the same constituency. The seeds of its death were sown when it was ushered into being; and its sickly existence and dissolution on every hand are the natural results of imperfect legislation. How long would the Quarterly and Annual Conferences exist if option were allowed, or, indeed, any other institution of Methodist economy as it relates to Conferences?

Efforts were made by those in charge of the measure and action of the General Conference of 1872 to blend the most popular features, by combining in one body certain functions of the Quarterly Conference, a Ministerial Association for biblical and theological literary exercises, and a Sunday-school Institute, with just enough religious and literary exercises at each session to increase its popularity. Had these features been pressed more, the District Conference would now have a stronger hold upon the Church. Instead of the movement in some quarters for its extirpation from the Discipline, it would have steadily grown into favor. History amply demonstrates that the completeness and unity of Methodist economy require some kind of intermediate body between the Quarterly and Annual Conferences, by which the lay power of the Church should be employed, and that Local Preachers could be vested with some form of recognition which is not now accorded them.

The District Meeting in Great Britain, to a considerable extent, represents the District Conference in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Its functions, however, are somewhat different, but it supplies the intermediate benefits; being always convened at a stated period by absolute authority, and without being held at the pleasure of a district. In the English Wesleyan system, which has no quadrennial General Conference, the Annual Conference being the highest ecclesiastical court, the District Meeting is ordered to be held in May, between certain dates, and is the second court in English Methodism. It was instituted, as stated at the first Conference after Mr. Wesley's death, "for the preservation of our whole economy." It is an important body in matters ministerial and financial, and is composed of all the ministers of the district, including supernumeraries and preachers on trial. That portion of business relating to ministerial functions is first transacted, and on the second day the laymen

appear for the purpose of considering certain connectional and financial interests.

The Methodist Church of Canada, in its recently organized form, comprised chiefly of the Wesleyans, and a dependency of the parent Conference in England, was modeled after the latter in its District Meetings, with somewhat enlarged powers and combining important functions. It is composed of all members of Conferences and probationers for the ministry, the Recording Stewards of the several circuits and missions, and one other lay representative for each minister and probationer for the ministry. The first day is devoted exclusively to ministerial affairs. The lay members of the District Meeting immediately preceding the General Conference are elected by ballot at the previous quarterly official meeting. Its business is to recommend candidates for the ministry, examine and recommend probationers, persons to be received into full connection and ordained; receive reports of trials and make regulations in reference to married men. On the second day it receives the reports from the Stewards of the circuits, recommends special grants to cases of affliction, inquires into the financial ability of probationers, elects members of the Conference committees, hears appeals of Local Preachers, recommends alterations in charges, and elects lay delegates to General Conference. There is also a Financial District Meeting required to be held in each district in September, composed of the Superintendent and a Steward from each circuit and mission, which is wholly occupied with financial matters.

In the Methodist Protestant Church each Conference is authorized to fix the number of sub-districts, and associating as many charges together as may be deemed best, composed of the pastors and such a ratio of lay representatives from each charge as it may decide necessary. The work of this District Meeting is to promote all the local and general interests of the Churches, such as missions, education, Sabbath-schools, finance, pastoral work, etc. This is the only body between the Quarterly and Annual Conferences.

The District Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, is a great agency in promoting its polity, and performs important functions not delegated to the Quarterly Conference, relieving the Annual Conference of the minute

details of certain departments of the Church. The Conference is cherished and heartily sustained by the Bishops, Presiding Elders, and preachers generally. It is composed of all the preachers in the district, traveling and local, including superannuated preachers, and of laymen to the number of the above; and their mode of appointment each Annual Conference may determine for itself. The business of the body is to consider the condition of each charge, as to their spiritual state and attendance upon the means of grace, missions, Sunday-schools, financial systems, and electing lay delegates to Annual Conferences. Prominence is given to religious exercises. It will be seen that its functions are more restricted than our District Conference in some respects. The Bishops frequently preside and vitalize every department. Through this body an interest is incited to provide for the Episcopal Fund.

The term "District Conference" in our Church was first employed in 1792, but it was originally applied to the Annual Conference, as will be seen by the following: 1792: "*Ques.* 4: Who are the members of the District Conferences? *Ans.* All the traveling preachers of the district or districts respectively who are in full connection. *Ques.* 5. How often are the District Conferences to be held? *Ans.* Annually." In 1796 the word "Yearly" was substituted for "District." In 1800 "Annual" took the place of "Yearly" Conference, and it has remained the same from that time to the present. According to a record examined, a "District Conference" was held in 1805, at Leesburgh, Va., in the bounds of the old Baltimore Conference, by William McKendree, President; Nicholas Snethen, Secretary. The only act recorded was defining rules on "Slavery," and here the record of its proceedings abruptly ceases.

Petitions had been presented from Local Preachers to the General Conference which met at Baltimore, Md., in 1820, asking for the organization of District Conferences, to enable them to enjoy certain rights, which they alleged were denied them; and the demand was intensified by the controversy which was then agitating the Church, called the "Reform" movement, which culminated in a secession and the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church. The Bishops had called attention to the desirability of some action on the subject. Dr. Bangs' "History of the Methodist Episcopal

Church," referring to this important change says: "A little uneasiness had been manifested at times by some of the Local Preachers, because they thought they had been abridged of some of their rights in not being permitted to be examined, licensed, and tried by their peers exclusively. To remove the cause of their dissatisfaction by granting them the privilege of transacting the business which related to themselves exclusively, this General Conference (1820) created a 'District Conference,' to be composed of all the Local Preachers in the Presiding Elder's district who shall have been licensed two years."

A special committee, comprising the late Dr. Martin Ruter, Bishop Capers, and three others, framed a plan of a District Conference, and it passed May 18, 1820; the features of which may be gathered from the following condensation: The Presiding Elder of the district, or, in his absence, such person as the District Meeting might elect for the purpose, was to be President. The Conference was authorized to grant licenses to proper persons to preach as Local Preachers, to renew their licenses, to recommend to Annual Conferences suitable persons for Deacon's and Elder's orders in the local ministry, for admission on trial in an Annual Conference, to try, suspend, expel, or acquit such Local Preachers as might be accused; but it could not license any man to preach unless he was recommended by a Quarterly Conference. In fact, all the powers formerly belonging to the Quarterly Conference which related to Local Preachers, except simply the privilege of recommending candidates for the office of the local ministry, were transferred to this District Conference. At the session of the General Conference in Baltimore, May, 1824, the seat of the "Radical" controversy, on May 12 a resolution was offered to do away with District Conferences, and make all ordained Local Preachers members of Annual Conferences, which was lost. Dr. W. Winans, of the Mississippi Conference, subsequently reported on behalf of the Committee on Local Preachers, that petitions had been considered for and against District Conferences, and that the request to allow a delegation of Local Preachers to the General Conference was inexpedient; and the report then recommended amendments to the chapter in the Discipline that when District Conferences were not held, or failed to transact all the business necessary, the Quarterly Conference was authorized to transact it.

Also licenses were ordered to be renewed annually, and a clause inserted making it necessary for admission into the traveling connection to be first recommended by the Quarterly Conference. When the General Conference assembled in Pittsburgh, Pa., May, 1828, while the "Radical" controversy was at high-tide, under the lead of McCaine, Jennings, Suthen, Shinn, Brown, and others, the organization existed more in letter than in practice. This General Conference provided that a majority of the members of a District Conference should be a "quorum to do business." Action was taken by inserting a clause, "Provided, that no person shall be licensed to preach without the recommendation of the Society of which he is a member, or of a Leaders' Meeting." By the time the General Conference convened in Philadelphia, in May, 1832, the organization seemed to exist more in name than in fact, and its death-knell was virtually secured, without seriously affecting the condition or relation of Local Preachers, as the Quarterly Conference was fully competent to perform any or all functions neglected by the District Conference. When the General Conference assembled in Cincinnati, O., May, 1836, it was found that causes had grown up, almost wholly outside of the organization itself, that had antagonized its design, and rendered it inoperative. Its abandonment was but a mere formal action, and every thing relating to Local Preachers was relegated back again to the Quarterly Conference, to the same condition in which they were previous to 1820.

A wide-spread feeling, gathering *momentum* for years, existed, that an intermediate Conference, so useful among the English Wesleyans, and so potent as an arm of denominational power in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was absolutely necessary. The culmination of the lay-sentiment in the Church by the introduction of laymen into the General Conference made the necessity still more imperative that a mixed body should exist, and possibly the two progressive steps would help to make the solution of the introduction of laymen into all bodies to "confer" on the interests of Methodism. Under this condition of sentiment in the Church the Bishops, in their Address to the General Conference of 1872, wisely recommended attention to the subject of District Conferences: "We deem this (District Conferences) a matter of considerable practical

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXXII.—19

importance, and think if such Conferences were carefully constituted, and their duties and prerogatives strictly defined, they might be rendered highly useful. In our opinion there should be two sessions held annually; the first near the commencement, and the second near the close, of the Conference year."

In the distribution of the portions of this able address to the standing committees, the question of District Conferences fell to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Itinerancy; but the exciting discussions on the Presiding Elder and other live questions overshadowed every other subject; and it is evident the same unfortunate misapprehension of the character, place, and work of District Conferences possessed the minds of the majority of its members then, as has clouded so many minds since it became a law; and on May 29 the Committee reported adversely to the organization of District Conferences. Subsequently, in debate in the General Conference, it was stated that a minority reported in favor of the measure.

The following bit of history is in place. At the sixth annual session of the National Local Preachers' Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, a deputation was appointed to visit the General Conference at Philadelphia, May, 1864. A similar deputation waited upon the General Conference in May, 1868, at which time some conference was "held on the subject of District Conferences for Local Preachers." Assurances were given by the Committee on Local Preachers that any well-matured and defined memorial to the General Conference on the subject would receive respectful attention and be granted. The deputation reported back these friendly assurances to their constituents at the annual session in October, 1868; also, the report of the committee of the General Conference in response to the memorial presented in May previous. Considerable discussion took place on the subject of District Conferences, and the outline of a plan was adopted. Brief action followed at each annual session succeeding, and at the annual meeting in October, 1871, a memorial was ordered to be carried and presented by a deputation of ten to the General Conference at Brooklyn, N. Y., May, 1872.

Dr. Daniel Curry was intrusted with the duty of presenting the memorial and accompanying fraternal papers of the deputation, which he did by special permission on the thirteenth day

of the session, and they were referred to the Committee on the State of the Church, of which he was the chairman. The memorial was as follows:

Resolved, That we memorialize the General Conference, as follows:

1. To organize in each Presiding Elder's district a District Conference, to be composed of all the Traveling and Local Preachers in the district, and to be presided over by the Presiding Elder, and meet semi-annually.

2. To give this District Conference authority to receive, license, try, and expel Local Preachers, and also to recommend suitable persons to the Annual Conference, to be received into the traveling connection and for ordination as Local Deacons and Elders.

3. To authorize the District Conference to assign to each Local Preacher a field of labor, and hold him strictly responsible for an efficient performance of his work.

Through the indomitable will and ability of the chairman, a friendly committee, and the faithful members of the deputations, the chapter on District Conferences was reported on the twenty-ninth day, and after a short but incisive debate, at the waning hours of the quadrennial session, it was passed and incorporated in the Discipline. It is evident from the discussion that ensued when it was reported to the Conference, that some sturdy blows in favor of the measure had been dealt in the Committee of the Itinerancy; and the point raised in the discussion in its favor, and ably sustained, was, that the measure deserved at least a trial, and that it was intensifying the recent action in favor of the laity, as laymen were constituted members of that body.

The chapter opens with reference to the action being in response to the memorial of the National Local Preachers' Association on the subject, and that portions of it and other suitable features were adopted. The full text of the chapter on District Conferences is as follows:

The District Conferences shall be composed of the Traveling and Local Preachers, the Exhorters, the District Stewards, and the Sunday-school Superintendents in the District. But if there shall be more than one Sunday-school Superintendent in any Circuit or Station, then the Quarterly Conference shall designate one of them for this service.

The District Conference shall meet twice each year, at such time and place as the Presiding Elder shall designate for the

first meeting after the adoption of this plan by any district; but the District Conference shall, at each meeting, determine the place for its next meeting, the time to be fixed by the Presiding Elder. The first District Conference for the year shall be held in the early part of it; the second, near the close.

The Presiding Elder shall preside in the District Conferences. In his absence the District Conference shall choose their own President by ballot from among the Traveling Elders.

The Minutes of the District Conference shall be kept by a Secretary chosen by the Conference. The Minutes shall be carefully recorded in a book provided for the purpose, and kept by the Secretary for future use or reference.

The regular business of the District Conference shall be,

1. To take the general oversight of all the temporal and spiritual affairs of the district, subject to the provisions of the Discipline.

2. To take cognizance of all the Local Preachers and Exhorters in the district, and to inquire respecting the gifts, labors, and usefulness of each by name, and to arrange a plan of appointments for each for the ensuing half year.

3. To hear complaints against Local Preachers; to try, suspend, deprive of ministerial office and credentials, expel or acquit any Local Preacher against whom charges may be preferred.

4. To license Local Preachers, and to recommend to the Annual Conference Local Preachers as suitable candidates for Deacons or Elders' Orders, and for admission on trial in the Traveling Connection; *provided*, That no person shall be licensed to preach, nor recommended for orders, nor for admission in the Traveling Connection, without the recommendation of the Quarterly Conference, or of the Stewards and Leaders' meeting of the Circuit or Station of which he is a member; and in all cases the candidates shall first pass a satisfactory examination in doctrine and discipline.

5. To inquire whether all the collections for the benevolent institutions of the Church, as recognized by the Discipline, are properly attended to in all the Circuits and Stations, and to adopt suitable measures for promoting their success.

6. To inquire into the condition of the Sunday-schools in the district, and to adopt suitable measures for insuring their success.

7. To inquire respecting opportunities for Missionary and Church Extension enterprises within the district, and take measures for the occupation of any neglected portions of its territories by mission Sunday-schools and appointments for public worship.

8. To provide for appropriate religious and literary exercises during its sessions for the mutual benefit of those attending upon them.

9. The District Stewards shall, at the place, and at or near the time, of the first District Conference for the year, make their estimate for the support of the Presiding Elder, as provided for in section 478.

The provisions of this section shall be of force and binding only in those districts in which the Quarterly Conferences of a majority of the Circuits and Stations shall have approved it by asking the Presiding Elder to convene the District Conference as herein provided. In those districts in which District Conferences shall be held the power by this section given to the District Conferences shall not be exercised by the Quarterly Conferences. In all other cases their powers shall remain as heretofore provided.

Although the character of the instituted body was different from what was petitioned for in the memorial, and in spite of its being optional with districts to organize it, it was decided by the National Local Preachers' Association to accept the action in good faith, and await for a clearer recognition of their wishes at another time. In the fall, previous to the General Conference of 1876, a deputation of thirteen was appointed to proceed to Baltimore and present a fraternal address, including the following memorial:

Resolved, That we memorialize the General Conference to make such changes in the Discipline as will make the District Conference obligatory and not optional, as at present.

2. That we recommend such disciplinary measures as will make our Local Preachers more effective in their sphere of labor, and in cases where Local Ministers are ineffective from any cause, except mental or physical disability, their parchments or licenses be taken away from them and they be silenced.

The memorial and papers, at the suggestion of Dr. Curry, were referred to the Committee on Revisals, but were afterward transferred to the Committee on the Itinerancy. The Presiding Eldership question was in the crucible before this Committee, and a fiery debate raged during most of the session of that body; and a sub-committee revised and enlarged the scope of the section, and it was reported to Conference and adopted, with a clause designating the mode of its dissolution by any district after the vote of the same and concurrence of a majority of the Quarterly Conferences. This change just suited the views of many Presiding Elders and others, who were unwilling to make the District Conference a success. A power exercised upon the same ground would abolish Quarterly Conferences; for certainly, if interest and numbers in attendance were the test, the most of them would be voted out of existence.

The full text of the revised and enlarged action is as follows :

Resolved, That Part II, Chapter i, section 3 of the Discipline be amended so that it shall read as follows :

THE DISTRICT CONFERENCES.

113. The District Conferences shall be composed of the Traveling and Local Preachers, the Exhorters, the District Stewards, and one Sunday-school Superintendent and one Class-leader from each pastoral charge in the District. But if there shall be more than one Sunday-school Superintendent in any Circuit or Station, then the Quarterly Conference shall designate one of them for this service; and it shall also select the Class-leader.

114. The District Conference shall meet once or twice each year in each Presiding Elder's District, as each District Conference shall determine for itself, at such time and place as the Presiding Elder shall designate for the first meeting after the adoption of this plan by the District; but the District Conference shall, at each meeting, determine the place for its next meeting, the time to be fixed by the Presiding Elder.

115. A Bishop, when present, shall preside at the District Conference. If no Bishop be present, the Presiding Elder of the District shall preside. And if both be absent, the District Conference shall choose its own President by ballot from among the Traveling Elders.

116. A record of the proceedings of each District Conference shall be kept by a Secretary chosen for the purpose, and a copy of the said record shall be sent to the ensuing Annual Conference.

117. The regular business of the District Conference shall be:

118. I. To take the general oversight of all the temporal and spiritual affairs of the district, subject to the provisions of the Discipline.

119. II. To take cognizance of all the Local Preachers and Exhorters in the district, and to inquire respecting the gifts, labors, and usefulness of each by name, and to arrange a plan of appointments for each until the next District Conference.

120. III. To hear complaints against Local Preachers; to try, suspend, deprive of ministerial office and credentials, expel or acquit any Local Preacher against whom charges may be preferred.

121. IV. To license Local Preachers, to renew the licenses of Local Preachers and Exhorters, and to recommend to the Annual Conference Local Preachers as suitable candidates for Deacon's or Elder's orders, and for admission on trial in the Traveling Connection; *provided*, That no person shall be licensed to preach, or his license to preach or exhort be renewed, or be recommended for orders or for admission in the Traveling Connection, without the recommendation of the Quarterly Conference, or of the Stewards and Leaders' Meeting, of the Circuit or Station of which he is a member; and in all cases the candidate shall first pass a satisfactory examination in such course of studies as the Bishops shall

prescribe. The District Conference shall also have the power given to the Quarterly Conference in Part II, Chapter ii, section 12, relating to the recognition of orders.

122. V. To inquire whether all the collections for the benevolent institutions of the Church, as recognized by the Discipline, are properly attended to in all the Circuits and Stations, and to adopt suitable measures for promoting their success.

123. VI. To inquire into the condition of the Sunday-schools in the district, and to adopt suitable measures for insuring their success.

124. VII. To inquire respecting opportunities for Missionary and Church Extension enterprises within the district, and to take measures for the occupation of any neglected portions of its territory by Missions, Sunday-schools, and appointments for public worship.

125. VIII. To provide for appropriate religious and literary exercises during the sessions, for the mutual benefit of those attending upon them.

126. The order of business of the District Conference shall be:

1. To inquire what members of the District Conference are present.

2. To appoint committees on—

(1.) Examination of candidates for license to preach.

(2.) Examination of Local Preachers in each of the four years of the course of study.

(3.) Examination of candidates for admission into the Traveling Connection.

(4.) Examination of candidates for orders.

(5.) Home mission work.

(6.) Appointments of Local Preachers and Exhorters.

(7.) Apportionment to each charge of the amounts to be raised for benevolent purposes.

(8.) Programme of religious and literary exercises for next meeting.

(9.) Miscellaneous matters.

3. To receive reports—

(1.) From the Presiding Elder as to the condition of the work under his charge, and his own work as Presiding Elder.

(2.) From each pastor as to the religious condition of his charge, his pastoral labors, benevolent collections, and the circulation of our Church periodicals and books.

(3.) From each Local Preacher, the form of which report shall be prescribed by each District Conference.

(4.) From each Exhorter, including a statement of the prayer-meetings he has held, and other work done, especially in destitute places, and among the sick and the poor.

(5.) From each District Steward as to the temporal affairs of the charge he represents.

(6.) From each Superintendent as to the condition of the Sunday-schools of the charge he represents.

(7.) From each Class-leader as to the condition of the classes of the charge he represents.

(8.) From each Committee.

4. To inquire concerning Local Preachers—

(1.) Are there any charges or complaints?

(2.) Who shall have their licenses renewed?

(3.) Who shall be licensed to preach?

(4.) Who shall be recommended for ordination?

(5.) Who shall be recommended for recognition of orders?

(6.) Who shall be recommended for admission into the Traveling Connection?

(7.) Where are Local Preachers stationed?

5. To inquire concerning Exhorters—

(1.) Who shall have their licenses renewed?

(2.) What work is assigned each Exhorter?

6. Where shall the next District Conference be held?

7. Is there any other business?

The order of business may be varied and the business interspersed with such literary and religious exercises as the Conference may direct.

127. The provisions of this section shall be of force and binding only in those districts in which the Quarterly Conferences of a majority of the Circuits and Stations shall have approved it by asking the Presiding Elder to convene the District Conference, as herein provided. A District Conference may be discontinued by a vote of two thirds of the members present, at any regular session, notice thereof having been given at a previous session, and with the concurrence of three fourths of the Quarterly Conferences in the district. In those districts in which District Conferences shall be held, the powers by this section given to the District Conferences shall not be exercised by the Quarterly Conferences. In all other cases their powers shall remain as heretofore provided.

Vigorous efforts were soon after employed by some administrators to effect the early dissolution of District Conferences at important localities, and also to so spread their adverse action before the Church as to intimidate and influence other sections that were inclined to abandon them. This action is the more unseemly, as the institution is popular in our Southern territory, and, indeed, necessary to accomplish results similar to those in the Church South. In the North-west it is an important factor in promoting connectional interests, and, as a general thing, is prospering in the West. The wise utterances of Dr. Crary, a veteran editor and Presiding Elder in far-off Colorado, have a ring of logic that cannot be resisted. He writes that to repeal the

law now would be a stupendous error, and a gross injustice to the mission fields, the frontier, and to the South, where District Conferences are most prized. The fatal blunder in the law is that miserable section which leaves it optional with the district to carry it out or not. In the Middle tier of States no uniform action prevails, and much depends upon the character of the Presiding Elder in popularizing the exercises and routine questions so as to invest the sessions with attraction.

There are points on the southern and eastern coasts that have resisted, with studied indifference, the mandate of the Church to give the institution a fair experiment, preferring to hide themselves behind a mere technicality and privilege, and thus depreciate an organization they know nothing about practically. Among the hopeful signs that assure the friends of the measure, and indicate a vigorous defense against its entire abolition at the next General Conference, is the wise concession made by the District Conferences which include that healthy spot in Methodism, Philadelphia—that, while there are objectionable features in the present section, which led to steps toward dissolution at first, the feeling steadily grows that some organization is necessary to complete the unity of the wheels within the wheel, and the duty now is to solve that problem and avoid hasty action. This is the view of Bishop Simpson, namely, that there is needed some kind of an organization to aid in promoting our connectional interests, and other work which the Quarterly Conference is unable to perform because of its local and limited powers, while the Annual Conference has not time at command for such business as the District Conference, or some body of a similar character, could do. A purely ministerial body cannot act for the laity, and hence the greater necessity for a mixed ecclesiastical court such as has been in force over a century in England, and which we must come to sooner or later. Bishop Simpson expresses the idea in his valuable work, the “*Cyclopedia of Methodism*,” (see page 301:) “Where they (District Conferences) have been used and properly conducted, they have been found valuable in developing a deeper interest in the affairs of the Church, and in strengthening the connectional bonds of the district.” Bishop Peck, and other Bishops, have given utterance to similar views, the former in much stronger language than the words quoted. Dr. Fry, of the “Central,”

in an able editorial, advocates the reconstruction of the District Conference as the best means of restoring the ancient acquaintance of the Bishops with the Churches, lost since Asbury's time by the wide extension of our work, and outlines what should be its character. We quote :

It should absorb to such an extent the functions of the Quarterly Conference, that the largest Annual Conference would not require more than three or four districts. The District Conference should meet twice a year, and a Bishop should always be present and preside, as at the Annual Conference. These District Conferences would afford him an insight into the condition of the charges that could not be obtained in any other way. It would greatly extend his personal intercourse with both the preachers and the people, and restore to some extent the pastoral relation of the Bishops of the Church, which has nearly been lost under the present system.

Coming so near the eighteenth delegated quadrennial session of the General Conference, there is naturally some solicitude on the part of the friends of District Conferences. In this institution the National Local Preachers' Association have a vital interest; and they have taken action on the subject, and appointed a strong deputation to present and urge their memorial. Chief above every personal consideration is the desire now and always expressed by that body, to ask for such an organization as will elevate the standard of ministerial usefulness and acceptability, and render this class of uncompensated preachers more useful and effective. They ask to be authorized to see that all who are admitted into the relation are worthy of it, to judge of their qualifications and continuance, to weed out the incompetent and useless, and to keep the ermine of ministerial purity under close surveillance, as cannot be done by the narrowed circle of a small Quarterly Conference. This, it is believed, can be accomplished best through the District Conference, or a body with similar powers. The same liberal spirit that was shown in their memorial, which led to the action of the General Conference in 1872, in associating the Traveling with the Local Preachers, is felt now in the action sought to be accomplished in May, 1880, and which was tacitly desired in the revision of 1876, either to be joined with the itinerants in an organization, or a provision inserted to hold a separate session at the same meeting for Local Preachers. In whatever form

the General Conference may recast the District Conference, they ask that its meetings shall be mandatory and not optional, and this requisition to be applicable to all concerned. Let this be done, and the declaration that Local Preachers do not attend because they feel ignored will no longer be true, as they are noted for being as obedient sons in the Gospel as any other class of ministers.

The National Local Preachers' Association at their late session in Troy, N. Y., adopted the following :

Resolved, That we memorialize the General Conference :

1. To organize the Local Preachers, either by districts or Conferences, under the presidency of a Bishop or Presiding Elder.
2. That such organization be given authority to license Local Preachers, persons recommended by the Quarterly Conference, and to try and expel Local Preachers, and also to recommend Local Preachers to be received on trial in the Annual Conference.

With some slight modifications in the section and provisions made for the just demands of Local Preachers, either by having a better recognition of their position and rights, or by their having a sub-District Conference for their benefit exclusively, the present section may be made acceptable, and can be easily carried out if it has an administrator who does not desire defeat. The routine disciplinary part may drag in the hands of a Bishop at an Annual Conference ; or a Presiding Elder may make a Quarterly Conference dull and prosy ; and so a District Conference may be duller than either, if the chairman allows long, rambling, verbal reports, with nothing in them, to occupy the principal time. Reports should be brief and pertinent. Considerable time should be given to popular exercises to interest the people. Part of the day exercises should be of a biblical and literary character, and the evenings should be largely devoted to religious exercises, and the social element be blended and infused in every part. Careful preparation for these meetings, the occasion well announced, and the introduction of popular features, will insure a grand success. It is proper to note, that while the National Local Preachers' Association seeks to elevate the standard of ministerial ability, and to have more systematic methods to increase their efficiency and accomplish greater successes, yet they think that the present interpretation of the law,

requiring a course of study for unordained Local Preachers and candidates for license, is hardly warranted by the Discipline, or by the action of the General Conference, so as to be applied strictly to aged Local Preachers who have spent scores of years in the ministry and are yet not ordained, so that they should be refused a renewal of their license and humiliated because they are unable to study by the course of the District Conference. Let the law be applied to those who enter the ministry, and young Local Preachers, without making the rule retrospective upon the class of aged veterans.

It is difficult to picture the ideal District Conference that will meet the requirements of the administrators and members of these bodies, but an outline sketch might be ventured. A body of this character should, in order to save time and expense, combine the elements of a Ministerial Association, District Sunday-school Institute, and a District Stewards' Meeting, and thus make one organization, and render it more effective and useful to every charge and to the connectional interests of the district. The essays should be broader and more practical than usually read at ministerial meetings, embracing questions of polity and the benevolent institutions, and thereby reaching ministers and members. The Sunday-school cause might be greatly stimulated under associated efforts, both by reports and special exercises. District Stewards have an opportunity to learn the condition of each charge in the district, and to act intelligently in their work. The holding of separate meetings for the above-named various objects is a wastage that should be avoided, as all the interests could be easily blended into one meeting. That portion of the disciplinary questions relegated from the Quarterly Conference to the District Conference may be rendered more effective in a larger body. Work may be done by a mixed one that could not be accomplished through a strictly ministerial membership, and the more the ministry and laity are blended together in considering the educational, benevolent, and financial interests of the Church, the better. Connectional objects and the social element may be stimulated, intensified, and revolutionized through this channel. The present chapter may be made to meet the highest ideal by grafting the part desired by Local Preachers, making the holding of its sessions absolute, and leaving the power of dissolution to the General

Conference. With these characteristics a skillful administrator can make District Conferences a popular and useful organization, just as he has the power in a great measure to make his quarterly visitation to the Churches popular.

What are the comparative gains from a well-conducted District Conference?

1. This body comprises all classes of officials in the Church, except Trustees. It imposes a specific duty on the Presiding Elder, the Traveling and Local Preachers—the former to give an account of his work, and the latter to do likewise, and to be subject to examination of character and relicensure if unordained; it requires exhorters to pass through the same steps, and Superintendents to report the condition of their schools; and it recognizes the District Steward. Under this head we note: (1.) The Presiding Elder's authority is not diminished, nor his quarterly visitations impaired. While, to some extent, the disciplinary questions and answers are the same in the District and in the Quarterly Conference, there is this advantage in the former, that the reports from the respective pastors act as a *stimulus* upon each other, and their statements are fuller and more inspiring. (2.) Pastors are brought into contact with other Pastors, and the reports, in their diversified form, are apt to produce aggressive and more liberal views. (3.) The careful examination of Local Preachers and Exhorters before disinterested persons from all parts of the district, relicensing them upon their merits and suitability for the office, is a much more thorough method than is attained by the Quarterly Conferences. This careful scrutiny of character and inquiry into the work of Local Preachers will have a salutary effect upon them. Their official recognition and assignment to systematic work, so far as possible, opens their way to favor with the people and to greater usefulness. (4.) Pastors alone are required to report the Sunday-schools to Quarterly Conferences, while the District Conference exacts reports from the Superintendent as well as from the Pastor. (5.) District Stewards become acquainted with the real condition of each charge, and this information furnishes each with an understanding of his duties which he cannot acquire elsewhere.

2. Taking into account the representations of the ministry and laymen brought together to consult and discuss questions

of finance, various departments of Church labor, examination of ministerial character and cultivation of the social element, the District Conference, if properly conducted, may advance every interest, and in time become a wonderful power in the Church. It should also supervise certain financial and kindred matters which the Annual Conference is unable to do, while in session, because of other pressing duties.

3. The communities unable to entertain an Annual Conference would readily sustain a District Conference. While their proceedings are unlike in most respects, yet the public services of the latter especially are greatly enjoyed, and leave a salutary influence wherever they are held.

4. All the members of a District Conference generally participate in its discussions and business, while but comparatively few do so at an Annual Conference on matters beyond what relates to themselves. The preparation of essays and special addresses and the discussions which follow, as well as in the transaction of routine proceedings, secure a discipline for the mind of young ministers which they might not obtain readily at a session of an Annual Conference. These Conferences develop latent talent in ministers which might never have been seen elsewhere.

5. Members of the Church have an opportunity to hear questions of polity and doctrine, as well as finance, discussed as they are not likely to hear them anywhere else. Everything which tends to disseminate light and knowledge of the wants and demands of Methodism benefits the ministry and members of the Church, and this the District Conference may do.

6. The intermingling of ministers and laymen of a district cannot fail to produce good results. The social element can be cultivated, and a bond of unity established that will enhance the interests of the district. Already many invaluable acquaintances have been formed at various District Conferences, which might never have been obtained by any other means.

These are a few of the advantages growing out of a well-conducted and spirited District Conference.

ART. V.—SHALL EDUCATION BY THE STATE BE
EXCLUSIVELY SECULAR?

It is but too apparent that the Republic of the United States is passing through a transitional, if not, indeed, a revolutionary period. Questions of gravest import are coming before us for adjustment or readjustment; questions fundamental to the perpetuity of the nation, and freighted with its hopes and interests.

Among these questions none is more grave or vital than that of education in all its relations and applications; but especially is the relation of the nation or State to the education of its future citizens of pre-eminent importance. Shall the State educate its youth? Shall it employ compulsory methods? To what extent shall State or national education be carried? Shall it embrace primary education only, or include secondary as well, or advance through all the grades of higher culture, even to the college and the university? And, more important still, what shall be the character of the State's educational work? Shall it be purely secular, or all inclusive, embracing the entire nature of its subjects and having respect to their entire fitness for future citizenship? These important questions cannot receive any extended consideration in the brief limits of this article. We can only give a hasty glance and a passing word to some of them in their specific form, but hope to elucidate certain fundamental principles relating to the generic question of *What the State shall teach, or the education requisite for American citizenship.*

It is, perhaps, needless to start the question, whether the State shall educate its youth at all. Popular education, under government patronage and support, is an established institution in the United States; an institution deeply rooted in the popular heart, and which will not be surrendered without a struggle. It is too late in the history of our government to discuss that question in its simple form. It is not, however, too late to inquire concerning the reasons which underlie this cherished institution, the foundation principles on which it rests. We may legitimately ask, then, what are the ends sought in our system of common-school education? The answer is neither difficult nor doubtful. Qualification for citizenship, preparation for

the manifold duties of life, protection to the interests of society, the safety, perpetuity, and prosperity of the nation—these are the ends sought and believed to be secured by the education which the State maintains at public expense. If these are the acknowledged and unquestioned ends sought, it is certainly a legitimate and important question which presses with imperative force upon us, *How are these ends best secured?* If the State proposes to accomplish certain definite ends, and employs certain well-defined means for that purpose, its citizens, who are taxed for the object contemplated, have a right to inquire as to the adaptation of the means to the end; and whether the end *is really secured* by the agencies employed. Here, then, comes before us, properly and forcibly, the question as to the character of our common-school education: what it actually *is*, what it *should* be in order to justify the State in supporting it? It will be answered that the ends proposed are secured by imparting knowledge to youth that they may become intelligent. But such an answer is vague and partial, and quite unsatisfactory to thoughtful people. *How much knowledge* does it require to make a man a good and safe citizen? Does simple *intelligence*, meaning by the term an intellectual knowledge of certain branches of study, constitute all, or even the most important part, of *education*? Are the ends which the State seeks and which its safety demands realized by any such meager and partial methods of education? Does it follow that because a child can read and write, or has passed through a more extended literary course, he is *thereby* qualified for the solemn and responsible duties of society, and of becoming a personal and potent factor in the social and civil institutions of a great republic? This vital question, deeper and broader and graver than all others relating to education, is the question which in some form is being rapidly pressed to the front in our country, and demands immediate and thoughtful consideration. The question, when reduced to its more specific form, is this: *Shall the education given by the State be purely and exclusively secular?* The subject is not a theoretical one merely. In several localities it has taken a very decidedly practical form. It is before some of the State legislatures for discussion and decision. Local school boards have it on their hands, and some of them are pressing it to a speedy settle-

ment. Teachers are called upon to adjust their daily work with this question ever before them. There is a party in every State, daily increasing in numerical strength, becoming more emphatic in its utterances, more pronounced in its attitude, whose avowed object is completely to secularize and atheize the State and the nation in all their work and in all their relations to State institutions and individual subjects. It is important that every intelligent citizen should have a thorough understanding of the subject, and be prepared for wise and prompt action in relation thereto. We do not propose to view the subject from the stand-point of a Christian minister, nor that of a devoted Protestant, nor even in the light of pure, unsectarian Christianity. We prefer to discuss it upon other and lower grounds, and view it as a simple citizen, in the light of sound, worldly sense, of true philosophy, and of undeniable history. Without bigotry, without sectarian prejudices, without bias, assuming nothing but the common principles of morality and theistic or natural religion, let us approach this subject, seeking to know only what is truth, what is right, and wherein lies the greatest good for the greatest number.

I. A complete secularization of our public instruction so as essentially to exclude moral and religious education would be thoroughly *unphilosophical*. To do this is to ignore the true end of education. What is that end? The united testimony of all recognized authority harmonizes with the judgment of all thoughtful persons in answering this question. Pestalozzi, whose place as an educator is universally recognized, and of whom it has been truly said that he has exerted a greater influence than any other man on education in England, America, and the north of Europe, states as his first principle that "*education relates to the whole man, and consists in the drawing forth, strengthening, and perfecting all the faculties with which an all-wise Creator has endowed him, physical, intellectual, and moral.*" "Education," he says, "has to do with the hand, the head, and the heart." Herbert Spencer will surely not be charged with any bias toward Puritanism in matters of education, but he affirms that the one end of all true education is to learn "how to use all our faculties to the greatest advantage of ourselves and others," or, in other words, "how to live completely. And this, being the great thing needful for us to

learn, is, by consequence, the great thing which education has to teach. To prepare us for complete living is the function which education has to discharge; and the only rational mode of judging of any educational course is to judge in what degree it discharges that function."

What an utter neglect of this true and philosophic end of education is manifest in a system that proposes only to furnish the mind with a few facts, or subject it to the discipline of a few intellectual processes. Such a system also ignores entirely the true nature of the child. It takes but the most partial and imperfect view of him. In the estimation of such a theory he is a being capable of learning combinations of figures, of chattering grammatical sentences, of remembering incidents and dates of history, and nothing more. That he is a moral being, that he has a conscience, that the awakening and culture of his moral nature is absolutely essential to all true development, that unless this is done no worthy end of education is ever realized and no real success in life is ever achieved, all this is forgotten or treated with supreme indifference, not to say contempt. The noblest part of our nature is thus untouched, its highest functions are never employed, and no appeal is ever made to its most inspiring motives. To expect any valuable results from such an unphilosophical and irrational process is to insult reason and defy logical sequences. As well might you attempt to execute a difficult piece of music upon an organ without touching its principal keys or employing its most important pipes; as well attempt to solve a trigonometrical problem without a knowledge of the multiplication table. You can as soon make a scholar out of a child by throwing a spelling book and grammar at his head, as you can make him a useful member of society by stuffing him with readers, geographies, and arithmetics.

This unnatural and unreasonable method strikes with paralyzing force the teacher, and prevents his accomplishing the very work he is aiming to do. What is the teacher's real work? again we ask. To aid the pupil in the development of a true character, to qualify him for a worthy life, to render him a proper subject for citizenship and society. How shall he accomplish this all-important work? Evidently by using the limited time he has to the best possible advantage; by touching every key in that marvelous organism which will respond

to the touch, by appealing to every susceptibility and every motive, by awakening every dormant energy, and especially by calling into play those powers and emphasizing those duties most essential to genuine manhood and womanhood. The true teacher does this by bringing *himself*, his whole moral and intellectual being, into sympathetic contact with his pupil's entire being. Hence it depends upon the teacher himself, his character, his culture, his personal influence, more than upon his mechanical methods of teaching, as to what kind of education his pupils will receive. Thus the genuine teacher is more than all text-books, more than all apparatus and all methods, more than every thing else in the work of true education.

When Pestalozzi was carrying on his great work in the old convent of Stanz, "his whole school apparatus consisted of himself and his pupils." But that was immeasurably more than all the apparatus of modern times *minus* the mighty personality of the strong-souled teacher himself. Yet of what avail is this transcendent factor in all the work of education—the personal force of the teacher—if it is to be limited to drilling the pupil's mind with figures or stuffing it with facts; or, in other words, if all the moral and spiritual force of the teacher is to be deprived of its legitimate effect, and his work is circumscribed within the narrow and beggarly limits of purely secular studies? Developed, ennobled, made great himself and worthy of his position by reason of his communion with truth in all her vast domain, in the realms of nature, of life, of duty, of destiny, and of God, he cannot, forsooth, lift his pupils to these lofty altitudes, he must not speak of these solemn sublimities and sacred verities, because *that* would be transcending the province of the State, whose work is to teach its ward to read and spell and cipher.

Could any theory or process of education more completely stultify the teacher and stunt the pupil than this? With such a theory character is nothing in teacher or pupil; the teacher who can cram the most multiplication table and spelling book into the child's mind in a given time, by whatever method or mechanism, bears off the palm, and is the State's best educational agent. How belittling such a view of education is to the teacher, how subversive of the high and noble ends he ought to seek, and how utterly at variance with every principle of sound

philosophy, is apparent to every thoughtful person. Yet such is the legitimate sequence of the vaunted secular theory of common-school instruction.

This theory of education, also, when practically carried into effect, is subversive of the very object for which the public schools are maintained. What is that object? Confessedly a *moral* one, the prevention of crime, the moral qualification of the present child for the future citizen. All advocates of education agree in this. "Remove ignorance and thus prevent crime," is their constant cry. No class of persons are louder or more persistent in the advocacy of this theory than the secularists themselves. With this conclusion we may not be able fully to agree, but that the end sought in all State education is a moral one is clearly evident. This must be admitted to be the ultimate end in view. No other or lower end would justify the State in taxing its subjects for educational purposes. Education is supported at public expense for the same reason that government itself, in its various departments, is maintained, and that courts of justice are established—because the moral interests, the *well-being* of the nation, demand it. Hence it is the legitimate province of the State to tax its citizens for schools, because of their supposed necessity to its moral welfare. But the very acknowledgment that the end is a moral one is fatal to the theory of purely secular instruction. A moral end is the pre-eminent purpose in view; but, forsooth, the moral nature of the child must not be the objective point in your instructions, and you must take good care not to use moral methods, nor deal with moral truths, nor appeal to moral motives. You must not appeal to the Deity, a belief in whom underlies the moral nature, nor to the Bible, the highest and purest text-book of morals extant, for *that* would be obnoxious to some one's prejudices, and subject the State to the charge of teaching sectarianism. You are seeking to develop the moral nature, it is true, and to qualify the child to become a moral agent, to whom is to be committed the most sacred trusts and solemn responsibilities; but you must beware lest you appeal to his conscience, though no faculty in the young is weaker, more imperfect, and more susceptible, and none stands in such transcendent need of development as that, and none is so vitally related to his whole future and fitness for citizenship. Or, if the conscience



is ever the subject of appeal, it must not be by employing those truths and influences which the history of the world has proved to be most effective in developing the moral sense and ennobling human character.

Such is the shallow philosophy, or, rather, utter ignoring of every principle of philosophy, which an unfounded and unreasoning prejudice calls upon this nation to adopt in its public-school system—to seek a moral end by systematically discarding the highest and best-established moral means; to seek development of character by persistently and purposely refusing to touch the most potent forces and factors which constitute character.

If an attempt is made to parry the force of this reasoning by pleading that to impart intellectual instruction to a child improves his morals and thereby secures the end proposed, we reply, first, if we grant that this is true in some slight degree, still it is a most indirect and imperfect method of compassing the end sought, and at best it would be far more effective if coupled with direct moral training; for the two processes of culture are not antagonistic when rightly joined, but mutually dependent and helpful, the one complementing the other. But, secondly, it is not so apparent that simple intelligence without corresponding moral training is an effectual preventive of crime, or that, in itself alone, it tends largely to moral elevation. It is coming to be more and more a question with thoughtful men whether we have not claimed quite too much for intelligence as a preserving and elevating force in society. If statistics have seemed to authorize our general belief in this respect, it is because that hitherto intelligence among us has been almost invariably connected with no inconsiderable moral and religious training, while criminal classes, so-called, were almost wholly deprived of both intelligence and moral influence. But other facts are pressing on us now, and facts which are not at all flattering to our boasted intelligence, nor favorable to reliance upon it for national safety. Though general intelligence is supposed to be largely increasing, yet crime seems not to diminish, and nearly all our prisons are full. Besides, it is ascertained that only *twenty per cent.* of State-prison convicts are illiterate.

It is not, then, surprising that there should be some honest questioning as to the more exact relation between the spelling

book and the State-prison. It is true, as we hear so frequently from our modern philosophers, that the "cure for unbalanced lives is training"—that a bad environment makes bad men. It is also true that the only solution of the problem of much of our evil, South and North, is the school-house. But it is the school-house built upon the foundation principles of morals and theistic religion; it is the school-house where God is recognized and the Bible revered, and where the teachings of the world's noblest and best men are permitted to exercise their unrestrained influence.

We shall find wisdom in the practical maxim of the Prussians, that "whatever we would have in the State we must first introduce into the school-room." We want self-government, respect for authority, a profound sense of moral responsibility, developed consciences, reverence for sacred things, the fear of God, truthfulness, honor, unswerving integrity, a moral manliness that cannot be bribed nor intimidated. How shall we secure these indispensable requisites of a safe and prosperous nation without the highest moral training in the school-room? The more thoughtfully we examine the question the more thoroughly shall we be convinced that to dissociate the ethical and the intellectual, the Bible and the grammar, is an unwise, unphilosophical, and unsafe procedure. We shall accept the words of Hon. D. D. Barnard, of New York, uttered some years since before the Legislature of that State. "Keeping all the while in view," says he, "the object of popular education, the fitting of the people by morals as well as by intellectual discipline for self-government, no one can doubt that any system of instruction that overlooks the training and informing of the moral faculties must be wretchedly and fatally defective. Crime and intellectual cultivation merely, so far from being dissociated in history and statistics, are, unhappily, old acquaintances and tried friends. To neglect the moral powers in education is to educate not quite half the man. To cultivate the intellect only is to unhinge the mind and destroy the essential balance of the mental powers; it is to light up a recess only the better to see how dark it is. And if this is all that is done in popular education, then nothing, literally nothing, is done toward establishing popular virtue and forming a moral people."

II. But many who admit the importance of moral training, and even its necessity in order to the welfare of the nation, will argue that this is not the work of the State, that the "government is exclusively secular, as much so as a bank corporation or a railway company,"* and it must, therefore, depend upon the family, the Church, and the Sunday-school to train its future citizens in morals and religion. This reasoning has a surface plausibility, but contains a poorly disguised fallacy which is fatal to the nation. It makes assumptions which are wholly unwarrantable and contrary to facts.

The claim that the nation is exclusively secular, is not true in the sense that it has no individuality of character, no moral sense, no ethical principles, no religious belief, no moral responsibility. All these it has, and must have, or miserably perish of imbecility and inward rottenness. There is no proper analogy between the government and a "bank corporation" or a "railway company." The grounds upon which the existence of each rests and the objects legitimately sought by each are as widely separated as the poles. The latter are carried on by private enterprise for individual ends, personal gain being a legitimate object in view; the former is the central source of power under whose authority all corporations exist, and the chief object of which is to promote the *well-being* of its subjects. To compare things as unlike as these is to confound reason and destroy all rational distinctions.

The theory that the government ought to be or can be entirely secular, that is neutral, in regard to all matters of religion is utterly untenable. Such an attitude on the part of government is absolutely impossible. What kind of a government would that be that had no mind, no opinions, no will, no expression of purpose in respect to the fundamental principles and practices upon which its very safety and perpetuity depends? The advocates of neutrality and absolute secularism cannot fail to see the utter impracticability of their theory, and so they prefer to theorize rather than to follow legitimately the resistless logic of facts, and see to what position their theory must inevitably lead the nation. They can hardly fail to see that its professed *neutrality* can mean nothing else than direct *antagonism* to the real ends for which it exists. Those ends

* Rev. Dr. Spear, "Princeton Review," March, 1878, p. 377.

are of the highest moral character, and they stand most intimately related to theistic religion, not to say Christianity. We have already seen that government has an acknowledged moral end in educating its youth, and it cannot escape the moral responsibility of legitimately and logically carrying out that end to its completion; it cannot honestly shift this responsibility upon other parties. It taxes the people for a given object, confessedly a moral one, and it cannot in justice to its subjects turn to them and say, "We expect you as individuals to do the work for which we have exacted a tax from you. We call the object a moral one, and it is, but we will attend to the intellectual part of our work and leave the moral to you; we will teach the principles of language and mathematics, you must teach the principles of ethics and worthy living." Such an attitude is unworthy of a great and enlightened State; it is imbecility and cowardice, personified and enthroned.

But is the State warranted in assuming that the moral education of its future citizens will be properly attended to by families or other organizations if neglected by its agents, the public school teachers? Possibly it will in some families, but so also would the same families furnish their children the necessary *mental* culture if *that* were neglected by the State, and would it not be equally wise and proper to rely upon the family or individual for the one as for the other? As a question of facts, is it true that the young people of our country *are* receiving, from any source whatever, the moral training requisite for the safety of the nation and the highest interests of society? Is it not rather true that one of the greatest perils to society lies in the fact that such vast numbers, of our young men especially, are coming upon the stage where life's responsibilities and issues are no longer play, but a solemn tragedy, with so little development of moral manhood, so slight a curb of moral restraint to hold in check the baser nature?

Precisely here is our peril most menacing. And it is folly to suppose that any imagined or actual increase of intelligence is rendering this peril less. Rather let us acknowledge with frankness, though with sorrow, that the danger from this source never was so threatening as now, and seems increasing with each year of our national history. If ever moral instruction were necessary in our nation, much more is it an imperative

necessity now. The dangerous and immoral elements of society seem to be constantly becoming more disproportioned to the better classes. Nor can it be truthfully affirmed that this arises wholly from the influx of foreign population. Our own native-born youth, as a rule, lack the moral fiber, the sturdy strength, the genuine manliness and lofty integrity, which come from true moral training persistently applied through all the years of early youth and opening manhood. The State, in relying upon the family for this training, makes too large a presumption upon the general morality and fidelity of parents. Dr. Peabody, of Harvard College, in contrasting the past with the present in respect to parental training, much to the discredit of the latter, says: "A very large proportion of the pupils in our cities and populous towns come from houses utterly destitute of culture, and of the means and the spirit of culture, where a book is never seen, and reading is with the adult members a lost art, or one never acquired. There are schools in which four-fifths or more of the pupils are of this class." He might have painted the moral aspect of the home picture in still darker colors. Nor is it in the lowest classes of society alone that the moral teaching of the family is wholly inadequate to the child's need. Herbert Spencer, speaking of the subject in its general aspects, says: "The management of children, and more especially the moral management, is lamentably bad. Parents either never think of the matter at all, or else their conclusions are crude and inconsistent."

And yet the State is to intrust the moral training of its future citizens wholly to such agents as these. But is it not the *duty* of parents to attend to the moral and religious instruction of their children? Certainly; and so it would be their duty to provide them intellectual culture if the State made no provision for it. So it is the duty of all to obey the laws without police force or courts of justice or prisons; but the State does not in these matters *presume* on every one's doing his duty, and so it makes provision for him in case of his failure in this respect. Why does it not take into consideration undeniable *facts* respecting the inadequate moral training of its youth, and make preventive as well as punitive provision for the welfare of society? The fact is, there is too much shifting of responsibility in this entire matter of the moral and religious instruction

of the young. The State commits it to the family, the family relies upon the Church, the Church intrusts it to the Sunday-school, and between these several agencies, with their indifference or inefficiency, the one transcendent work of the republic, the proper education of its youth, is most negligently and imperfectly achieved.

There is something inspiring in Sparta's training of her youth for the one object she wanted to compass, that of making hardy soldiers. For this purpose the boy was taken at seven years of age, and kept in the hands of the State until he was sixty. He was fed on black broth at the public tables, toughened by exposure, inured to hunger, thirst, fatigue, scourging, too loyal and too brave ever to utter a word of complaint. Not an example by any means of a perfect education, but worthy, nevertheless, of careful study. Cannot an enlightened Christian State, far on in the wiser ages, exhibit at least equal wisdom and zeal in the education of her more favored youth for the higher ends she seeks to compass, and the nobler arena of life into which they are to pass?

It ought to be added, also, that the theory of providing exclusively secular education by the State exerts a most unfavorable influence upon our youth, tending to demoralize and atheize them. This attitude of the State cannot fail to be interpreted by young and susceptible minds as one of indifference to morality and religion. With the State assuming such an attitude, and the natural disrelish of the young for moral instruction and restraint, the parent and the religious teacher, however willing and capable they may be, find it almost impossible to impress these higher truths on the mind that is indurated rather than made more susceptible by its purely intellectual culture. Five or six days of the week devoted exclusively to secular instruction, with rarely or never an appeal to the higher nature of a child, is a poor preparation for that higher instruction, be it from mother or minister. The receptivity of his moral nature is gradually lessened by the overshadowing pre-eminence given to mental culture, and his indifference to all moral and religious truth constantly increases by a kind of logical sequence under this fearfully one-sided and irrational method of training. If the Bible is not honored in the school-room, it will not be likely to receive much attention in the pupil's chamber; if God is not

recognized as authority there, he will not be often in the pupil's thought elsewhere; if moral and religious truths find no place in the daily instruction from the teacher, the parent and Sunday-school teacher will have a hard and ungracious task to find any place to crowd these truths into the pre-occupied mind in the occasional half-hour reluctantly yielded to them for such a purpose. And so it happens, by the practical working of laws which are as inexorable as destiny, that the moral nature of multitudes of young people is an uncultivated waste; and the State, pursuing such a policy, will annually pour out upon society multiplied thousands of youth as unqualified for the duties of life and as dangerous to all the best interests of the nation as if they had never received any training at the public expense.

This theory of pure secularism in education is *revolutionary*. Whatever merits it may claim, it is in direct antagonism to the history, the spirit, and genius of our common-school system. It is an unquestioned historical fact, well-known by all intelligent persons, that the common school owes its origin to the intense religious spirit of its founders. It is the child of Christianity, and the Bible is its fountain head. If we refer to that famous original order of the General Court of Massachusetts, in 1647, by which every township of fifty householders was required to establish a school, we find its inspiration in the emphatic recognition of God and the Bible. Thus originated and thus has been developed a system of education, permeated and inspired with the highest moral and religious ideas—a system which has given us, as a nation, a history of unparalleled growth and prosperity; a system which has achieved for us greatness and honor unprecedented; a system which, in its essential features, is the admiration of the civilized world. Is it, then, the part of wisdom and statesmanship to strike away the very foundations of this vaunted institution, and smite it with paralyzing force by one fell revolutionary blow from the destructive hand of atheistic secularism? If we consent to such a revolutionizing departure from the honored past, let us do it with open eyes and clear understanding of the logical consequences. Let us consider what this secularization of the government, and of the public schools especially, means, and what will be the inevitable results. It is not a question of teaching sectarian tenets, nor of reading a

few verses from any version of the sacred Scriptures, nor of opening the school with a brief religious exercise of whatever form; all these questions are of minor importance, as compared with the great question at issue. That question is this, *Shall the State become unqualifiedly atheistic?* Shall it assume an attitude of absolute indifference to religion and that whole domain of fundamental truths and historic facts, based upon religion? Shall it entirely ignore God, the Bible, Christianity, the Sabbath, with all the moral teachings that have their roots in these fundamental ideas? Shall it forbid its teachers to give instruction in any of these truths and the duties arising therefrom? Shall it, at this late day, assume an attitude of antagonism to the very principles which have hitherto permeated every department of our government, and have given it stability, greatness, and power? And shall all this be done at the clamorous bidding of a few restless spirits, who are dissatisfied with the noble structure which our fathers reared with sacrifices of toil and tears and blood, and who seek to smite the proud edifice with destructive hand?

All this the State must do if it honestly concede the demand for complete secularization. It must expurgate every text-book in use, it must eliminate every extract from the Bible, every allusion to God as the beneficent Creator, to Christ as the world's Redeemer, to the Sabbath as God's appointed day of rest for man, to Christianity as the purest type of religion. There must be no allusion to the great First Cause, none to the evidence of design in the human system nor in the universe; no reference to a Divine Providence whose bounty makes the earth to smile, no word of instruction respecting man's responsibility to his Maker, the true foundation of moral obligation, the fundamental distinction between right and wrong. All this savors, it is said, of religious prejudice, and is offensive to some of the State's subjects; therefore the State must take care that it has no place in its public schools. This and nothing less is the issue; this and nothing else is the legitimate result. It is useless to say that the Bible can be introduced "as literature to be studied, as Homer and Virgil and Shakspeare."

The plea for secularism on the part of the State is either a quibble or it is an honest objection to theism and Christianity

having any recognized place in our national government. If it be the former, it is unworthy of a moment's thought; if it be the latter, then it demands all that we have specified, and more. It demands that the nation shall banish the recognition of God and the Christian religion from every governmental department in the whole national domain. It demands that the Bible shall have no recognized authority in the nation's laws nor in their administration; that no prayer shall ever be offered in legislative assemblies, that no oath shall be administered to bind the conscience of a witness in a court of justice, that the name of God shall never be invoked at the inauguration of the nation's high officials, that no chaplain shall be employed, and no minister of the gospel be permitted to offer prayer in the various governmental institutions of the land. In a word, it demands that the nation shall be *atheistic*, purely, confessedly, emphatically, persistently atheistic, refusing any and all recognition of God and religion throughout all its departments.

With the issue thus before us, carried out to its logical consequences, little more need be said to convince thoughtful persons of the utter fatuity and fatality of such a course. It would smite with complete destruction our whole common-school system. To use the language of the University Report of the School Board of New Haven, Conn.: "If there is to be any thing like education in our schools, if any thing is to be taught other than the use of the alphabet and the processes of arithmetic, with, perhaps, the higher branches of mathematical science, the teacher, and the text-book, if there be one, must recognize religion as an element of human nature; as a fact and a dominant factor in all history; as implied in laws, governments, and the being of society; as an influence pervading the literature of all languages in all ages; and as modifying to-day the thinking, the morals, the usages, the institutions, and the national character of every people under heaven. Such recognition of religion is not religious teaching in any sense in which any man, be he Christian, Mohammedan, Pagan, or Atheist, can reasonably complain of. A prayer at the opening of a legislature, or at the opening of a judicial court, is not an intermeddling of the State with the rights or duties of any Church, nor is it an attempt by the State to teach religion." "If the simple recognition of religion in the public schools is objectionable,

much more would the systematic and thorough *ignoring* of religion be objectionable."

The State, then, is to prepare its youth for future citizenship.

It is to teach that which underlies all true and worthy character—the virtues, the moralities, the duties, and responsibilities of life in all its varied relations. It is not to assume control over the individual conscience, nor dictate religious belief, nor *enforce* the performance of religious duties, nor assume to teach technical religion, much less sectarianism. But it is to *recognize* religion as the foundation of all highest morality, the basis of all sense of responsibility, and the inspiration of all that is noblest and best and most salutary in human society. It is freely to employ these great fundamental truths and all potent factors in developing the character of its future citizens and solving the problem of its future safety and perpetuity. In doing this it violates no right of any of its subjects and does no injury to any one.

To adopt the opposite course we have indicated is positively to injure the many in deference to the unreasonable prejudices of the few. Who asks it? Not the great body of American citizens, who are loyal to the government and ardent supporters of its public schools. Not the teachers, whose vocation would be degraded and whose success would be rendered impossible by such a policy. Not the Catholic, with any honesty, for he is a staunch believer in Christian education, and the whole theory of a secular and godless culture is to him an offense tenfold greater than the introduction of a few verses from the Protestant version of the Scriptures. Not even the Jew, for he believes in God, and the great principles of religion, and wants his children trained therein. If any of these parties object to features of our common schools, it is because they are virtually opposed to the entire system. Who, then, does make this revolutionary demand? A few infidels who affect to have no belief in God, and who really have little or no sympathy with our whole system of government. And in deference to the clamor which these men have raised, some men who are good and true have been led to espouse their cause and become champions of absolute sectarianism in the State.

For the State to heed this demand and adopt this policy would be unjust to the pupils of our schools, who are thereby

robbed of the only preparation which will qualify them for a true life; unjust to parents, who intrust their children to the State with the expectation that they will receive the best and most needed training; unjust to citizens, who are beguiled into a false belief that the national safety is being secured through a system which proves to be inadequate and delusive; unjust to tax-payers, whose money is exacted for a purpose that is not accomplished and cannot be accomplished by such a method; unjust to teachers, who, in worse condition than the Hebrew slaves under their Egyptian taskmasters, are expected to build up the national edifice strong and stately, and enduring without employing the material and methods which are absolutely necessary to its strength and beauty and permanence. It is to attempt a feat which has never been achieved in the history of the world, and stands without historical precedent. Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, all nations in all ages, have recognized the Supreme Power of their imperfect creeds in their national instruction and in their whole national life. It remains for this favored Republic of the United States, standing on the summit of privilege, with its pure faith and its flaming light, with its knowledge of the true God and its marvelous experience of his saving help, to ignore that God who has lifted the nation to its high pre-eminence, and to flaunt its banner before the world, on which is blazoned in letters of burning shame, the atheistic motto, "NO GOD, NO RELIGION." Let the theory of secularism which we have combated be adopted, and the nation is doomed. Our boasted Public-School System will be smitten with paralysis and perish, as it ought when thus shorn of its strength; the noble institutions, which are the nation's support and pride, will totter to their fall, and the nation itself will be numbered among the buried nationalities of the past.

May a merciful Providence save us from such a fate! Let us be grateful that he has given us so distinguished and successful a history in the past; let us be thankful also that our common schools, permeated, as they have been so largely with the spirit of morality and religion, have contributed so much to make that history illustrious; and let us cherish the faith that he will deliver us from the evils which now menace our nation by giving us wisdom for our guidance, virtue for our support, and an unswerving fidelity to the sacred charge committed to our trust.

ART. VI.—THE ITINERANT MINISTRY OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

IN an article on this subject which appeared in the Methodist Quarterly Review for January last, the writer presented, in epitome, the history of the origin and growth of the Itinerant system, and of its various modifications down to the present time. He also set forth the peculiar advantages of the Itineracy, and then endeavored to weigh accurately the evils incident to the system, at the same time ascertaining "the value of any compensations which may exist." Proceeding further in the examination of the question in its relations to the present time, he came to the proposal to remove the limitation, which was reviewed at length. His final conclusions were then affirmed in the following words:

When the proposition was first presented to the mind of the writer several years ago, in connection with the embarrassments of a few Churches, it seemed quite plausible. But after pursuing that course which alone can lead to a safe conclusion, namely, to reread the history of the denomination and submit the theory to unprejudiced analysis, he has been led irresistibly to the conviction that the proposition is impracticable, and that its adoption would prove fatal to the Denomination as an organic unity in harmonious action.

At the close attention was called to a "possible amendment" based on propositions under examination in Australia.

Having carefully followed the subsequent discussions of the subject in the periodicals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of other Denominations, the writer resumes the consideration of those portions of his former article to which exceptions have been taken.

No one has yet come forward to attack the Itineracy; neither minister nor layman has recommended a dissolution of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the substitution of Congregationalism or Independency; nor does any one among us maintain the superior efficiency of a settled ministry *on the whole*, as it exists in any other body of Christians. Recent history proves, that if any Methodist ministers of greater, or even of less, ability than the average, were "mindful of that country" "they might have had opportunity" to

remove thither. But many have perceived by reflection, or have determined, as the writer and many of his brethren in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church have had occasion to do, when approached with reference to a settlement, that where a majority of one can dislodge, and an active and watchful minority soon become a majority, "uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." Especially is this true, unless there be a fundamental change of religious belief, as the glorious doctrines of free grace, equally removed from the spurious encouragements of Universalism and the frigid inflexibility of Calvinism, could be preached only by sufferance, or with "secret evasion," or "mental reservation."

Not only does no one among us attack the Itineracy, but none profess greater love for it than those who are advocating the removal of all limitation of time from the action of the "appointing power."

In this state of the case, it is necessary to take note of the fact that the Itineracy could not *maintain itself*. Left to the action of individual ministers and local Churches, it would at once cease. If our connectional principles and machinery were removed, all would fall apart, like beads when the string is broken, or a cluster of grapes when the branches and twigs are cut off. The larger Churches would become independent, and most of the smaller, languish and die. Therefore, as the system impartially regulated could not maintain itself, the ardent praises of the Itineracy which we hear on every side must, as in all cases of the adaptation of means to ends, include approbation of some kind of machinery to make it effective. Since many observations in the leading papers of other Denominations, and in the secular press, show that their editors and correspondents have a vague and imperfect idea of our system of making appointments; and as all proposed amendments are modifications of existing arrangements, we shall at this point delineate the essential features of the present plan.

METHOD OF FINAL ADJUSTMENT OF APPOINTMENTS IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The power and responsibility of stationing the effective ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church inhere in the Bishops or Superintendents elected by the General Conference; such

power to be exercised in conformity to rules made by the said General Conference, to which the Superintendents are responsible. *Theoretically* any Bishop has jurisdiction over every appointment at all times, the theory being that the Superintendency is one; *practically*, by reason of agreement among the Bishops, whichever of their number they may designate at any semi-annual meeting to preside in an ensuing Annual Conference, has special jurisdiction over the appointments in that Conference for one year—or till the semi-annual meeting of the Bishops, subsequent to the adjournment of the Annual Conference at which he presides. The Bishop obtains information from every source, but in most instances chiefly from the Presiding Elders; being in practice an arbitrator among them when they are not a unit in judgment, but having and exercising, according to his final decision, whenever he may think best, the autocratic authority necessary to give stability to the mechanism.

By the usage of the Denomination, the appointments announced at the Conference are for a year. Unless the Bishop shall revise his judgment, "nothing but immorality, insanity, heresy, voluntary withdrawal, disease, or death," can terminate them prior to the expiration of the Conference year. A part, however, of the work of the Bishops is, or may be, done through agents, called Presiding Elders. Presiding Elders, in the early history of the Denomination, had great power. Transfers, prior to 1794, were generally frequent, and the Bishop was not only "absent," but inaccessible, even by letter, for many months. The power given to the Presiding Elder "to change, receive, and suspend Preachers in his District, during the intervals of the Conferences, and *in the absence* of the Bishop," made him practically a "suffragan Bishop." But, by the Discipline, he is bound to give the Bishop "when absent all necessary information by letter of the state of his District." With the increase of the number of the Bishops, their assigned residences, and the improved modes of travel and postal and telegraphic communication, Bishops are now seldom inaccessible when in the United States, for any great length of time. So that no Presiding Elder, himself an appointee and agent of the Bishop, without giving information to the Bishop and awaiting his answer, and without a cause

which, or the knowledge of which, has come into being since the appointment, would claim the power to nullify the action of the Bishop by changing any or all of the "Preachers on his District." His necessary powers for unforeseen emergencies are guaranteed, but his position is that of an agent of the Bishop, and it is made impossible for him to do any damage by usurping the prerogatives of his superior by two safeguards. He can himself be removed by a single act of episcopal discretion, and his *conduct in his office* is subject, and has been from the beginning, to review at the next session of the Annual Conference to which he belongs.*

The General Conference of 1840 made this clear by special legislation, whereby a provision which seemed to give the Presiding Elder power to permit a Preacher to leave his work was stricken out.

Appointments made at Conference are therefore annual, subject only to the operation of causes arising subsequent to the appointments, when the Bishop may revise his judgment, or, in case of his being inaccessible, the Presiding Elder may act for him in a critical emergency. But after a second re-appointment the Bishop is powerless, and so also is his agent, even in the employment of Superannuate and Local Preachers.†

It is this machinery which makes the Itineracy effective. The position taken by those who would remove the time limit is, that the appointing power is competent without the aid of a statutory limitation to secure the desired result more efficiently than is possible under any restriction other than its own judgment of the demands of the work.

It is held by the present writer, that "a limitation by law is essential to the successful working and permanency of the Itineracy."

* "And yet their power is so considerable that it would by no means be sufficient for them to be responsible to the Bishops *only* for their conduct in their office. They are as responsible in this respect, and in every other, to the *yearly* Conference to which they belong, as any other preacher."--*Coke and Asbury's Notes on the Discipline.*

† "Provided, however, that a Presiding Elder shall not change a Preacher in his District from a charge to which he has been appointed by the Bishop, and appoint him to another to which he could not be legally appointed by the Bishop. The law of limitation applies also to Superannuated and Local Preachers who are employed in the pastoral work."--*Discipline*, p. 106.

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE REASONING OF FORMER ARTICLE.

We now propose a careful survey of the fortifications erected in defense of our position, that a time limit is indispensable to the efficiency and perpetuity of the Itineracy, to determine what breaches if any have been made; and whether, if any are found, they can be repaired, or, if incapable of being strengthened, they are sufficient to undermine or overthrow the structure.

I. The first position was thus stated :

1. Under a limitation the appointments are made in the discretion of the appointing power until the limit is reached. The will of the Bishop determines when the pastor shall go, whether he shall return once or twice. Loyalty requires him to go or stay. But, according to his appointment, when the constitutional limit is reached the Bishop becomes "weak as other men." It is now the whole Denomination which compels the incumbent to move, and he cannot resist. If the Bishop, the Minister, and the Church, should combine, it would avail nothing. Hence it is impossible for the man to stay, and though he may go with the tears of the people mingling with his own, there is no outcry against the Bishop. But let all limitation be removed, and the exercise of Episcopal discretion is the sole "efficient cause" of the otherwise unnecessary removal of their beloved pastor, and the people are grieved and indignant, while he feels oppressed. And after a pastor should have been settled many years in a place, if the people desired him to remain, it would be impossible to remove him without his consent. It would be useless to talk to either about the good of the Denomination as long as both were satisfied.

This position has received attention from the editor of the "Methodist" whose remarks we quote in full :

Some of the reasons of Dr. B. for a time limit are : 1. After the limit is reached "It is the whole Denomination which compels the incumbent to move, and he cannot resist." We have once before pointed out the fallacy in this statement. We answer now as before, "the whole Denomination" requires a man to go at the end of any year, if the Bishop, speaking for it, tells him to go, "and he cannot resist." Any removal has the whole Denomination behind it, and there is no case of successful resistance known to us. The whole Denomination weighs (at least) just as much when its law empowers a Bishop to do something as when it forbids him to do it. The vast virtue of a negative is chiefly a matter of the controversial imagination.

It would seem that this passage was written under an error as to the meaning of the statement declared to be fallacious.

We must, therefore, endeavor to make it more clear. Up to the statutory limit the decision is contingent on the judgment and will of the Bishop; but when the limit is reached the removal is arbitrarily effected by the force of the statute.

When the Denomination empowers a Bishop to perform an act contingent on his discretion and will, it holds him personally responsible for his action. Ministers and Churches have their opinions of the wisdom or folly of his decisions, of his motives, of his "bias;" and if he could be proved to have an unworthy motive, or to have neglected to inform himself, or to have acted capriciously, or without reason, it would be a sufficient ground for impeachment. But when the law limits the term, the personality of the Bishop sinks out of sight before the impartial decree of the Denomination. Let it be observed that, in the *final decision*, the Bishop has every thing to do with the minister's leaving prior to the expiration of the term of three years, but practically *nothing whatever* to do with his leaving at the end of that time. As when the law fixes the punishment of murder in the first degree to be death, the jury having declared the prisoner guilty, the judge has no alternative, and *therefore* no responsibility for the sentence; so when the third year ends, the law relieves the Bishop of all responsibility, by forbidding another reappointment to the same circuit or station until after the lapse of three years more. Whether this radical difference exists is a question of fact; whether it is recognized is one of perception. The logical reader will decide after due reflection. We should hardly have thought it necessary to refer to it again, were it not that some may have seen the objection who never saw the original proposition. The editor of the "Northern," in an elaborate article, which strikes us as a model of gentlemanly discussion, thus summarizes the argument:

In other words, the ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church will submit to inconveniences which come from a statutory regulation, but would not submit, even for the greater good of the Church, to the same inconvenience coming from the exercise of discretion conferred by the statute upon the administrators of the law.

To this we reply: "Discretion," given by the statute to the administrators, may be judged by the discretion of those af-

fect; "the greater good of the Church" becomes a matter of opinion, and there is room for argument, appeal, and resistance to any extent less than rebellion. Now, to destroy the force of our reasoning, Dr. Warren says:

Let us test the validity of this argument by experience. The fact is, that under the operation of the present rule not more than one third—probably not more than one fourth—of the changes or removals of pastors to new charges made every year are required by the limitation. We base this assertion upon facts ascertained from an examination of the Minutes of five eastern Conferences, and two western. Here, then, we find "Episcopal discretion" exercised each year in effecting the removal of at least two thirds of the pastors who receive new appointments. Under these circumstances we venture to affirm, that of those who are moved by Episcopal discretion, there will be found a smaller proportion complaining of the act of the Bishop than can be found among those who are moved by the limitation complaining of the arbitrary exactions of the law.

We quote so much because the style is clear, and because we have no sympathy with the method of discussion which distorts language to gain a point.

The question is, Does the fact that two thirds of the removals are cheerfully submitted to under the exercise of Episcopal discretion prove, or even raise a presumption that a "time limit" is not essential to the "successful working" of the itineracy? We hold that it does not, and for these reasons. Most removals *before* the time limit is reached are of one of the following classes: the Church or the minister wishes a change, or one or both are indifferent to it, or a minister is wanted for some more important work.

The instances in which a minister *strongly* wishes to stay, and the Church as strongly desires him to remain, and the minister is removed before the time limit is reached without some most imperative reason growing out of the demand for his peculiar gifts, are "few and far between;" and when they occur, they are most bitterly complained of by pastor and people, and are astonishing to all. They are submitted to because there is no help, and because both minister and Church know that the pastor could not stay more than one year, or, at the most, two years longer.

Now, no one, so far as we have learned, ever imagined a time

limit to be necessary to preserve the Itineracy in cases where the minister wished to go, or the people earnestly desired a change, or both were indifferent on the subject, or where the reason for the removal is so obvious that neither minister nor people could complain. How, then, it could be fancied that submission to "Episcopal discretion" in instances where there is substantial agreement or indifference, would show that if there *were no limit*, and both minister and people felt in their "inmost souls" that the separation was wholly unnecessary and would ruthlessly sunder ties that years of intimacy had formed, there would be equal submission—is a problem as difficult of solution as any presented by the subject itself.

The same writer adds another passage which, if we understand it, is not confirmed by the history either of Churches or Nations:

If it shall be claimed that the one third who are moved by the limitation include most of the more able and experienced ministers, we reply: The greater measure of loyalty ought also to be with them, and it would hardly be admitted by them that they would not submit to the exercise of Episcopal discretion as cheerfully as their younger and weaker brethren.

On the subject of "loyalty," we shall speak in another part of the discussion; but observe here, that the men who are more likely to revolt are those who, by reason of conscious strength, influence, and position, have grounds for expecting success. The young, except in a few instances of rashness, and the weak, know that there is no help for them; but the able and experienced, accustomed to rule, are strongly tempted, when they feel the yoke of higher authority, to resist. Most of the serious difficulties in the exercise of Episcopal discretion have come from influential Churches and able or popular ministers, though by no means always co-related. The men who in Europe and America have left original Methodism and formed other sects, have not, as a rule, been "young and weak," but "able and experienced." James O'Kelly, Nicholas Snethen, Alexander M'Caine, Asa Shinn, the leaders of the South on the one hand, and Orange Scott and his colleagues on the other, were not "young or weak." We may conclude, therefore, that the distinction between the "exercise of Episcopal discretion and a statutory regulation," relieving

the Bishop from all responsibility, is a valid one, and that the latter is essential to the permanency of the Itinerary.

II. Subordinate to this position, we said :

But great changes would surely be introduced in Methodist usages, doctrine, and discipline. One minister, believing in the annihilation of the wicked, another preaching hope for all, a third winking at dancing, card-playing, theater-going, a fourth indifferent to class-meetings, these could all, and easily, stamp their peculiarities on their congregations, and great dissimilarities in usages, doctrine, and discipline would soon appear. If the germs of these things are planted "in the green tree, what would they do in the dry?" Then, when these evils should have become obvious, and it would seem necessary to remove the man to save the Church, the cry of persecution would be raised, those whom he had infected would gather around him, and he would remain or divide the Church. This result would be the more sure because, under a ministry likely to be permanent, those who sympathize with a peculiar style gather around its embodiment, and those who dislike it (unless they remain as a turbulent element) depart.

This passage has had the fortune to be extensively quoted. It appears in full in an article in the "Independent" of February 12, the second in a series now appearing from Methodist writers on various phases of this subject. The author of the article says, referring to the above passage :

This is a mild and harmless joke that nobody will mistake for an argument, as it is generally known that Methodism has a more prompt and vigorous way of dealing with heresy and misdemeanors than cutting their tap-roots and translating them every three years.

To mistake reasoning for joking, and joking for reasoning, are usually closely connected, though of little assistance in the solution of a difficult problem. Dr. Warren addresses himself to the examination of the passage with energy and candor. He says :

These evils would be prevented by other features of Methodist polity and practice. . . . If it may be presumed that any considerable number of Methodist preachers, yielding to the small temptation which the possibility of a long pastorate might present, would, if left to themselves, forget the vows and obligations of their office, fall from the grace of Methodist loyalty, and then develop all the perverseness and depravity above indicated, it should still be remembered that judgment awaits them. They are responsible. This fact would tend to reduce the number. With

the Discipline marking distinctly the course of ministerial duty, with the Bishops having general supervision of the Church, with Presiding Elders having more immediate and personal supervision of Districts, with Annual Conferences jealous of the honor of the Church, and intolerant of heterodoxy or disloyalty, and with a body of critical laymen ready to judge ministers by the standards of Methodist law and usage, it is probable that the number of these erratics would remain quite small, and that their following would not be very great. There is little danger that Dr. Buckley's "green tree" would ever become a "dry" one.

But in summing up all that was suggested as possible of different men, and predicating it of one, in the phrase "develop all the depravity and perverseness above indicated," attention is diverted from the main point. We said: "One minister believing in the annihilation of the wicked, another preaching hope for all, a *third* winking at card-playing, dancing, and theater-going, a *fourth* indifferent to class-meetings . . . might easily stamp their peculiarities," etc. "If the germs of these things are planted in the 'green tree,' what would they do in the dry?" The grounds of that conclusion must now be submitted. The effect of the permanent identification of ministers with the same Church or society is not a matter of conjecture. Around us are Churches in which permanency of the pastoral relation is possible, and desired by the ministry and by the people so long as they are satisfied.

Though the results are often so beneficent that, as the Methodist minister who must "move in three years" looks upon the venerable pastor or *pastor emeritus*, a feeling of despondency sometimes arises in his breast, we cannot be blind to the fact that great differences in the spirit, doctrinal teachings and practices of the people arise. Consider, as examples in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the influence respectively of Drs. F. C. Ewer and Stephen H. Tyng, Jun.; the Church of the former hardly distinguishable from Roman Catholicism, that of the Rev. Mr. Tyng, in its spirit and teaching distinguishable from a Methodist Church chiefly by the use of the prayer-book and the gown. In the Presbyterian Church how unlike in spirit and modes are the societies of Drs. Talmage and Cuyler. In the Congregational Churches there are ministers preaching a species of Universalism, and others the Calvinism of Jonathan Edwards; some as strict in their teaching con-

cerning amusements as the early Puritans or Methodists, others inculcating views the very opposite. It is reasonable to infer that, with permanency made possible among us, similar changes would arise, unless natural tendencies were counteracted by some *adequate force*. Under the operation of the time limit as it now exists, no minister has the opportunity to infect, to any great extent, an orthodox congregation. If, on his arrival, he were to preach contrary to the "standards" of Methodism, he would arouse opposition, and would soon be removed if not suspended. A preacher of false doctrine, without friends and an established position, is seldom dangerous. If he insidiously undermine, his time is up before he has done great damage. The figure of "cutting the tap-root," quoted above, implies forgetfulness of botany. The botanical definition of "tap-root" is this: "The root of a plant which penetrates the earth directly downward to a considerable distance without dividing." The tap-roots in a Methodist congregation, educated under a long line of preachers "speaking the same words and minding the same things," are too sound and healthy to be killed in a year or two.

That some of our ministers have been indifferent to class-meetings, and allowed them to become almost or quite extinct, and that there are some pastors in rich and fashionable congregations and in wealthy farming communities who do not mention class-meetings in the pulpit from the beginning to the end of the year, could be proved if denied. Furthermore, that dancing and theater-going are continually making inroads; that the waves of fashionable dissipation, augmented by the laxity of other Denominations in all great centers, are beating continually against us; that some ministers have been silent, or even "winked" at these things, so as to make it difficult for their successors to be faithful to Methodism, and at the same time to be popular with the young people, or even approved by their parents, is known to all who have the opportunity to know it. And wherever these things have made inroads, whether in the East or the West, in the beginning it was the indifference, the blindness, the weakness, or the cowardice of some minister or ministers that allowed it. To pluck up one weed, and that a little one, is easy; to search for one at the roots of every flower or plant in the garden, troublesome if not

dangerous. But often these careless husbandmen are followed by those who prefer fidelity to ease, and the evil work is partly or wholly undone.

When Dr. Warren says that "there is little danger that Dr. Buckley's green tree will ever become a dry," we must be allowed to remind him that under the operation of natural causes the only thing necessary to turn a "green tree" into a "dry" is *time*.

But what are the forces, said to have been overlooked, which are to prevent these results? The action of Bishops, and trials for heresy. But when time has made the incumbent strong, so that "to remove him will rend the Church," "there's the rub." Again, a Society may be honeycombed with fashionable dissipation, and no Bishop know it. Ah! but the Presiding Elder will, and he will give the Bishop that "necessary information." Nay, the Presiding Elder cannot enter very far into the *social* life of a congregation, even where his family attends, much less elsewhere. As for trials for heresy, they are so difficult to manage, create so much bitterness, and afford such opportunities for hair-splitting, that, except in the most outspoken cases, nothing could be done. A distinguished and able man, tried for heresy in the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a strong society to which he had preached for eight or ten years in sympathy with him, would become a martyr, and his society would vow to stand by him to the end.

The other evils, decline of class-meetings, increase of worldly amusements, etc., could come on from simple neglect. If the original passage be carefully studied and judged, in view of what occurs in Churches where permanency is possible and desired, in the light of the tendencies of modern times, especially if the influence of the secular press on ecclesiastical trials be duly considered, it will appear that there are no adequate forces to prevent the "green tree" from becoming a "dry" if all time limits should be abolished.

III. Our next position, concerning the complication of the work of the Bishop, has received comparatively little attention, except that of flat denial. We see no reason to do otherwise than to reaffirm that position, adding only important admissions from authoritative sources. The "Methodist," in an editorial of January 17, says: "If we believed in the helplessness of the

Episcopacy, as our critic seems to do, we should not favor the change in question. We believe as strongly as he in a limit and a limiting power; but we believe that it exists in the Episcopal authority." The Rev. C. N. Sims, D.D., states an objection to the removal of the limit as follows: "It would so interfere with the authority of the Bishops that they could not exercise it according to their best judgment." He then says:

If this be true it is an unanswerable argument against the proposed change. But we deny it wholly. Ample constitutional power remains with the Bishop, and the contempt of the whole Church would justly rest upon any man in that high position who had not the courage and conscience to use it faithfully.

"Ample constitutional power" is a "good phrase," but the *practicability* of its exercise is the question at issue.

IV. To break the force of our objections to the removal of the limitation, the editor of the "Northern" relies on "loyalty." He says:

What, then, is the ground for the declaration that the removal of the limitation—a change in itself desirable and requiring nothing but loyalty to render it perfectly safe and highly advantageous—would cost us the Itineracy? Has it come to pass that they who are faithful in much can be trusted with nothing? That ministers and Churches that have respectively surrendered much for a common good cannot safely be permitted any freedom which could in the least increase the temptation to insubordination and independence? It is true there *might* occur instances if the limitation were abolished, etc., but after reading Dr. Buckley's truthful explanation of the phenomenon of Methodist loyalty, we cannot but think that the number of such instances will be, as he says with reference to cases of insubordination at the present time, "so very small as scarcely to be a factor in the estimate of the working of the system."

But what is this "loyalty" of which he speaks? It is loyalty to the Methodist Episcopal Denomination or Church; for a minister is never permitted to feel that he is identified permanently with any particular society. Now, suppose that he were settled over a society for ten or twenty years, that it had been planted by him, or grown up under his labors, that though he went to the Conference every year, and received his re-appointment, neither he nor the people expected him to be removed so long as he succeeded; suppose, further, that a Bishop should propose to arbitrarily remove him, or that he

and his people should think it arbitrary; or that a small minority should become dissatisfied without cause, and should stir up other ministers to say "he has been there long enough," what then? Suppose that his friends should say, "We have stood by you, and you must stand by us," and his wife, with her social relations, and his children in the schools, were to chime in, what would be the result?

There has been but one kind of "loyalty" thus far—loyalty to the Methodist Episcopal Church; every Methodist minister "to the manner born," and all who have selected the Denomination on reflection, have been educated to such loyalty to the whole Church. This in ministry and laity is the centripetal tendency which holds the body together. But a sentiment of loyalty to the local Church, which the abrogation of a time limit would make possible and stimulate, is antagonistic to the other, and to rely on the loyalty now existing to protect the Denomination from the evils arising from another kind of loyalty is not reasonable.

Surely the American people need no lessons on the baleful effects of a conflict of loyalty. General Robert E. Lee originally had no heart in secession. He was loyal to the Union, and would have fought for it. Why, then, did he reluctantly go with the South? Because his education and associations had developed a sentiment of loyalty to the State in distinction from that to the Federal Republic, until the former surpassed the latter.

V. We affirmed that "the history of the introduction of the 'time limit' confirms all that has been set forth." And in supporting that position, we charged the "Brooklyn Society for the Promotion of a more Effective Working of the Itineracy" with putting forth "an amazing, though no doubt unintentional, misrepresentation." The editor of the "Methodist" avows himself the author of the paragraph, the accuracy of which we impeached, and made answer in his paper of January 17:

The paragraph attacked as "an amazing misrepresentation" is this:

"Up to 1804 the pastorates were all short—shorter than now; but they were made so by a judgment annually exercised by those who made them. We are quite willing that the pastorates

should be short, provided that they be made short by the judgment which annually fixes them. In 1804 the pastoral limit was fixed at two years of continuous service, and this limit was in the law for sixty years. Since 1864 the limit has been set at three years. I ask you to notice that the men who fixed upon two years in 1804 were large-minded, and set the mark up to the highest demand of any Church under their care. Two-years' pastorates, in 1804, met the extremest city want. If a General Conference were now to imitate the men of 1804, it could not fix the limit short of ten years. John-street, in 1804, was provided with a pastoral term up to its largest ambition; no one, remembering all the changes that have occurred, would think of a less term than ten years, if he wished to meet the largest ambition of St. Paul's in 1880."—P. 18.

The leading statement here is that, up to 1804, the pastorates were made short by a judgment annually exercised; a subordinate statement is, that the two-years' limit met the extremest city want. Dr. Buckley does not deny either statement, but he attacks the details of the latter one with considerable vigor, as follows:

"Nearly every statement in that passage is incorrect. 'Up to 1804 the pastorates were all short—shorter than now.' This is not correct. 'Two-years' pastorates, in 1804, met the extremest city want.' This is an error. 'John-street, in 1804, was provided with a pastoral term up to its largest ambition.' This is wholly wrong. Joining issues so positively on these statements, it behoves the writer to furnish irrefutable proof of the errors charged, or submit to be convicted of assailing the accuracy of another's affirmations without due care and caudor. The facts are that, though for some time previous to 1794 the general custom had been for the preachers to change every six months, (albeit this was only required 'when convenient,') between 1794 and 1804 the terms greatly lengthened. Many remained *two* years, and several stayed *three* years, and Francis Asbury *could not* prevent it."

To substantiate this charge of inaccuracy, the following proof was furnished:

1. The Annual Minutes for the years between 1794 and 1804. These show many appointments for two years, and several for three—*John-street* and Baltimore, among others, having had pastors appointed for *three successive* years.

2. Stevens' "History of the Methodist Episcopal Church," vol. iv, p. 178: "They were not allowed to appoint preachers for more than two successive years to the same appointment; hitherto there had been no restriction, and some had been *three* years in one appointment. Asbury rejoiced in the new rule as a *great relief to the appointing power.*"

3. Dr. Stevens is generally thoroughly reliable; but for details

it is well to go to primary sources. Jesse Lee's "History of the Methodists" was published in 1810. He says, pp. 298, 299: "The following rule was also formed, 'The Bishop shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station or circuit more than two years successively.' In some cases, prior to that rule, the Bishop had appointed a preacher or preachers to the same place for three years together. He now determined on a better plan, and formed this rule to prevent any preacher from wishing or expecting such an appointment in future."

An important typographical error occurred in the extract from Lee's "History." It reads: "We [not he] now determined on a better plan, and formed this rule to prevent any preacher from wishing or expecting such an appointment in future."

Candor requires any one who charges another with serious error to publish his answer in full: we therefore transcribe as follows the defense of the editor of the "Methodist: "

We answer: 1. Our leading statement is confirmed by Dr. Buckley, that the pastorates were made short by a judgment annually exercised. 2. The term "all" is seized upon, and bears the brunt of the criticism, though it is plain that the editor was speaking of the admitted fact (not denied by Dr. B.) that the general run of pastorates was shorter than now. The point is of little consequence to the argument, but, to answer a "smart" controversialist according to his smartness, we may say that if men "stayed" three years in John-street before 1804, they now "stay" four years in the New England Conference—and that is a complete answer to the purely technical objection on which Dr. B. founds the heavy charge of "an amazing misrepresentation." 3. Dr. B. furnishes no proof that any body was dissatisfied with the limit at two years. He proves that this limit had been reached and passed, but does not attempt to prove that any Church asked for a longer term in the rule. Respecting what some Churches might now ask, he is prudently silent.

On the answer but little need be said. The passage controverted declares that the "pastorates were all short, shorter than now;" and holds up the men "who fixed upon two years" as "large-minded;" and declares that "if a General Conference were now to imitate the men of 1804, it could not fix the limit short of ten years." The spirit of the passage, as well as the letter, is a call to the men of 1880 to be as "large-minded" as the men of 1804. In answer, we proved that leading men had been appointed for three years, and that the men of 1804

made the rule *solely to keep the limit down to two*. We now leave the reader to form his own judgment as to the issue of fact.

From the above premises "the conclusion is that"—

If the iron hand of Asbury, when the Churches were weak and the discipline strong, could not maintain the Itineracy without a time limitation, it is certain that, considering all the changes that have transpired, if the limitation by law were removed, the Itineracy would at once and forever break down.

On this the editor of the "Northern" remarks:

So positive and sweeping an inference should rest on an unquestionable basis. . . . That Asbury did not want the preachers to *wish or expect* to remain more than two years in the same place is, according to Lee's testimony, very evident, but that he recommended the rule because he "*could not*" make the appointments or maintain the Itineracy without it is an inference which the "iron-handed" Asbury would hardly have tolerated. Is it not a pure *non sequitur*?

We did not attempt to republish Asbury's "Journals," nor his letters to Francis Morrell, nor his valedictory to William M'Kendree, in which he bemoans the difficulties in his way of making changes and keeping the terms short, nor the quaint passage in which, under date of July 13, 1793, he says: "I am convinced there ought to be a change generally, presiding elders and others. This I aim at, but there are great difficulties. . . . All my woods and wilderness troubles vanish in a moment when I have to take one single grain of conference *tartar*."

We really supposed that every student of Methodist history knew Asbury's views on this subject, and that he was thoroughly opposed to long terms of service in one circuit or station. The question, however, is, what was made out in the article reviewed. It was clearly shown that Asbury *could not* move the presiding elders without the aid of a time limit; that as late as 1794 he desired the preachers to change every six months, and that in 1804 the General Conference was compelled to make a rule limiting the time to two years, because Asbury had not been able to withstand the pressure, and had appointed some for three years. If it is a *non sequitur* to conclude from such premises that Asbury *could not* maintain the Itineracy against localizing tendencies, a true sequence in historical reasoning will be difficult to find.

Whatever view may be taken of our deductions thus far, we have it in our power to set this branch of the subject forever at rest, by giving, in the very words of the minister who proposed the adoption of the two-years' rule, a full account of all the circumstances which led to its enactment, extending even to the conversation with Bishop Asbury on the subject.

HISTORY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE TWO-YEARS' RULE, IN THE WORDS OF ITS MOVER.

The circumstances which led to the adoption of that rule are not fully known at this day. Soon after the commencement of the present century two or three cases occurred that gave the Bishop great annoyance. Some preachers finding themselves in pleasant stations, and by the aid of self-constituted committees—*believing, of course*, that they could do better in the place than any one else—objected to removal, while the more pious part of the society would have preferred a change; but the officious committee prevailed. One of these unhappy cases came under our personal knowledge when in company with the Bishop, which gave the venerable Asbury much anxiety, seeing that to remove the incumbent would rend the society, and to leave him would result in injury to the Church. Finally *they* prevailed, and evil followed. In conversation with the Bishop we suggested the above rule, to which he pleasantly replied, "So, then, you would restrict the appointing power?" "Nay, sir," was the reply; "we would aid its execution, for in the present case it seems to be deficient."

His laconic reply of "So, so," encouraged me at the ensuing General Conference of 1804, to present the resolution, which was signed and seconded by the Rev. Joseph Totten, of the Philadelphia Conference. . . . Of course, it was laid on the table for the present. It was talked over out of doors, and scanned in all its bearings by the fireside, and when called up again, after some discussion, it passed with a very general vote. Nearly forty-seven years of experience has proved its utility, and we believe it has saved the Bishops and the Church no little difficulty. Now, if nearly fifty years ago there were two or three such unhappy cases, might we not reasonably calculate on two or three *score* at the present day? And if Bishop Asbury, with all his fatherly influence and decision, needed the aid of such a rule, how much more do our present Bishops! Indeed, we cannot conceive how an efficient systematic Itineracy can be sustained without some such rule; hence our English brethren have one of like import.

The author of the above passage, and the mover of the two-years' rule, was the venerable Aaron Hunt, of the New York

Conference. The case referred to, concerning which he conversed with Bishop Asbury, was that of the Rev. Cyrus Stebbins. This brother was a man of some influence over the more cultivated classes, and, after being stationed in Brooklyn and New York City, was appointed, in the year 1800, to Albany City, re appointed in 1801, again in 1802, and again in 1803, making in all *four* consecutive years; and this against the convictions of Bishop Asbury, under the pressure of Brother Stebbins and of the "self-constituted committee," representing the society, and the threat that "to remove him would rend the Church."

The Rev. Aaron Hunt published the foregoing statement in the "Christian Advocate and Journal" for March 6, 1851, over the signature of Luther. Papers in the possession of his grandson, the Rev. Dr. A. S. Hunt, show that the case of Cyrus Stebbins is the one referred to.

Who, therefore, will hereafter dispute the proposition that Bishop Asbury *could not* maintain the Itineracy against the wish of certain ministers and Churches without the aid of a *time limit*. And if "the iron hand of Asbury, when the Churches were weak and the discipline strong, could not maintain the Itineracy without a time-limitation," how can it reasonably be supposed possible now?

As for the Rev. Cyrus Stebbins, though he was returned to Brooklyn, he withdrew in 1805 from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The so-called "reform" that is to be "the panacea for all our woes, real or imaginary," when studied historically and analytically, has little to commend it to the wisdom of the Church. If it were adopted, a certain proportion of ministers might perhaps find some delightful spot in which to grow old, surrounded by friends who cared for them, and would "stand by them." But the triumphant march of Methodism across the Continent and around the world, even if here and there a check temporary or permanent be felt, is a more inspiring spectacle. That many are at first inclined to favor this proposition arises from the fact that they have "unequally viewed" our history and system, and have reasoned from the point of view of the *local society* and the individual minister, rather than from that of the whole Denomination.

Though the term "Triennialism" has been invented, and the declarations "It *will* come" and "There is a general call for it" are often reiterated by a comparatively few, it will be found that this "reform" cannot be incorporated with the existing machinery of the Church.

A POSSIBLE AMENDMENT.

That there are some defects in the present system we admit, nor can we be driven to deny it by exaggerated statement of them, or inconclusive reasonings and perilous propositions for their removal. The question is, Can they be remedied or diminished without jeopardizing the whole system?

The Australian plan, so-called, with some modifications, that the Bishops may have power, on the request of three quarters of the Quarterly Conference, sustained by a vote of two thirds of the Annual Conference, to re-appoint a pastor up to the period of six years, we suggested might possess the following advantages:

1. The "Itineracy" is still "limited by law."
2. The extension is so protected that it must be *exceptional*.
3. It would compel influential congregations to show a little more respect to the Annual Conferences than they sometimes do.
4. Such power given to the Annual Conferences would not be an innovation. See *Discipline*, 1876, pp. 102, 103.

But the proposition has been adversely commented upon.

Dr. Daniel Steele, in "Zion's Herald," has said:

But we hope that our preachers will never be required to vote on the term of one another's appointments. It would be like the *outs* of civil office voting on the *ins*. We prefer Bishop Peck's suggested extension of the three-years' term when in any case it is deemed to be necessary by all the Bishops in their semi-annual meeting.

A writer, who conceals his name, says:

1. It would take the appointing power from the Bishop and Cabinet and give it to the Conference; for no Bishop would veto this double sanction.
2. Any minister who can get a majority of the official board can so constitute it as to get a two-thirds vote.
3. No Annual Conference would refuse to approve the request of the Quarterly Conference. So that in point of fact the con-

tinuance of a pastor beyond the three years would be largely in his own hands.

A well-known layman, in private correspondence, says :

I fear the application of the "possible amendment" would place in many Churches a few members of a Quarterly Conference in the same position as the unfortunate jurymen who had to serve with eleven obstinate men.

On these objections a few suggestions may be made. Dr. Steele's objection to the *outs* voting for the *ins* implies distrust of the ability of the ministers to rise above personal interest and prejudice. Yet in any special instance all who were not about to move, and all whose places were determined, could vote without prejudice growing out of personal relation to the appointment in question, and *nearly* all others.

That no Bishop would veto the double sanction, and that no Annual Conference would veto the request of the Quarterly Conference, are propositions not supported by proof. That they would not do so except in *extreme* cases may be taken for granted. But those who desire any extension should not object to that. That a minister who can get a majority can so constitute the official board as to get two thirds or three fourths, and that the minority may be the most judicious members of the Church, must be admitted. But the minority have a double appeal, namely, to the Annual Conference and to the Bishop.

The reference of such cases to the Board of Bishops is objectionable, because in the matter of transfers for particular Churches, etc., the Bishops have as much responsibility as they can bear; because the "Board" could not obtain personal cognizance of the facts; and because between the meeting of said Board and that of the Conference great changes might occur.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada the rule is, that "the Bishop shall not allow any preacher to remain in the same station more than three years successively, *unless by request of the Annual Conference*, except the presiding elders." The usage is as though it read "consent of the Annual Conference," but final discretion is with the chair as to exceeding three years. The rule was made to cover the case of the Rev.

Joseph Wild, D.D., then of Belleville, now of the Elm Place Congregational Church, of Brooklyn, N. Y. There have been but two or three cases exceeding three years, the general view being unfavorable to it.

The Rev. Bishop Carman, in a letter to the writer, says :

Am for keeping to the old landmarks. Think our plan is, perhaps, as good a modification as practicable. Quarterly Conference memorialize Bishop; Bishop comes to Annual Conference; ought to be safe there if any where.

This is substantially the "Australian plan." While we remain of the opinion that a substitution of five or six years in the rule for three is very undesirable, and that the removal of the limitation would be destructive, we are willing to see a plan proposed that will give a little more flexibility in *extreme* cases. If no safe plan can be devised, as the advantages of the Itineracy far outweigh its defects, it would be better to "bear those ills we have, than fly to others that we know not of."

A safe plan must have four elements—the extension must be so restricted as to be *exceptional*; the episcopacy must be shielded from responsibility, and yet allowed the absolute final decision; there must be a time limit at last, and that at no great distance.

But it seems probable from present indications that those who advocate the removal of the limitation will not be admonished by the errors of many other "reformers;" but, refusing to accept any thing less than all they desire, will drive those who will take no risk of the destruction of the Itineracy (which we believe to comprise the great majority of the ministry and laity) to oppose all change. As the "thin edge of the wedge" once introduced often makes possible what could never be attained by the direct application of external force, it is necessary to move with great caution. It is a safe maxim that experiments in mechanism and in legislation are dangerous in proportion to the delicacy and complexity of the original system.

Though this principle should never be allowed to obstruct genuine progress, it requires attention to the teachings of history, and is opposed to flippancy and superficiality in the discussion of great questions. Whether, then, the "Australian" or "Canadian" plan, with some modifications, is a safe experi-

ment, is not to be hastily determined. We have called attention to it as seeming feasible, and entitled to critical examination; but nothing less than a general demand, after much deliberation, and a discussion marked by accuracy and fairness and in harmony with the "zealous and itinerant genius of Methodism," would justify its adoption. At no time in the history of the Church has there been need for greater wisdom in the administration of the system of ministerial transfer and adjustment than at present.

Every thing which the rule, fairly interpreted, admits, may be done to meet emergencies, but it is necessary that all should have reason to feel that the "appointing power" seeks absolute impartiality, and will gratify the wishes of the weakest country society whenever it is possible, and protect the interests of the humblest minister who tries to do his duty, as gladly as it will promote the desires of city Churches and their pastors.

"Transfers" should be made on principles of universal application, and mere capriciousness in Churches, either great or small, discouraged. Anomalies in administration foster discontent. We believe that the Itineracy has but just begun its work. The constant problem of the superintendency is to so guide it as to give the greatest efficiency. The problem before the Church is to determine what modification, if any, can be made that will not block the wheels in one part of the mechanism, or unduly accelerate their motion in another.

ART. VII.—THE WESLEYAN MISSION IN NEW ZEALAND.

To the Episcopal Church belongs the honor of being the first to introduce Christianity into New Zealand. Messrs. Hall, King, and Kendall, under the auspices of the Rev. Samuel Marsden, were the first to visit the islands on this errand; and Mr. Marsden, on Christmas-day, 1814, was the first to proclaim the gospel message, which he did from the appropriate words, "Behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy." Though residing in Sydney, New South Wales, Mr. Marsden superintended the New Zealand Mission, paying it seven visits for that

purpose—the last in 1837, when he had attained the advanced age of seventy-two. Throughout the whole of his long and useful career as a missionary superintendent he secured and maintained the highest respect of missionaries belonging to other Churches than his own, to which a simple and beautiful testimony was borne in the following “pulpit notice,” read in the Wesleyan Church at Paramatta, Sydney, where he had died, on the Sunday preceding the one on which his funeral sermon was preached: “Next Sunday morning we intend to close this place of worship, and, as a mark of respect to the memory of our late venerable friend, go to the English Church to hear his funeral sermon.”

The first Wesleyan missionary was the Rev. Samuel Leigh, who arrived in Sydney from England on the 10th of August, 1815, where he remained till 1818. In that year he proceeded to New Zealand, staying but nine months, during which period his soul was stirred within him as he witnessed the appalling degradation of the people. Returning again to Sydney, he remained there but a short time, when he proceeded to England with the object of persuading the Wesleyan Missionary Society to open a mission in New Zealand. In this he was successful, and accordingly, he, along with his wife, set sail for the new land, arriving at the Bay of Islands in the month of February, 1822. Acting under the advice of the Episcopal missionaries, who gave every assistance to their Methodist brother, Mr. Leigh, on the 10th of June, 1823, secured a piece of land at Wangaroa for a mission station, in a beautiful valley, to which he gave the name of “Wesley Dale.” Here, within two or three days after claiming this lovely spot for the Redeemer, heathenism made one of its revolting displays on Christ’s own day, when, a war-canoe coming into harbor crowded with slaves, one of them was killed, roasted, and eaten. Mr. Leigh did not remain long in New Zealand, the health of his wife requiring his return to Sydney toward the end of 1823. Yet in this brief period, not long enough to acquire a competent knowledge of the Maori language, he learned what were the perils and annoyances of a life among a haughty and savage people. His constancy was put to a severe test because he would not supply them with arms or gunpowder in exchange for food. Not merely did they temptingly offer as much as a hundred

baskets of potatoes for one musket, but they determinedly refused to receive any thing else as payment. The description of their behavior given by an early missionary represents them as treating the new arrivals with the most provoking contempt:

They are almost past bearing, coming into our houses when they please, demanding food, thieving whatever they can lay hands on, breaking down our garden-fences, stripping the ships' boats of every thing they can. They seem, in fact, ripe for every mischief.

Says the Rev. James Buller :

When at family prayer it was not uncommon for the natives to creep in and steal something. A chief, for instance, would secrete the teapot within his mat. One day the dinner was cooked in the yard; while the table was being laid inside a hawk-eyed fellow got over the fence and walked away with oven, dinner, and all. On washing-days, basket and line, as well as garments, were tempting baits, and had to be narrowly watched.

In 1823, and before Mr. and Mrs. Leigh had left New Zealand, the Rev. Nathaniel Turner and Mrs. Turner, and the Rev. John Hobbs arrived. The mission party now consisted of four missionaries, a missionary's wife, an artisan, and a nurse-girl that Mrs. Turner had brought with her; of whom but one could speak the Maori language. Surrounding them were tribes described as the vilest in the land, of whose degradation Mr. Turner had very soon full proof, when one morning, not very far from his home, he came upon a small tribe preparing to sit down to feast on the body of a slave just cooked. A deputation from the London Missionary Society, consisting of the Rev. Messrs. Tyermann and Bennett, accompanied with a Mr. Thielkeld and son, had about this time a very narrow escape from being cooked and eaten. Putting in to Wangaroa, with the intention of seeing their Wesleyan brethren, the ship in which they were sailing, the "Endeavour," had no sooner been brought to anchor before the Maoris crowded the deck and began their pilfering tricks. In trying to clear the deck a chief was jostled by the captain, and fell into the sea. Thereupon the natives took possession of the ship, and made the officers and crew prisoners, at the same time arming themselves with axes, billets of wood, and whatever else they could lay hold of. Not one of the passengers or crew dare move. While

spears and clubs menaced the captain, Mr. Bennett was made secure by his arms being pinioned, his two friends being, at the same time, secured in another part of the ship. Terrible excitement prevailed, the howlings and yellings of the infuriated savages mingling in frightful discord as they menaced their helpless prisoners, who looked for every moment as their last. The ax had already been uplifted, awaiting but the signal to give the blow, when the attention of the cannibals was providentially diverted from their present murderous purpose by the appearance of a sail, which proved to be a boat having on board some of the Wesleyan missionaries and a native chief, Te Ara, the object of whose visit was to give an invitation to the deputation to visit Wesley Dale. Their timely appearance and interference saved the imperiled lives from destruction; but the invitation was not accepted, for the visitors had received such a fright that they adjudged it wiser to at once take their departure. Accordingly, they lifted the anchor and went out to sea, two of the missionaries remaining on board with them until they were fairly away.

Nor was the mission party itself permitted to remain for long in undisturbed security. Addressing themselves cheerfully to their work, they had acquired the language, prepared several small books, and made visits to distant native villages, when suddenly their hopes of a bright day in store were for the present beclouded. Hongi, a blood-thirsty warrior, made an attack upon the tribes in the locality, and wrought fearful havoc among them. Robbery, fire, and slaughter prevailed, and the mission party with difficulty succeeded in making their escape. Gathering together some of their clothing, which they tied in a few small bundles, the fugitives, including Mrs. Turner and her three small children, hurried away from danger and from death, through forest and fern, for twenty miles, until they arrived at the Church of England mission station at Koriki. It was now too evident that all the tribes were more or less to be involved in horrible warfare; and nothing remained for the party, who had lost their all, except a few articles of clothing, but to secure themselves by wholly departing from the scene of anarchy and blood. Accordingly, they left New Zealand for Sydney on January 31, 1827, where they remained for six months; at the end of which time, learning that a powerful

chief, Patuone, who had saved their lives in their flight, was favorable to their return, the party, with the exception of Mr. and Mrs. Turner, returned, and settled on the river Hokianga, giving to the mission station the name of Mangungu, meaning in Maori, *broken to pieces*, a name appropriately descriptive of the irregular and broken appearance of the surrounding country. Mr. Turner returned to New Zealand in 1836, and remained in superintendence of the mission till 1839. On the death of Hongi, which took place soon after the missionaries' return, blood was again freely shed, and one of the most sanguinary contests that had been known in the country was threatened. A great array of armed natives took place at Waima, ready for fierce encounter. By this time the missionaries had gained some influence over the savage mind, and, at the risk of their own lives, they ventured to mediate between the contestants, rejoicing after many days of delicate and difficult negotiations in being able to secure a mutual declaration of peace. In this victory of the gospel of peace over murderous passion and cannibalistic propensity, the missionaries beheld the first-fruits of a long and toilsome season of sowing in tears. These successful negotiations strengthened their hold upon the Maoris, who soon came to regard them as their friends and counselors. Distant tribes expressed their desire to receive among them the men, no longer strangers, whom they had begun to respect and love; the few books they had printed were eagerly received and mastered with gratifying diligence; while in many places unholy rites and superstitious incantations were abandoned for the pure and simple worship of the almighty God. In striking contrast with the ferocious character of the people from whom, a few years previously, Mr. Turner had to flee for his life, that devoted missionary was gratified by witnessing many instances of generosity and true kindness. One may be mentioned, when the missionaries' house was accidentally burned to the ground, at a time when his wife was confined to bed through illness for ten weeks. The fire occurring at night, the inmates had to escape in their night-dresses as best they could, when one of the native chiefs, throwing a blanket over Mrs. Turner, carried her away gently in his strong arms, and upon depositing her in a distant house, broke out in pathetic strains of sympathy: "O mother, let not your heart be

distressed. Though your house and property are gone, your life, your husband, and your children are spared. I have no garments to give you; but you shall have pork and potatoes, and all such things as we have."

Before Mr. Turner's return, in 1836, the Rev. Messrs. Whitebey, Wallis, and Woon had joined the little band; and in 1839 the Rev. John H. Bumby arrived, as successor in the superintendency to Mr. Turner, who was also accompanied by his sister, and the Rev. Messrs. Warren, Creed, and Ironside, with their wives. To these were added in the following year the Rev. Messrs. Buddle and Turton, with their wives, and Messrs. Buttle, Smales, and Aldred. It should be mentioned that as general superintendent of the Wesleyan missions in Australasia and Polynesia, the Rev. John Waterhouse was sent out by the English Missionary Society in 1839. His head-quarters were at Hobart Town, in Tasmania, whence he made several official visits to New Zealand, and where he died in 1842.

Nor was Mr. Bumby's career a long one; for while yet but thirty-two, in the full promise of usefulness, he met a sorrowful death, the year after his arrival in the colony. One day he was crossing the Waitemata in a canoe with twenty natives, himself seated in the stern with a book in his hand. A gentle breeze springing up, one of them rose to unfurl the sail, which, being heavy, others hastily stood up to assist him, capsizing the boat by so doing. Righting the canoe again, his brave boys succeeded in placing him in it; but some of them incautiously pressing into it, overturned it again. One of the Maoris, Hemi Karana, succeeded in placing his pastor on the upturned boat, where he supported him for half an hour, when a rolling wave passing over them drove them from their position, the missionary sinking beneath it before his faithful friend, who was a capital swimmer, had time to come to his rescue. Fourteen out of the twenty were drowned. Eloquent as a preacher, and of thoughtful habits and studious tastes, the young missionary superintendent was much better adapted for the ministry in England than for the arduous and many-sided work of a missionary pioneer in New Zealand. Special gifts were his, but they had a most unsuitable sphere for their employment among fierce and proud warriors, upon whom the only telling arguments were plunder and blood and cannibalism.

The Supreme Disposer withheld permission even for their ultimate employment in the young country in the years yet to come; for his first and last service to his dusky charge consisted in the giving out of a hymn from the pulpit in the Maori language.

Mr. Bumby's successor as mission superintendent was the Rev. Walter Lawry, who for several years onward from 1818 had been a missionary in the Friendly Isles, and was thus well qualified by previous experience for the work upon which he entered on March 17, 1844. The prospect before him was in the highest degree hopeful. Heathenism had in many parts disappeared before the gently subduing power of the Christian religion, and he found the ordinances and institutions of the Methodist Church in existence among many a Maori tribe, and in some of the few European settlements which had already sprung into existence. Many and frequent were the occasions when the missionaries' hearts were made glad by applications from the stout-hearted warriors of former years for admission to the privileges of Church membership, and on some of these one hundred at a time would be baptized and admitted as catechumens.

Perhaps no better evidence can be supplied of the power of the Christian religion to subdue the savage character and regulate the lawless conduct of a Maori multitude than an account given by an eye-witness, the Rev. James Buller, of a Maori feast held in 1844 at Remnera, a few miles from the present city of Auckland. The Maoris have always been given to feasting, and this feast was no exception to the generality in that it had a political purpose:

The number of visitors was about four thousand. For their refection there awaited eleven thousand baskets of potatoes, a hundred large pigs, nine thousand sharks, and liberal supplies of flour, rice, sugar, and tobacco. A shed, four hundred yards long, was standing about fifty yards from the breastwork of potatoes, which shed was covered with Witney blankets, and one thousand more were ready as gifts. The feast lasted nearly a week. There was a natural fear in the minds of the European settlers in Auckland that the presence of such a muster of Maoris would be fraught with danger. Had they intended mischief, the few soldiers in the barracks sunk into nothing before such a host. But not a single act of disorder transpired. Only one accident happened, and that was to one of themselves. It has been well

asked, "Would the Caledonians, from the age of Constantine to that of the Plantagenets, have shown similar forbearance?" The governor, Captain Fitzroy, with his suite, paid a formal visit to the assembly. The war dance was performed by sixteen hundred. With such a number it was effectively done; but, as a relic of their old barbarism, it is not to be commended. Good taste, not less than sound morals, must condemn the practice. The several tribes were attended by their respective missionary pastors. Clusters of tents covered the ground, with small flags waving in the breeze. The Sunday was well observed, as it generally was in those days. Gathered into their several groups, the people worshiped God and heard his word.

Thousands of people, lately savage, brought together on an occasion usually stimulating to warlike propensities, must have come under the influence of habits far removed from those which had made men the plunderers and murderers they had been so recently, if they could conduct themselves with such admirable decorum. And indeed this was the case. Formerly liars and thieves, Mr. Lawry, describing a seven weeks' journey among them, says:

I was forcibly struck with their truthfulness and honesty. I did not hear of a single departure from truth or honesty in the case of a single individual of our people. I was cheered with the sight of the natives, without exception. Whether they traveled with us or not, all united with us in morning and evening devotion; the hymn was sung, the chapter was read, and prayer was offered. This is now the case in all those places where the influence of the missionary prevails, and there are few which that influence has not reached.

A few years after Mr. Lawry's arrival in New Zealand two useful educational institutions were established—a native model-school and the Wesleyan College. The first of these was founded at "Three Kings," three conical hills of volcanic character, near Auckland, for the purpose of training youth of both sexes, Maori and half-caste, in the rudiments of an English education, Christian knowledge, and industrial pursuits. Placed under the care of the Rev. Alexander Reid and Mrs. Reid, with an efficient staff of assistants, it continued in active operation till 1860, when it was interrupted by the disastrous Maori war. Wesley College came into existence under the presidency of the Rev. J. H. Fletcher, and was specially devoted to the training of the sons and daughters of missionaries

in New Zealand and the South Seas, though not to the exclusion altogether of the children of laymen. For some years Wesley College, though now non-existent, had a successful career as a high-class educational institution, and was the only one in the land in which any thing but the merest elementary instruction could be obtained.

Mr. Lawry continued to fill his office of general superintendent until the year 1854, when he retired from the active work of the ministry, and, after residing four years in Sydney, died, aged sixty-six, March 20, 1859.

Mission work among aborigines every-where has always suffered, more or less, from the detraction of the unsympathetic settler and the selfish trader; and it is not to be wondered at that the Maori mission should have awakened some hostility in the same classes of critics. Much labor has been bestowed upon the Maori race, and though it can no more be said of this than of any other benevolent enterprise that the results have been co-equal with the hopes and expectations indulged, yet the work, as a whole, has been a very great success. It cannot be claimed that success was immediate. Long and wearily did the first missionaries labor before they were able to claim their first convert, and it was only on the 14th of September, 1825, ten years after their landing, that they were able to administer Christian baptism to Rangi, the first to bear the Christian name among the Maori race. In the face of brutalizing cannibalism and infanticide, debasing polygamy and unclean indulgences, and a belief in a powerful priesthood and their black arts, it was an up-hill battle that had to be fought before a people who had been subjected to such mighty brutalizing forces could be brought under the purifying and elevating influences of Christ's gospel. But the liberation was accomplished, and, until the disastrous wars broke out, for which European cupidity and wickedness are so largely responsible, the Maoris who accepted Christianity and her institutions displayed an admirable spirit of devotion and fidelity to the truth they had received as from God. Habits of decency, regularity, and piety were fostered by New Testament teaching, and the law of God, so long as they yielded to its requirements, had to them a sanctity, especially as it enjoins religious worship and observance of the Sabbath, which secured sincere and devout

obedience. A military officer, Colonel Mundy, gives a description of a scene witnessed by him in 1847, which shows how these statements may be claimed to be realistic. He says :

I was returning with the governor from a walk to Mount Eden, when, upon turning the angle of the volcanoes, we came upon some hamlets belonging to people employed by government in quarrying the stone at the foot of the hill. I do not remember ever to have seen a more interesting or impressive scene than met our view as we looked down into the little valley below us. Eighty or a hundred Maoris, of various ages and both sexes, were standing, sitting, or reclining among the low fern in front of the village, in such groups and attitudes as accident had thrown them into. In the midst, on a slightly elevated mound, stood a native teacher, deeply tattooed in face, but dressed in decent black European clothes, who, with his Bible in his hand, was expounding to them the Gospel in their own tongue. Taking off our hats, we approached so as to become part of the congregation. No head turned toward us, no curious eyes were attracted by the arrival of the strangers, (as is so often the case in more civilized congregations,) though the governor was one of them. Their calm and grave looks were fixed with attention on the preacher, who, on his part, enforced his doctrine with a powerful and persuasive voice and manner, and with gestures replete with energy and animation. The sermon was, apparently, extempore, but there was no poverty of words or dearth of matter. It was delivered with the utmost fluency, and occasional rapid reference to and quotation from Scripture. The wild *locale* of this outdoor worship, (in the lap, as it were, of a mountain torn to pieces by its own convulsions, in the midst of heaped-up lava and scoria, with fern and flax waving in the wind,) invested the scene with a peculiar solemnity, and carried one back some centuries in the history of the world.

Similar testimonies from impartial sources might be adduced to almost any extent; while records of public profession of faith in Christ, verified by holy living and crowned by triumphant dying, fill the note-books of many a devoted missionary.

Despite the unwillingness of some even who have been the most profited by Maori civilization to admit their obligation to Christianity, in the present instance it is undeniable that it made a way for British law and British commerce. Sir George Grey, twice Governor of New Zealand, and who has spent so large a portion of his life in it, once said on a public occasion : " I feel confident that, regarded as a mere money investment, the very best investment England can make is to send out in advance—and far in advance of either colonists or merchants

—missionaries, who are to prepare the way for those who are to follow them.” And, said the first governor, Captain Hobson, addressing the Legislature, in 1841: “Whatever difference of opinion may be entertained as to the value and extent of the missionary body, there can be no doubt that they have rendered important service to the country, or that, but for them, a British colony would not at this moment be established in New Zealand.” If to reduce a rude language to writing, to provide an elementary literature, and to instruct in the simpler arts and handicrafts of civilization, be to prepare the way for a profitable intercourse on the part of a commercial nation with a strong, brave, and intelligent native race, then the Wesleyan missionaries of New Zealand, along with their brethren of other Churches, are entitled to the ungrudging thanks of many who have built up substantial fortunes out of their trading in the fair and fertile home of the Maori.

By the blessing of God the missionaries had been able to cope successfully with native superstition and ferocity. There remained another obstacle to their work, which came from their own race. A country so admirably adapted for colonization as New Zealand was sure to attract Europeans and Americans to its shores in large numbers; and it is simple truth to say that, while many of the earliest settlers were orderly, virtuous, and Christian, all of them were by no means so. A government officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Russell, native commissioner, speaks, in 1862, to this point as follows:

The conduct of some of the Europeans who have located themselves in the Mohaka and Wairoa districts would almost lead me to suppose that they were the barbarians, and the Maoris the more civilized people. Scenes of drunkenness and outrage are described, in which men have taken part whose education and position should have led to a very different line of conduct, and which bring the moderation and forbearance of the natives into very strong contrast.

New forms of evil were thus presented to the Maori, and that, too, by the countrymen of the very men who had persuaded him to abandon slavery and cannibalism. Drinking, gambling, profanity, and Sabbath-breaking were now before his eyes; and what wonder if, as he beheld them, he first lost confidence in the religion of his benefactors, and ere long abandoned it to return to the more complicated and unmeaning religious

superstition of Hau-hauism. Very soon it could be said of the Maori as of the Englishman, "He swears like a trooper;" and, as if to fix the responsibility of his profanity upon those who had taught him it, he swore in English. Whereas the Sabbath in aboriginal New Zealand had for years been observed with a strictness not exceeded in Christian England, it soon lost its sacredness in Maori estimation after British troops were seen fighting on it. The shady side of the contrast would be quickly seen by the discerning Maori mind, when the British troops took the Ruapekapeka fort while its dusky defenders were in the very act of worshiping the British soldiers' God. To inconsistency, religious division must be added as an effective cause of Maori apostasy; and if blame in this matter is to be rightly centered, it must undoubtedly be located with a pretentious Anglicanism and a still more pretentious Romanism, which obtruded themselves many years after the evangelical Marsden and his associates had extended the hand of Christian cordiality to Leigh and his Wesleyan brethren. Bishop Selwyn is undoubtedly deserving of all the commendation which has been bestowed upon him as an eminently successful missionary bishop; but it is regretfully remembered by some now venerable Methodist missionaries, who did good service in Maori evangelization years before he landed in New Zealand, that he did not always repress, either in himself or his subordinates, an arrogant bearing toward ministers who did not attach the same value as himself to episcopal teachings and orders. A yet further and final cause of disaffection and apostasy soon made itself apparent in the hostile relations established between some of the more powerful native tribes and the government of the day. The Maori had learned that his land was his wealth, and, as he reflected that it had too often been parted with for prices wholly inadequate, and on negotiations not always honorable, he resolved to refuse and defy all claimants to it outside his tribe or nation. A war-feeling grew up in his breast. Disquietude, debate, and passion took the place of security, order, and peace; and ultimately the white man came to be regarded as the Maori's bitterest foe.

With all these causes of disaffection working together among a highly imaginative race, it is not to be wondered at that relief from perplexity and annoyance should be sought for

in a change of religious belief and social relations; nor that it should be imagined that such relief was most likely to be met with by a return to at least some of the old superstitions. Accordingly, a wide-spread and furious spirit of fanaticism displayed itself during the last Maori war, in what is called the Pai-Marire movement, speedily followed by another, bearing the name of Hau-hau. "Pai-Marire" means "good and peaceful," while "Hau-hau" signifies "to deal blows to." Hauhanism, which as a system became quite as much political as religious, was a remarkable compound of Romanism, Spiritualism, Mormonism, and Judaism. Te Ua, a fanatical Maori, bolder and more unscrupulous than the rest, and shrewd enough to discern a favorable opportunity for distinguishing himself, claimed to have received a revelation from the angel Gabriel raising him to the position of a prophet. By virtue of powers vested in him, he instituted orders of priests, and assured the discontented Maoris that if they would but place themselves under their power, following at the same time his leadership as high-priest, and paying homage to the Virgin Mary, Gabriel would assuredly grant them victory over the Pakehas. Captain Lloyd, an English officer of the 57th Regiment, fell into the hands of the fanatics, and, being beheaded, his head, after being cured, and then carried in procession, was reserved for sacred use as a medium of communication with Jehovah. Te Ua, having gathered together his priests, solemnly declared that through the poor captain's head the tenets of the new politico-religious system had been revealed in the following order:

1. All its followers to be called "Pai-Marire."
2. Gabriel, with his legions, will protect them.
3. The Virgin Mary will be always with them.
4. The religion of England, as taught in the Bible, is false.
5. The Scriptures must all be burned.
6. No notice must be taken of their Christian Sabbath.
7. Men and women to live promiscuously.
8. Complete victory to follow the vigorous "Hau."
9. The European population to be driven out of New Zealand.
10. This will be done when the head [of Captain Lloyd] has made its circuit of the land.
11. Men will then come from heaven to teach them knowledge.
12. The priests have the power to teach the Maoris English.

The new belief spread like wild-fire among the disaffected and belligerent tribes, many of whom, including the more powerful and intelligent, had renounced their allegiance to the

Queen of England; set up their own king, in 1858, in the person of Te-Whero Whero, or Potatau, an old chief of high rank by birth, and widely respected, to whom they required all Europeans, the missionaries included, to promise allegiance or quit their country; enacted laws disallowing European magistrates, forbidding the imprisonment of natives, and prohibiting the construction of roads; and, in 1864, renounced Christianity, and threatened the extirpation of all European inhabitants. Some of the tribes retained their friendly relations to the English government, and displayed fidelity and disinterestedness rarely equaled by such as have for centuries been under the influence of Christian doctrine and motive. But for ten years fierce warfare prevailed in the fairest portions of the land, involving the loss of hundreds of lives, the destruction of contented and happy homes, the expenditure of millions of money, the confiscation of tracts of fair and fertile country, and the engendering of bitter feeling not likely to admit of the restoration of completely amicable relations for many years yet to come; and all this, it may be admitted, with defeat of the Maori, but certainly not his conquest, as its result. Of obtuseness, incapacity, and blundering on the part of the British army there were more than enough; while there was little that added to its luster or increased its renown. Saddest of all is the reflection that the Maori campaign, with its decade of suffering and loss, was by no means unavoidable, and that it can never claim a place in the list of those wars which men agree to call either "necessary" or "righteous."

As might be expected, the force of so violent a reaction as lay in the uncontrollable wildnesses of Hau-hauism was felt by no class of settlers more keenly than by the missionaries. Formerly trusted as their most judicious advisers and constant friends, the Maoris now showed them the most bitter hatred. Not merely had they to abandon their stations, but, as in the case of Bishop Williams, some had to save their lives by hasty flight. Two valuable lives were sacrificed to their insatiate vengeance—those of the Rev. C. S. Volkner, of the Episcopal, and the Rev. John Whiteley, of the Wesleyan, mission—both eminently devoted men, who had spent many years in ungrudging service of their murderers. Mr. Whiteley was specially respected and trusted by a large section even of the more turbu-

lent natives, at the same time that he was implicitly confided in by the government because of his wise counsels, and esteemed by the settlers because of his transparent and saintly character. Yet these considerations were not sufficient to shield even him from the blood-thirsty frenzies of Hau-han fanaticism. As was his wont, he had gone to one of his distant preaching appointments on the Saturday of February 13, 1869, to be ready for divine service on the following Sabbath, and on his arrival found the place—Puke-aruhe, in Taranaki—in possession of an armed party of natives, who had murdered every one of the settlers that had taken shelter in the redoubt. Approaching them, as is supposed, with full confidence in his influence over them to prevent further murders, he was fired on while yet at some distance, his horse first dropping under him, and himself speedily falling pierced with no less than five bullets. The government evinced its appreciation of the good man's services in its behalf by voting his widow an annuity of £100, which she still enjoys.

The worst is past, and better days are dawning. There will be no more Maori war, for the "King" party is fast losing its influence, and, indeed, can scarcely be said to have an existence. Of those who were hurried away by the terrible fanatical force of Hau-hanism, many are returning to their "right minds." The Scriptures are once more finding their way among those who had so grievously departed from their teaching, as was seen but recently, when two cases of copies were readily disposed of at an influential meeting of the "Kingites" with the premier, Sir George Grey; while there is clearly discernible a growing desire for the return of missionary agency among them. Henceforward such agency will be native, and to provide it both the Wesleyan and Episcopal Churches are engaged in training young and intelligent Maoris of promise. Six Maori chiefs have seats in the two Houses of Parliament—two in the upper and four in the lower house; while many fill honorable positions as native magistrates or assessors. When it is added that about two thousand Maori children are being taught English in schools, and that the outward condition of the race, as a whole, as to diet, clothing, and general habits, is greatly improved, it will be seen that there is yet reason for hope for the future of the Maori. Unfortunately, the race is decreasing;

but with a census return that can show a total of over 42,000, there is presented to the Churches of New Zealand, for many years to come, no little scope for all its energies upon Maori evangelization. And the Maori, with his high capabilities of intelligence, and especially his ready discernment between right and wrong, is worthy of it all.

ART. VIII.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN, October, November, December, 1879. (Chicago, Illinois.)—1. The Mound Builders; by J. E. Stevenson. 2. Alaska and its Inhabitants; by Rev. Sheldon Jackson. 3. Antiquity of the Tobacco Pipe in Europe. Part II.—Switzerland; by Edwin A. Barber. 4. Fort Wayne, (Old Fort Miami,) and the Route from the Maumee to the Wabash; by R. S. Robertson. 5. How the Rabbit Killed the (Male) Winter; by J. O. Dorsey. 6. The Delaware Indians in Ohio; by S. D. Peet. 7. The Silent Races; by L. J. Dupre. 8. Sacrificial Mounds in Illinois and Ohio.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1880. (Philadelphia.)—1. Pre-tended Unity of Modern Philosophy; by Rev. J. Ming, S.J. 2. Vocations to the Priesthood; by Right Rev. Thomas A. Becker, D.D. 3. Socialism at the Present Day; by Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J. 4. The Necessity for Infallibility; by Dr. Daniel Gans. 5. Archbishop Gibbon, and his Episcopalian Critic, Dr. Stearns; by A. de G. 6. English Manners; by A. Featherstone Marshall, B.A. 7. Is Froude a Historian? J. Gilmory Shea, LL.D. 8. Insanity as a Plea for Criminal Acts; Insanity as Emotional or Affective; and whether Insanity can be of the Will alone; Rev. Walter H. Hill, S.J. 9. The Stack-O'Hara Case; by S. L. M.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, January, 1880. (Andover.)—1. Calvin's Ethics; by Rev. Frank H. Foster. 2. Recent Works Bearing on the Relation of Science to Religion; by Rev. George Frederick Wright. 3. Method of the Theological Use of the Bible, Especially of the Old Testament; by A. Duff, Jun., Ph.D. 4. Do the Scriptures Prohibit the Use of Alcoholic Beverages? by Rev. A. B. Rich, D.D. 5. The Meaning of שבת; by Rev. Wm. Henry Cobb. 6. The Sabbath in the Old Dispensation, and in the Change of Observance from the Seventh to the Lord's Day; by Rev. William De Loss Love, D.D. 7. Dr. Dorner's Christian Theology; by Dr. D. W. Simon.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY, January, 1880. (Lebanon, Tenn.)—1. A Chapter from the Evidences; by R. Beard, D.D. 2. Scientific Theism; by J. I. D. Hinds, Ph.D. 3. Sanctification; by S. T. Anderson, D.D. 4. Baptismal Regeneration—Part I; by S. G. Burney, D.D. 5. Individual Immortality: The Problem of the Ages; by A. B. Miller, D.D. 6. Exegetical; by R. V. Foster.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, January, 1880. (Gettysburg.)—1. Mr. Ruskin and the Lord's Prayer; by C. A. Stork, D.D. 2. Is Conscience Infallible? by M. Valentine, D.D. 3. The Lutheran Church in Columbia County, N. Y.; by Rev. William Hull. 4. Secular Education; by A. A. E. Taylor, D.D. 5. The Historical Character of the Book of Genesis; by Rev. Dr. Geo. H. Schodde. 6. Assurance; by Rev. Joel Swartz, D.D. 7. Phillips Brooks' Influence of Jesus; by C. A. Stork, D.D. 8. The Principle of the Reformation; by Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph.D.

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, JANUARY, 1880. (New York.)

The Contemporary Review contains an article on "The Eighteenth Century," by Hillebrand, from which we give its view of Wesley and the Methodist movement.

Little was left either of the mysticism or the superstition of Christianity. All that remained was a very prosaic system of morals, and a very jejune metaphysical belief in an all-loving Creator. The worship of God dwindled more and more into a mere form. The sermons were moral essays, such as Addison might have written in the *Spectator*; indeed, at last, under the influence of Sterne's daringly profane genius, they became short humorous lectures on all possible subjects, except Christ and redemption. There was still, however, the outward semblance of reverence for Christianity, which even Hume did not discard. Gibbon was the first to attack religion openly and without any show of respect; but Gibbon was hardly to be called an Englishman any longer, at least with respect to his philosophical standpoint, which had been determined wholly by his residence on the Continent. By the end of the century, however, this rationalism had so far spread that Paine and Priestley could use its language even to the people, because "the faith which had long failed to satisfy the educated classes was now rejected also by the instincts of rude common sense." (Leslie Stephen.) Even the conservative divines, who showed a hostile front both to the orthodox and the freethinkers, preached a morality which amounted to nothing more than sentimentalism or mere prudence. They did, indeed, retain the theological forms of speech; but they used them with such an uncertain sound that the hearer might put any construction upon them that he pleased. They talked about harmony, oneness, the best of worlds, and so on, and found God in nature, but said little or nothing about his personality. God had, indeed, once shown himself to man in a tangible form, but that was long ago, in remote wonder-world; and since then the Most High had ceased to interfere with the order of nature. In short, God the Father had become a sort of "supernatural overseer, whose decrees were carried out in an extra-natural world, but who (for this world) was a constitutional monarch who had signed a social contract and had withdrawn from the active government." The argument, therefore, between Christians of this stamp and the Deists was, if we except the pugilistic Warburton, a very tame one. Indeed, it could not well be otherwise, since the Deists did not wish to stamp out religion, and their opponents were by no means intolerant.

Few things could bear less resemblance to the English Church of to-day than the Church of this period. While in our time the still very numerous Broad-Church party can hardly gain a hearing, between the aristocratic Catholicizing High-Church and the Puritanical democratic Low-Church, at that time it was



almost exclusively dominant, taking the lead on all points; in a word, it was the fashion, for the High and Low-Church of to-day are the outgrowth respectively of the Wesleyan movement of the last century, and of the Tractarian agitation of our own.

The English Church was wonderfully adapted to the English mind and character, as well as to the historical conditions of the country. It had the advantage of being a national Church; it was free from the only dangerous rival, and did not extend its toleration to that which "can never be regarded simply as a religion." (I believe Mr. Lecky is the only living English writer who is able to rise to this unqualified judgment upon Catholicism.) It had, moreover, rejected the dogmas of Catholicism most obnoxious to reason; it was a compromise between two extremes. It had a monarchical and aristocratic constitution; it was closely bound up with society through the marriage of its priests, and yet, as being sure of a following, had not abandoned the historical tradition so dear to Englishmen.

In the middle of the century the indifference had become so great within the Church, that Hume could say: "The nation has settled down into the coolest indifference to religious matters of any nation in the world." This was, indeed, only half true, but the great man who dwelt on the lofty heights of an intellectual culture did not notice the movement which had already begun deep down in the valley among the working classes. The judgment Hume pronounced referred only to the State Church, and so far it was fully justified.

As early as 1740 a reaction of religious sentiment began to make itself felt. The pietism which, fifty years before, had renewed for a century the growth of religious life in Germany, awoke in England also. The Dissenters were still a feeble minority at the beginning of the century—about one in twenty-two to the adherents of the State Church. The Independents, or Congregationalists, who would have been glad to see the State Church broken up into a number of small bodies, independent of the State, and who were strongly Calvinistic in their dogmas, especially in the doctrine of predestination, had, after a great show of resistance, been almost carried away by the religious reaction. The political instincts of the English rebelled against a Church which was to be only an invisible spiritual community of the elect scattered over all the world. The Anabaptists, who were bent on purifying the character of the Church, and who sought to make the initial rite a more rational act, and the Quakers, who believed in the abolition of all outward rites, set themselves against the new movement. They still lived on, and lost but few of their adherents, but they won no new ones. Only the young sect of the Unitarians, so entirely a creation of the last century, grew and flourished; this was, however, of necessity, only a creed for the cultured, and could not become a national religion even in this century of enlightenment. For it required, as an essential feature, the complete emancipation of the



Church from all obligations which could in any way limit the doctrinal liberty of the clergy; and religion, a national religion, cannot exist under such conditions. It was otherwise with Wesleyanism, which did not at first identify itself with Dissent, but, like pietism in Germany, made its aim to renovate the national Church through the feelings and by a spiritual regeneration. It therefore formed lay societies and associations within the Church, and required manifest conversion and the personal reception of revealed truth by every individual; it even introduced Moravian institutions, and Wesley himself was in direct connection with the Moravian body. He wished, however, to remain in communion of the Established Church. Such a compromise could not, of course, be lasting, but he had, so to speak, to be turned out by the shoulders. Long after he and his apostle, Whitefield, had transferred their activity from the Church which had driven them out to other and freer fields, they declared themselves to be true members of the Established Church. First in 1785, and more positively in 1795, the "Evangelical movement," as it was at first called, was consolidated into the Methodist sect, which now numbers in England alone a million of members, (some say 2,400,000,) and in America two millions. Nevertheless, it began from that time to decline, for "although powerful religious movements always emanate from the classes which are inaccessible to philosophical culture, they are, nevertheless, doomed to become unfruitful unless they are capable of assimilating some philosophical element." (Leslie Stephen.) This unfruitfulness must be understood, however, only of Methodism as a sect. Wesleyanism, as a historical fact, was abundantly fruitful. It gave new life to the State Church, roused it to resistance, and discovered to it its own weak points.

Such movements, however, arising out of feeling, always produce in the end a reactionary effect, as had been already shown in the case of German pietism, while, on the other hand, rationalistic movements are, of necessity, always progressive. The Tractarianism, Puseyism, Ritualism, of the present century, which would never have arisen but for the impulse given by Wesleyanism, are thoroughly reactionary in their nature.

Thus has this much calumniated eighteenth century, which produced such fair flowers and noble fruits on the continent, left deep and beneficial traces also in England. It was an era of increased political liberty; of revival in literature; and of remarkable religious development. This should be remembered by the Radicals, advanced thinkers, and High-Churchmen, who are wont to look back with so much contempt on the age of their grandfathers. A century in which England twice, at the commencement and at the close, defended European independence against schemes of universal monarchy, and built up and perfected its own internal constitution; an age which produced, from "Gulliver" to "Hallowe'en," a series of literary masterpieces such as no other nation in the world possesses; an age which exercised



the most complete religious toleration the world has ever seen, without falling a prey to religious marasmus—such a century need not shrink from comparison with any other, even in the glorious annals of English history.—Pp. 11, 12.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for JANUARY contains a very able article, entitled "The Metaphysics of Science," by Prof. Alexander Winchell. Its aim is to show that Science can exist only under assumption of a basis of metaphysical principles, and that that basis is in its nature truly teleological. The contempt so often expressed by scientists in regard to metaphysics is, therefore, suicidal; for the scientist can neither draw an induction nor propound a demonstration without the due metaphysical postulates. Metaphysical truths are to science what the nails are to the planks of a ship, the fasteners which enable the totality of said planks to be a ship. Agib, the son of Cassib, we are veraciously told in the "Arabian Nights," sailed his ship so near to a loadstone mountain that its nails were all pulled out; and what became of Agib the son of Cassib's ship? Just what would become of science if its metaphysical nails were extracted. It would tumble to pieces, and cease to be science. Dr. Winchell's style is sententious, embracing a large proportion of Latin words, rendering his thought difficult of attainment to the popular reader; but the language is very uniformly the exact expression of the thought.

Inquirers are sometimes perplexed as to the doctrine of theism implied in the theory of EVOLUTION, as evolution presents itself both in the animal system by *heredity*, and in the astro-nomic system by the *nebular hypothesis*. Dr. Winchell thus finds theism in both:

All that we know of fundamental plans of structure in the organic world is but a body of facts exemplifying adjustment of parts, not alone to each other, but to an archetypal conception—an intelligential standard. It is frequently suggested that fundamental relationships have resulted from the law of heredity, with progressive divergence. That, probably, is a valid scientific account to give of what have been styled *plans* of organization; and every one is free to rest in the finality of science. But if our minds are so constituted that we irresistibly conclude design from co-ordination, regardless of the instrumentality or means by which the co-ordination becomes expressed in matter; then heredity with divergence is not an ultimate explanation, and every man is at liberty, without reproach, to pass beyond the pale of science, and recognize heredity as a thoughtful determination



fixed for the purpose of introducing order and method into the organic world, as we find them. So the mathematical order of the solar system is explicable in scientific terms, by ascribing it to the cooling of a primitive nebula; but the forces engaged in the evolution of a planetary system must be rationally conceived as merely the instruments which work out symmetrical results co-ordinated to a general concept or plan. If, finally, the deepest law of nature is the law of evolution, we may recognize that as the all-embracing principle under which events emerge into being; but reason can never be divested of the simple conviction that events co-ordinated on so comprehensive a scale, and co-ordinated to so vast a scheme, give expression to *purpose equally vast and comprehensive*. The explanations of science are held to be valid, but they do not go far enough; they are not ultimate explanations. By the inherent principles of our mental being we postulate and posit motive and agency behind the last explanation of science.—P. 81.

The following is his exposition of the nature of FORCE:

As design is the necessary implication of parts co-ordinated to each other, or to a general concept, so metaphysical cause is the only rational explanation of those ultimate physical antecedents which belong to the category of sub-causes or scientific causes. Of metaphysical cause science professes to have no knowledge, holding that invariable antecedence is the scientific conception of causation. But, manifestly, no phenomenon comes into existence *because* another phenomenon precedes. The precedence is the sign of antecedent efficiency. So the law under which a phenomenon arises is modal, not causal, and implies prior ordination, as the subordinated event implies transcendent causation. The *conditio sine qua non* of a phenomenon is not its essential cause, but the condition of the operativeness of a certain law which expresses a method of activity of essential cause. The notion of metaphysical cause is therefore the underlying ground of all the ultimate conceptions of science.

That notion, in spite of the formal restriction of the logic of science, has found constant expression in scientific language under the name of *force*. This, like the assumed atom and molecule of physics, the ethereal medium and the ultimate incompressibility of matter, is a purely metaphysical conception. It is a name which the necessities of thinking have impelled us to adopt for the efficiency transmitted from or through the phenomenon which stands in the place of invariable antecedent. Yet there are questions still deeper which offer themselves as subjects of analytic thought. Is force an entity or an attribute? If an entity, is it self-acting or subordinated? If subordinated, what is the nature of the power which subordinates it? If self-acting, then the discernment and design revealed in the results of its activity are attributes which characterize a demiurge. But, if we say force



is an entity which produces results, what is the means by which it produces them? Are not all results produced by force, and is not our reasoning thus reduced to the proposition that the entity force employs force to produce results? This proposition is unintelligible, and shows that the conception of force as an entity is absurd. Force is an attribute.—Pp. 81, 82.

Dr. Chalmers opined that theism is proved, not so much by the existence of matter, as by its "collocations" into an intellectual system; but Dr. Winchell finds the following proof of *theism in material existence*:

But, if force must be conceived as an attribute, what is the nature of its subject? *What* is it which exerts or manifests force? To say that the attribute force exerts itself is to make it both attribute and subject. Something which is not force, but which is capable of exerting force, is therefore necessarily implied in the conception of force. Is matter the subject? Then, *first*, it is a subject which thinks and purposes; for the results of force are thoughtful and purposive, and matter does thus possess a "power and potency" of psychic results. But, *secondly*, we are not certain that matter possesses a subjective nature. We only know matter phenomenally, and it may easily be that phenomena constitute all there is of matter in itself. Yet phenomena are manifestations of something possessing the power to produce them. The phenomena which we cognize as matter are manifestations of force. If there be no subject matter, there must be some other subject revealing itself in the phenomena which we group under the designation of matter. We are driven, then, to the recognition of an intelligent subject as the ground of the attribute of force manifesting its activities in the being of what we call matter, as well as in the changes which are impressed upon matter.

The inquiry does not end even here; for it remains to ascertain what is the mode of origin of force from its subject. What is the method by which the subject reveals the attribute of force? Is forceful emanation from the subject an unconscious and continuous necessity of its being; or is it a conscious and voluntary activity? If necessary, then some higher power has imposed the necessity; if unconscious, then some higher intelligence directs according to the laws of conscious thought; for co-ordination of products implies at least two things consciously apprehended both in their separateness and in their relation; unconscious intelligence is a negatory expression, for consciousness is the prime moment of intelligence. If forceful manifestations are effected through the method of volition, then the subject which constitutes the ground of all cosonical force is possessed of will as well as intellect and susceptibility to motive, and is consequently a personal entity—an entity thinking, feeling, and willing with reference to that which is not itself.—Pp. 82, 83.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, January, 1880. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. Methodist Episcopacy. 2. Development of Monotheism among the Greeks. 3. Studies in Shakspeare. 4. The Conflict. 5. Bible Revision. 6. The Problem of Life—The Book of Ecclesiastes. 7. Spencer's First Principles. 8. Providential Uses of Pain. 9. Social Life of our Forefathers.

The welcome return of Dr. T. O. Summers to the editorial chair of the Southern Quarterly suggests some old antebellum, we had almost said antediluvian, recollections. The bitter antislavery contest was then at its height, and the presages of war were growing more and more distinct. Now the question of slavery is settled, even if the question of serfdom is not. We cherish the hope of prospective peace, not without recognition of lowering omens in the coming presidential contest.

This Quarterly is externally done up in good taste, has nearly two hundred octavo pages, with articles of a high character, and an extended editorial department, such as Dr. S. can furnish, priced at three dollars, in advance. The only fault which we have to find with it is the oppressive omission of the names of the writers, sustained by unreasonable reasons. The practice of furnishing the names exists in all parts of Europe, excepting England, and with, we believe, every Quarterly and Monthly in America, except the Southern Methodist.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1880. (London.)—1. Richard Baxter; by the Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D. 2. Evolution in Religion; by the Rev. Dunlop Moore, D.D. 3. Testimony of St. Paul to Jesus Christ; by the Rev. J. Oswald Dykes, D.D. 4. The Unity of the Human Race, Considered from an American Stand-point; by the Rev. Prof. John Campbell. 5. Poetry of Edmund Spenser; by M. H. Towry. 6. Righteousness of Life. 7. The Formal and the Vital in the Bible; by the Rev. I. E. Dwinell. 8. The Lord's Supper; by Prof. Peck, D.D.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1880. (London.)—1. The Lords of Ardres. 2. Glimpses of the New Gold and Silver Mines. 3. Modern Greece. 4. Practical Aesthetics. 5. Why is Scotland Radical? 6. The Christian Idea of God. 7. Nonconformist Psalmody. 8. Mr. Gladstone and the Nation.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1880. (New York.)—1. Agricultural Depression. 2. Hamerton's Life of Turner. 3. The Military Position of Russia and England in Central Asia. 4. Ireland; her Present and Future. 5. The Persian Miracle Play. 6. British Light-houses. 7. Russia Before and After the War. 8. Lord Minto in India. 9. Plain Whig Principles.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1880. (New York.)—1. Colonial Aid in War Time. 2. Early Greek Thought. 3. The Grand Dukes of Tuscany. 4. The Organization and Registration of Teachers. 5. Imperium et Libertas. 6. The Relation of Silver to Gold as Coin. 7. Social Philosophy. 8. Russia and Russian Reformers.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1880. (New York.)—1. Lord Bolingbroke. 2. The Progress of Taste. 3. Bishop Wilberforce. 4. The Successors of Alexander and Greek Civilization in the East. 5. Prince Metternich. 6. The Romance of Modern Travel. 7. Mr. Bright and the Duke of Somerset on Monarchy and Democracy. 8. The Credentials of the Opposition.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1880. (London.)—1. Egyptian and Sacred Chronology. 2. Modern Realism. 3. A Victim of the Falk Laws. 4. The Transvaal and its People. 5. Charles Waterton. 6. Our Convict System. 7. St. John's Doctrine of Christian Sonship.


The following notice of a biography of St. Hugh of Avalon, by G. G. Perry, gives us an impressive idea of a model mediæval bishop :

Probably the ordinary conception of a monk is that of a man whose life, even when it happens to be free from vice, is passed away in indolent devotion; and probably few ordinary readers have fairly realized the immense obligations which literature owes to the monastic settlements of the dark ages. Not to mention the familiar fact that the literary treasures of all antiquity, both sacred and profane, have been preserved for us by the monks, it is right to remark that we owe our knowledge of Europe, from the days of Charlemagne to the revival of letters, mainly to the monasteries. Especially in our own country, from the times of Bede to those of the Edwards, we are indebted for almost all our information to a series of literary monks. The great works which were composed in the monasteries, above all at Peterborough and St. Albans, are an almost inexhaustible treasury of historical information. But for such writers as these, the days of William Rufus, Henry, and Stephen, would be almost as perfect a blank as the history of Peru a couple of centuries before the invasion of Pizarro. The great interest which is taken by this generation in historical inquiries has brought many of these works into circulation; and, among others, Professor Stubbs has earned the gratitude of students by the care and industry with which he has edited these relics of English antiquity. Some years ago Mr. Dimock published an edition of the *Metrical Life* and the *Great Life* of St. Hugh of Lincoln. He then began to prepare for publication the works of Geraldus Cambrensis, whom Mr. Green describes as the wittiest of court chaplains, the most troublesome of bishops, and the gayest and most amusing of all the authors of his day. On Mr. Dimock's death the work was delayed for some time, but afterward completed by Mr. Freeman. When the *Great Life* appeared, Mr. Perry, already favorably known by his life of Bishop Grossteste, wisely determined to give this interesting biography to the English reader; the work, however, was delayed in the expectation that Geraldus Cambrensis would supply additional information. As soon, then, as this author was published, Mr. Perry proceeded with his task, and the result is the present biography of St. Hugh of Avalon, the main builder of the Cathedral at Lincoln.



Mr. Perry has given us a picture which enables us to realize, with tolerable accuracy, the religious life of our ancestors in the days of Cœur-de-Lion and Lackland. Probably even in his own Cathedral of Lincoln there is no very absorbing interest taken in St. Hugh himself; but still the study of this book may be pressed upon all those who desire to learn how our religious ancestors actually lived and thought and felt. Protestant readers especially need this kind of literature; for they usually regard the ages before the Reformation as altogether dark and corrupt. We are in danger of forgetting the truth, so often proclaimed by Carlyle, that no system can long endure after it has become altogether corrupt.

After an introductory chapter, in which he relates the previous history of Lincoln Cathedral, Mr. Perry opens the more immediate subject of his book by a capital account of the kings and clergy in the days of St. Hugh. His sketch of the three monarchs, Henry the Second, Richard, and John, agrees with the estimate formed by other modern historians; but his intimate acquaintance with the monastic annalists enables him to paint very vividly the manners and customs of the clergy. The wealth of the Church had already begun to accumulate in the hands of the monks, and consequently the parish priests were often in a state of wretched poverty. The inevitable result was that they eked out their meager incomes by various forms of simony. Thus it was a common practice to say the mass as far as the offertory; when that had been taken up, to begin afresh, and to repeat the process as long as the congregation put any thing into the boxes. Perhaps profanity never reached a higher point than when the Lord's Supper was used in magical rites. The mass was said over waxen images, devoting to death, with solemn imprecations, the persons represented. No wonder the monkish annalist remarks that the rural parish priests were worse than Judas; for he, believing Jesus to be a man, sold him for thirty pieces of silver; but they, believing him to be a God, sell him for a penny. Another feature of clerical life under the Plantagenets was the remarkable ignorance even of those priests who undertook to preach. "A certain priest preaching about Barnabas, said 'he was a good and holy man, but he was a robber,' confounding Barnabas with Barabbas. Another described the Canaanitish woman as partly woman, partly a dog, thinking her name to be derived from *canis*, a dog. The Latin equivalent for a 'broiled fish and a piece of a honey-comb' was transformed by another into 'an ass-fish and beans covered with honey!' The word used in the Vulgate for a 'fire of coals,' (*pruna*,) another explained as meaning plums. A somewhat more serious fault was his who argued from the words, 'Fornicators and adulterers God will judge,' that no other evil-doers were to be judged."—Page 152. Yet more serious charges than those of simony and ignorance were constantly laid against the clergy. William of Newbury mentions more than three hundred homicides with



which the clergy of his own time were popularly credited; while even some of those officials who had been active in the introduction of celibacy admit that it had produced a frightful amount of immorality. "The superior clergy were generally," says Mr. Perry, "free from these stains, but ignorance, meanness, avarice and servility were common among them all. There was a paralysis of discipline in the Church." There is no need to study carefully the lives of the leading bishops in order to judge their spiritual influence. Every reader of English history knows the pomp and vanity, the secular ambition and religious pride, the violence and warlike habits, of many of these servants of Christ. Shakspeare's Cardinal Beaufort expresses the popular conception of a powerful bishop: that there is no man so wicked as a wicked priest. Thus the clergy were base, and apparently the people were miserable. A modern historian gives an extract from the English Chronicle, which reveals the terrible anguish of the English in the days of St. Hugh's happy youth in Burgundy. "They hanged men up by their feet, and smoked them with foul smoke. Some were hanged up by their thumbs, others by the head, and burning things were hung on to their feet. They put knotted strings about their head, and writhed them till they entered the brain. They put men into prisons where adders and snakes and toads were crawling, and so they tormented them. Many thousands they afflicted with hunger." Against this terrible oppression the Church alone had power to come in between the people and the barons; and when, therefore, the clergy were corrupt, we may conclude that it was never merry world in England. Such were some aspects of English society in the days of St. Hugh; and his biographer rightly remarks that there could have been no greater boon conferred on the country than the sincere, bold, and saintly example of the Burgundian monk.

Hugh was born at Avalon, close to the Savoy frontier, probably in 1135. He sprang from a line of noble ancestors, as renowned for piety as for gentle blood; and when, in his eighth or ninth year, his mother died, his father devoted himself to a "religious" life, and took Hugh with him into the monastery. A beautiful feature in the future bishop's character was his affection for birds, and even squirrels, which were tamed by him so perfectly that they would leave the woods, and, at the hour of supper, come to share his frugal meals. Finding the discipline of the monastery not sufficiently stern to satisfy his devotion, Hugh broke an oath of loyalty which he had taken, and fled to the Carthusian Convent, at Grenoble. Here Mr. Perry notices a singular fact which seems to us to prove that the life of man cannot possibly be ordered by regulations imposed by external authority. The Cistercians required that the whole time of the monks should be occupied in devotion and manual labor, while the Franciscan friars were not allowed to possess a book. Now such is the perversity of human nature that the laborious Cistercians became the most luxurious, and the ignorant Franciscans



the most learned of the monastic orders. Here, in the obscurity of Grenoble, St. Hugh spent his early manhood, until he was suddenly translated to England, became the favorite of the sagacious Henry the Second, and ended his days as Bishop of Lincoln.

The immediate cause for Hugh's transfer was the foundation of a new abbey in Somersetshire. The Norman Conquest had given a vast impulse to this particular form of piety, so that the next century witnessed the rise of many of our most stately buildings, and in ten years which followed 1128 nearly twenty large Cistercian monasteries were erected, including such stately foundations as Riveaux and Fountains. In accordance with the prevailing fashion, Henry made a vow to found three abbeys; and after several other priors had failed, Hugh was invited to take the government of the new foundation at Witham, in Somersetshire. In his character of religious patron, Henry seems to have fallen into the error so amusingly put into rhyme by Mr. Canning:

"In matters of commerce, the fault of the Dutch
Is giving too little, and asking too much."

Accordingly Hugh found that almost every thing was needed, and only after much ingenious diplomacy and some bold speaking, prevailed on the king to give full effect to his vow. At this period of his life he laid the foundation of a close intimacy with his sovereign, and it is pleasant to believe that Henry found one churchman who asked nothing for himself. The manner in which the pious monarch sought to defraud the heavenly powers may be judged from the singular history of a Bible. Henry gave ten marks to St. Hugh for the purchase of parchment, on which the monks might copy the word of God; but shortly afterward he determined to enrich his new foundation with a complete illuminated copy of the whole Bible. Accordingly, having heard that there was a fine copy in the monastery at Winchester, he coolly ordered the prior to make him a present of it. The latter, of course, did as he was commanded, hoping, but apparently in vain, for some rich reward in return. The king then sent the splendid manuscript as a royal present to Hugh and his brethren. Much to the credit of the brethren at Witham, it is added that when the pious fraud was discovered, Hugh insisted on returning the costly treasure to its first owners at Winchester.

In 1186 St. Hugh was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln. One of his first acts was to take a firm stand against the iniquitous forest laws. These laws were so oppressive that we can hardly understand how the country contrived to exist under the burden. The old annalist exclaims that "violence was instead of law, rapine a matter of praise, equity a thing to be hated, and innocence the greatest guilt." Hugh ventured to excommunicate the king's own forester, and did not consent to remove the excommu-

nication till the forester had submitted to be flogged. Mr. Perry rightly remarks, a little later in the narrative, that "a still greater proof of true courage, because it shows a moral courage very rare in the men of his generation, was the way in which Hugh behaved when invited to inspect an alleged miracle. A priest once called upon him to inspect a miraculous appearance in the chalice, where it was said that the actual conversion into flesh and blood of part of the host could be seen with the bodily eyes. Hugh indignantly refused to look at it. 'In the name of God,' he said, 'let them keep to themselves the signs of their want of faith.'"—Page 235. In his communication with his own diocese, Hugh appears to have been the very ideal of a Roman Catholic bishop. He performed with due solemnity all the official duties of his post; endeavored to familiarize himself with his flock; was especially successful in winning the affections of the young; and on the wildest nights, after the hardest toils, was ever at the call of the afflicted or bereaved. Mr. Perry says only little of this bishop's work as an architect; but the pious historian of the English cathedrals narrates that "the whole of the front choir, east transept, with its chapels, chapter house, and eastern side of the great transept, were all erected during his life, and such was his earnest zeal in this great work, that, when seized with mortal sickness in London, he occupied himself a considerable time in giving parting instructions to the master of the fabric. In him the bishop, the architect, and the saint were united." Mr. Perry dates the commencement of his work in 1190, or two years later. It is easy to believe that it was carried on with the greatest energy, when we find that the bishop himself worked with his own hands, carrying cut stones in a basket, or sometimes a hod of mortar on his head. It may be added here, that when the main body of the cathedral was completed, in 1280, the body of St. Hugh was translated to the magnificent presbytery at the east end of the choir, and inclosed in a shrine said to have been of solid gold. The historian already quoted appears to marvel that not even the sanctity of the good bishop could protect his remains from the sacrilegious hand of Henry the Eighth's Commissioners. Our wonder would rather be first, how so great a mass of gold was gathered together, and then how it escaped so long! One would fancy that when Cardinal Beaufort was Bishop of Lincoln such a mountain of gold would hardly be likely to escape annexation.

St. Hugh's intercourse with that strange hero of English romance, Richard I., was marked by the same intrepidity and dexterity which he had manifested in the previous reign. Not only did he venture to resist the king's demand for money, but he even openly remonstrated with him for his immorality. "If you serve God," said the bishop, "he will make your enemies peaceably disposed toward you, or he will overthrow them. But beware lest you commit some sin, either against God or your neighbor. It is currently reported of you that you are unfaithful to your



marriage bed, and that you receive bribes for appointments to spiritual offices. If this be true you cannot have peace from the Lord." This is in the true spirit of Nathan; and when we read these bold strong words, we can forgive the good bishop for appropriating a few relics of departed saints. Would that all monarchs had such bold advisers, and that all monarchs would heed their warnings! Equally bold was his treatment of the crafty, if cowardly, John. He preached before this monarch on the duties of the kings; but, much too serious for a man who made as port of all things, sacred and profane, he preached too long. Three times John sent messengers to the pulpit to tell the preacher to conclude; he, however, proceeded with his discourse till all his hearers, except John, who appears to have been as nearly a professed atheist as the times would allow, were deeply affected. Unfortunately, as has happened so frequently in later days, the bishop's eloquence failed to affect the one man whom it was mainly intended to reach.

St. Hugh died in London in the year 1200, in the episcopal residence, which stood on the present site of Lincoln's Inn. Twenty years later he was canonized according to the rites of the Church of Rome, and his shrine soon rivaled the popularity of that of Thomas à Becket, at Canterbury. Such a life, while scarcely conceivable in England to-day, must have been of incalculable benefit to his own generation, and the records of human virtue would have been incomplete without a suitable memorial of St. Hugh. His abiding monument on earth is the grand cathedral of Lincoln; and who can doubt that in the heavenly world he is already surrounded by many whom, according to his light, he allured to virtue? While we have felt it necessary to complain of some features of this work, we yet have to thank Mr. Perry for his instructive and learned volume. A little more care in the composition would have smoothed away a few blots, and made this biography as interesting as it is able. It is with history as with geography. The careful study of an atlas is necessary for all who wish to possess an accurate knowledge of any foreign country; but a far more vivid idea will be gained from a good painting of some characteristic village. In the same way, the historical student must make himself familiar with the long roll of kings, battles, and revolutions; but to make the life of our ancestors real, we need a careful photograph of some typical individual; and such a photograph of the days of the Plantagenets Mr. Perry has presented us in the life of St. Hugh.




German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. Edited by Dr. Brieger. *Essays*: LINDNER, Pope Urban VI. *Critical Reviews*: STÄHELIN, A Review of all New Works Published from 1876 to 1877 on the History of the Swiss Reformation. *Analecta*: 1. BRIEGER, Remarks on Book VIII. of the Church History of Eusebius. 2. HARNACK, The Muratorian Fragment. 3. KOLDE, The Fifth Lateran Council. 4. SCHULTZE, Documents Relating to the History of the German Reformation. 5. MAURENBRECHER, Morone's Report on the Tridentine Council. 6. SCHULTZE, The Newly-Discovered Tomb of a Christian Gladiator.

Among the most valuable features of this periodical are the comprehensive reviews which it occasionally gives of the entire new literature on some particular period of Church history. The article in the present number, by Prof. Stähelin, himself a distinguished historian, on the recent literature relating to the history of the Swiss Reformation, is a worthy sequel of a number of articles to which attention has been called in former numbers of the Methodist Quarterly Review. The value of this article is all the greater because, as its author says, there is hardly any section in the entire province of the literature of Church history which has been so much neglected as the history of the Swiss Reformation. The last special work in German on the Swiss Reformation was published in 1708, (Hottinger, *Helvestische Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols.) the last work in French in 1728, (*Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse*, 1727-1728, 6 vols.) The new editions of both these works give comparatively but few and insignificant additions, and make no use of the ample material which has since been brought to light. The years 1877 and 1878 have largely added to this material, as Prof. Stähelin shows. A brief reference to a few works will give some idea of the strenuous efforts which are made in Switzerland, as well as elsewhere, to obtain from the old archives new light on the age and the history of the Reformation. A Roman Catholic society publishes at Solothurn "Archives for the History of the Swiss Reformation," (*Archiv für die Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte*), the third volume of which appeared in 1876. Though the editors of these archives are, of course, led in their selection of documents by sectarian considerations, some documents of general interest are found in their publications, as the negotiations concerning an alliance between the Catholic Cantons with Austria and Rome.



The archivist of the Canton of Zurich, Strickler, has begun the publication of the official acts of the Federal Diets from 1521 to 1532. The first volume appeared in 1878, and will be followed by three others, which will publish an aggregate of more than eight thousand documents. A work of general interest is a history of the Protestant fugitives from England, France, Spain, Italy, Austria, and Hungary, who found a refuge in Switzerland, (*Geschichte der evangelischen Flüchtlinge in der Schweiz*, 1876,) by Mörikofer. The subject of this work, which has been translated into French by Roux, (1878,) is of general interest for Protestants of all countries, as it is well known how many distinguished men were among those fugitives. Its author, Mörikofer, who died in 1877, is favorably known as the writer of several other excellent works on the same period, as the best biography of Zwingle, (1867-1869, 2 vols.) As might be expected, the literature on Calvin, his life and his teachings, continues to be numerous. Of the excellent work of Hermingard, entitled, *Correspondance des reformateurs dans le pays de langue française*, the fifth volume, containing the years 1538 and 1539, was published in 1878. Most of the documents given in this volume refer to the life of Calvin and his companions during the first year of their exile. They are not all printed in this work for the first time, but the copious notes of the editor shed new light on many points. A considerable amount of entirely new material is found in the complete works of Calvin, published by three professors of the University of Strasburg, Baum, Reuss, and Cunitz, (*Joannis Calvini Opera*), of which four new volumes (the fifteenth to the eighteenth) appeared from 1876 to 1878. They refer to the times from the beginning of 1554 to September, 1561. A new life of Calvin has been published by Hoff, (*Vie de Jean Calvin*, Paris, 1877,) but it is said not to be of great value; on the other hand, the two articles on Calvin which are found in the new edition of the "German Theological Cyclopedia" of Herzog, and in the "French Theological Cyclopedia" of Lichtenberger, are said to be thorough and exhaustive. An essay on Calvin, by Kattenbusch, (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*), is especially recommended for its lucid exposition of the inner development of Calvin's doctrine, and of the relation existing between his theology and the theocracy



founded by him. A little book of considerable interest is the publication of the first French Catechism of Calvin, which he compiled in 1536, a few months after his arrival in Geneva, and the Latin text of which he sent, in 1538, immediately before his expulsion, to friendly Churches as a testimony of the doctrines prevailing in Geneva. As this catechism was subsequently suppressed by Calvin on purpose and replaced by a new compilation, it fell into oblivion, and has only recently become known again. The editors of Calvin's complete works have since published the Latin edition, while the first French edition of 1537 has recently been found in the National Library of Paris, and has been published (in 1878) at Geneva by Rilliet and Dufour. It is regarded as probable that the Latin text was the original, and the French the translation. A special work on the ethics of Calvin (*Die Ethik Calvins*, Strasburg, 1877) has been published by P. Lobstein.

The "Documents Relating to the History of the German Reformation," which are published by Schultze, were taken from the archives of Naldes, which, like the archives of many other Italian cities, contain many letters and dispatches on the early history of the Reformation which had never before appeared in print. The Report of Cardinal Morone on the Tridentine Council, which is published by Prof. Maurenbrecher, of Bonn, has been obtained from the library of Prince Altieri, of Rome. The celebrated German historian, Leopold Ranke, in his work on the Roman Popes, calls Morone's Report the most important document on the Tridentine Council. Ranke had read it, but had failed to take a complete copy.


ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology.) Edited by Hilgenfeld. Second Number. 1880. 1. ISRAEL, On Jerome's Vita S. Hilarionis. 2. GORRES, The Persecution of Christians at the Time of the Emperors Numerianus and Carinus. 3. HOLTZMANN, St. James the Just and his Namesakes. 4. BONNET, Remarks on the Most Ancient Writings on the Ascension of Mary.

In the January number of the Methodist Quarterly Review we called attention to a remarkable new work published by an Old Catholic theologian, Prof. Friedrich, of Munich, on "The Earliest History of the Primacy in the Church." Prof. Friedrich, after the precedence of several Protestant theologians of Germany, especially Dr. Uhlhorn and Dr. Ritschl, attempted to show that the idea of a primacy was indeed not



unknown in the earliest Church, but that this idea was not connected with the Apostle Peter and the bishops of Rome, but with St. James and the bishops of Jerusalem; that the office of a primate was at first hereditary in the family of Jesus, but that subsequently it remained connected with the episcopal see of Jerusalem, until the catastrophe of A. D. 135 gave to Rome a favorable opportunity to vindicate successfully its claim to be the metropolis of Christendom. In the above article on St. James, Prof. Holtzmann, of the University of Strasburg, declares a partial assent to the theories of Prof. Friedrich concerning the See of Jerusalem, while in some respects he rejects the views of the Old Catholic theologian. Prof. Holtzmann refers to a commentary just published by him to the "Pastoral Letters" (*Die Pastoralbriefe kritisch und exegetisch behandelt*, 1880) for a full exposition of his views regarding the early constitution of the Christian Church. The article in the present number of the "Journal for Scientific Theology" treats particularly on the person of James the Just, the head of the Apostolic Church of Jerusalem, and his relation to the apostles of the same name. It is well known that a large number of treatises have been written to elucidate this relationship, which was pronounced by Dr. Neander to be the most difficult question in the apostolic history. Prof. Holtzmann identifies James, "the brother of the Lord," who is mentioned in Gal. i, 19, and James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, who was surnamed the Just by the ancients on account of his eminent virtues. He finds, however, that the description of this James, as it is given by some of the early Christian writers, ill accords with the accounts given of him in the Acts; that while the Bible represents him as being on friendly terms with Paul, the Ebionitic party of the early Christian Church described him as leading a life of ascetic strictness, and as held in the highest veneration by the Jews. In the writings of this party James, the bishop, ranks the apostles, and is called archbishop. All the teachers of Christianity among the pagans are said to derive from him their authority, and there is an apparent tendency to clothe him with the authority of a universal bishop of the Church. Dr. Holtzmann further holds that James, the brother of the Lord and first Bishop of Jerusalem, was not one of the twelve apostles, and

was, therefore, not identical with James, the son of Alphaeus; but that the writers of the ancient Church began at an early period to confound James, the son of Alphaeus, with James, the brother of the Lord. The relationship which, according to him, existed between Jesus and all the relatives mentioned in the New Testament, is illustrated by him in the following genealogical table:



Soker and James, the sons of Judas, were, according to Eusebius, heads of the Churches in Palestine, probably as assistants of the aged Simeon. Simeon, as head of the Church of Jerusalem, was followed by Justus; at that time no more relatives of Jesus were alive. The brothers of the Lord who are mentioned in the New Testament are regarded by Holtzmann as children of Joseph and Mary, not as step-brothers or cousins of Jesus. He regrets that so many Protestant theologians appear to have, like Hengstenberg, submitted to the papal dictation which designated the belief in full brothers of the Lord as a crime for which even recantation cannot atone. As praiseworthy exceptions to this tendency he mentions Schaff, Wieseler, Pressensé, ("History of the First Three Centuries,") Hofman, (in his "*Bible-werk*,") Grau, (*Entwicklungsgeschichte*,) Laurent, and Gustav Plitt.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) *Essays*: 1. HACKENSCHMIDT, The Teaching of the Lutheran Theologian, John Muebauer, concerning the Visibility of the Church. 2. KLEINERT, Practical Theology, (First Article.) *Thoughts and Remarks*: 1. SEIDEMANN, Luther and Bishop John VII. of Meissen. 2. BERTLING, A Transposition in the Gospel of John. *Reviews*: 1. GESS, Christ's Person and Work; reviewed by REIFF. 2. KOFMANN, History of Church Latin, edited by LUDWIG.

Dr. Bertling believes that, by the mistake of a copyist, the passage John vii, 19-24 has been put in a wrong place; that

originally it was part of the fifth chapter of John, following immediately after verse 16, and that it should be restored to its original place. We give his remarks in a somewhat condensed form :

In John v, 1-15, the healing of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda is related. According to verse 16 the Jews persecuted Jesus and sought to slay him because he had done these things on the Sabbath-day. In verse 17 Jesus answers : " My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." According to verse 18 the Jews sought the more to kill him because he said that God was his Father. The answer of Jesus, in verse 17, has no direct reference to the Sabbath. Such a reference may only be thought to be implied in the words, " My Father worketh *hitherto*," which may be understood as meaning that the Father worketh every day, also on the Sabbath-day, and that this justifies the healing of the sick man on the Sabbath-day. At all events the necessary reference to the Sabbath is not expressly made, but must be supplied by conjecture. Now, it is noteworthy that an explicit reference of this kind does find itself in John vii, 19-24, and that in the latter place it seems to break the connection. A transposition of these verses from the seventh chapter of John to the fifth chapter, inserting them between verses 16 and 17, would give us in both chapters the most natural connection. If this transposition is made, Jesus answers the charge that, in healing the sick man, he broke the Sabbath by referring the Jews to the fact that in cases of circumcision they all transgress the law. The Jews, therefore, are admonished, (vii, 24 :) " Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment," and the healing of the sick man, like circumcision, is represented as an act of justification and redemption which is not only allowed on the Sabbath, but necessary. The transposition facilitates the understanding of John v, 17 ; the miraculous healing of a sick man being a remarkable manifestation of the uninterrupted (" hitherto ") working of the Father, and, therefore, a proof that such an act performed on the Sabbath-day is no crime, but divine worship. The transfer of vii, 19-24, will also greatly improve the connection between the remaining parts of this chapter, (verses 1-18, and 25 to the end of chapter.) Chapter vii relates that Jesus went somewhat later to the feast of the Tabernacles

than the others. About the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple and taught. Some of the Jews "marveled at his words," inquiring how "this man knew letters, having never learned." Jesus answered that indeed his teaching was not human wisdom—not any thing contrived by man—but that it came from God, and was a divine testimony for every earnest inquirer. The men who speak of themselves seek their own glory, but if one seeks only the glory of God, then the hearers may be convinced that there is no unrighteousness in him. The transition from this assertion (verse 18) to the law of Moses concerning circumcision (verse 19) appears not to be very obvious. On the other hand, by transposing verses 19 to 24 from chapter vii to chapter v, and connecting vii, 18, directly with vii, 25, the transition becomes entirely natural. It appears both from vii, 15, and from vii, 25-27, that the hearers of Jesus were wavering, and could not make up their minds as to what to think of him. Therefore it also appears entirely natural that the powerful argument for the divine origin of the teaching of Jesus (in verse 18) should be followed (in verse 25) by the marveling inquiry "of some of them of Jerusalem," "Is not this he whom they seek to kill?"

In conclusion, the author frankly admits that there is one serious objection to his argumentation. All the ancient manuscripts and translations agree in giving the verses referred to in the very place where they are found in our present Bible. The simplest way to explain this fact is, in his opinion, to assume that in the earliest times, when there was as yet only one copy of this Gospel, one entire leaf, containing verses 19-24, was misplaced while being copied.

French Reviews.

- REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review.) December, 1879. 1. COUSSIRAT, Henry Ward Beecher. 2. BONET-MAURY, The Friends of God in the Fourteenth Century. 2. ALONE, Too Probable Not To Be True, (A Novel.) 4. PRESSENSE, The Free Synod and the New Projects of Conciliation in the Reformed State Church of France. January, 1880.—1. FEER, The Religion of Aryan India in Vedic Times. 2. ASTIE, The Correspondence of Doudan. 3. IRMA S., A History which Begins with a Marriage. February, 1880.—1. NAVILLE, Religion. 2. ASTIE, The Correspondence of Doudan. 3. The Life to Come, Shall We Recognize Each Other?

The "Christian Review," which began, on January 1, 1880, the twenty-sixth year of its existence, will be conducted

during the coming year according to the former plan. The bi-monthly articles on German and English affairs which have graced the pages of the Review for several years, and which are excellent specimens of "Foreign Religious" and "Foreign Literary Intelligence," will be continued during the coming year. The articles on German affairs are by E. Liechtenberger. The monthly reviews of French affairs will, as in former years, be alternately supplied by Pressensé and Sabatier. Articles are announced as forthcoming in the course of 1880 from Pressensé, Bersier, Naville, Godet, Astié, Father Hyacinthe, (on Paganism in Paris, formerly and at present,) and others.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

MOHAMMEDANISM AND CHRISTIANITY IN TURKEY AND THE NEW BALKAN STATES.—The treaty of Berlin, as was expected, has greatly changed the religious aspect of the Turkish empire and the neighboring States. Roumania, Servia, and Montenegro have been generally recognized as independent States, and thus a considerable portion of the Balkan peninsula again finds itself under Christian rule. Bulgaria remains nominally a dependency of Turkey, but, virtually, it is likewise an independent Christian State. Even East Roumelia is really made a new Christian State, as it has its own Parliament, under a governor who must be a Christian, and whose appointment must be confirmed by the Christian powers. Besides, Bosnia and Herzegovina have been placed under the administration of Austria, and they can never be replaced under the direct rule of Turkey, but must become either a part of the Austrian Empire or States virtually or really independent, like the other new States just referred to. In consequence of these changes the rule of a Mohammedan government over large territories and a population of several million Christians has ceased, and a considerable number of Mohammedans have now become subjects of Christian governments.

The following table, which gives the total population of each of these States, together with the Mohammedan population and the population connected with the Greek Church, will illustrate the magnitude of the changes which have taken place in the religious aspect of these countries:

Countries.	Total population.	Mohammedans.	Population connected with the Greek Church.
Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	1,212,000	442,000	571,000
Roumania.....	5,376,000	120,000	4,700,000
Servia.....	1,577,000	75,000	1,487,000
Montenegro.....	286,000	25,000	284,000
Bulgaria.....	1,860,000	600,000	1,200,000
Eastern Roumelia.....	751,000	350,000	370,000
Turkey, (except Bosnia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, and Eastern Roumelia.)	42,000,000	34,000,000	3,425,000

All the above States, with the exception of part of Montenegro, were, until 1878, subject to the rule of the Sultan. In consequence of the treaty of Berlin the Sultan's authority over a population of nearly 11,000,000 has been wholly, or at least virtually, destroyed. Of this population about 1,600,000 are Mohammedans, who will now be distributed among six different Christian States. They form a minority in each of these States, except in Eastern Roumelia, where they constitute about one half of the total population. The immense majority of these Mohammedans do not belong to the Turkish race, but are descendants of Slavs, who were induced by the prospect of worldly advantages and privileges to embrace Mohammedanism. They still speak the language of the Slavic tribes to which they belong, and the consciousness of a common nationality cannot fail to exert upon them, in the course of time, a strong influence. The national feeling makes itself so strongly felt in all the Slavic countries that it will certainly attract many of the young Mohammedans; and it must, of course, be expected that in proportion as the Mohammedan Slavs begin to feel a more intense interest in the aspirations of their race, their connection with the Islam will be weakened. All the six Christian States of which these Mohammedans are subjects have to make provision for the religious worship of the Mohammedans; and as all of them have a constitutional form of government, it will be a matter of considerable interest to watch the development of the Church government of the Mohammedans in these States.

There is as yet no indication that the decay of the Mohammedan power in Turkey, which has for centuries been on the increase, has received any check. On the contrary, other territorial losses will certainly occur ere long, and a general dissolution becomes more and more probable. Turkey has bound itself by the Berlin Treaty to cede a part of its territory to Greece, and the execution of this part of the treaty has thus far been only delayed by the disagreement of the Greek and Turkish commissioners. In Candia and the smaller islands the Mohammedan element of population is so weak, and the desire of the majority of the population who belong to the Greek nationality for annexation to Greece is so strong, that a reunion with the kingdom of Greece appears to be very probable. In Asia, as the British ambassador, in 1879, told the government of Constantinople, the failure of the Turkish government to carry out the reforms promised in the separate treaty between England and Turkey, has stimulated among the Armenians, and also among the other Christian nationalities of the Asiatic dominions of Turkey, aspirations for an autonomy similar to that of Bulgaria and East Roumelia, in Europe. By the pressure brought upon him by England, the Sultan has finally been forced to intrust to an Englishman the task of reconstructing the administration in the Asiatic provinces. The financial condition of this empire is so wretched, and the inability of most of the Mohammedan statesmen to effect any lasting reforms so palpable, that even the chief representatives of the religious interests of Mohammedanism, the ulemas,

urged, in 1879, upon their government the appointment of able financiers of Christian Europe to assume the control of the Turkish finances.

Turkey is the only country in Europe the population statistics of which are little known. The statements both of the total population and the religious statistics have hitherto greatly varied; only of late greater care has been taken to obtain reliable figures. In view of the probability that the disintegration of Turkey will go on, the following religious statistics of the vilayets or provinces of European Turkey, which are given by M. Jakshitch, the head of the statistical bureau in Belgrade, Servia, will be found of interest:

Vilayets or Provinces.	Christians.	Mohammedans.	Jews.	Total.
1. Constantinople (City).....	121,267	183,540	22,943	327,750
2. Adrianople.....	451,612	273,464	13,492	738,568
3. Salonica.....	419,116	280,974	7,409	807,499
4. Monastir.....	315,521	347,286	2,566	665,373
5. Kossovo.....	288,483	341,543	1,323	631,354
6. Scutari.....	90,255	77,779	168,004
7. Janina.....	533,574	238,812	4,085	766,471
8. Candia.....	234,213	37,840	3,200	275,253
9. Islands, (Thasos, Imbros, } Samothrake, Lemnos) }..	40,490	1,884	42,374
Total of immediate possession...	2,484,501	1,833,127	55,018	4,422,646

The table shows that in none of the vilayets the Mohammedans constitute a large majority, and that in several they even are very largely in the minority. The Christians generally would prefer incorporation with one of the Christian Balkan States, and the weakness of the Mohammedans makes it highly probable that a partition of at least European Turkey between the Christian races of the Balkan peninsula is highly probable. In Asiatic Turkey Mohammedanism is, numerically, much stronger. The Mohammedans constitute the large majority of the population, numbering about twelve and a half millions of a total population of sixteen and a half millions. But here, also, Turkey is threatened with great losses in the future. The difference of race makes itself felt in Asia also. Of the Mohammedans only 6,000,000 are Turks, the remainder belong to other races. The Christians, about 2,800,000, constitute a considerable majority in several districts. They have begun to aspire after political independence, or at least autonomy; and if ever they should secure the acquiescence of both Russia and England the Turks will be entirely unable to resist their demands for independence. Another very remarkable fact in regard to the future of Asiatic Turkey is the very rapid advance of the Greek population all along the coast. Almost the entire commerce of the large cities is in the hands of Greeks, Armenians, and other Christians. The Turks feel their inability to compete with the Christians, and more and more fall back from the coast to the interior. In Africa, Egypt has, of late, grown so rapidly that it now has a territory larger than the entire immediate possessions of the Sultan, with a population about equal to that of Asiatic Turkey. The authority of the Sultan in the African dependencies is not much greater than it is in Bulgaria. It must necessarily come to an end if the power of Turkey is still further reduced in Europe and Asia.

As Mohammedanism continues to decline, the power and influence of the Greek Church, or, as it calls itself, the Orthodox Eastern Church, are looming up. A few years ago this Church had among the independent governments of the earth only two representatives, Russia and Greece, leaving out Montenegro, which was a little principality of only 120,000 inhabitants, and the independence of which was not recognized by Turkey. Now there are four other States in which the Greek Church will predominate—Servia, Roumania, Bulgaria, and Eastern Roumelia. The latter is likely to be, ere long, united with Bulgaria. Every further loss of Turkey will add to the territory, population, and power of these States; and in the history of the Christian Church the Greek Church must, therefore, occupy henceforth a more prominent place than in the past.

This growth will, however, greatly change the inner constitution of the Church. The Patriarch of Constantinople still is, and probably will remain for a long time to come, the most prominent bishop of the entire communion; but the Churches of Russia, Austria, Greece, Servia, Roumania, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and the Churches of the Bulgarian nationality in East Roumelia, have made themselves entirely independent of his jurisdiction. Therefore, although the honorary pre-eminence of the See of Constantinople continues, the direct jurisdiction of the Patriarch has become limited to the Christians of Greek nationality living under Turkish rule. The progressing consolidation of the Bulgarian nationality, and the prospective annexation of large districts of the European part of Turkey to Greece, are likely very soon to reduce this jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople to still narrower limits.

As the Greek Church of Bosnia and Herzegovina is of the same (Servian) nationality as a large portion of that Church in Austria-Hungary, the Austrian government is intent upon establishing the closest union between these two Churches. It is estimated that in Austria-Hungary there is a population of about 3,100,000 which belongs to the Servian nationality. If to this number the Servians of Bosnia and Herzegovina are added, the number of Servians who are under the rule of the Emperor of Austria rises to more than 4,300,000, a number exceeding that of all Servians outside of the Austrian dominions. The establishment of a strong, consolidated Servian Church within the boundaries of Austria appears, therefore, to many of the leading statesmen of Austria as a matter of grave political importance for the future of the Empire. The Churches of Bosnia and Herzegovina were, until the treaty of Berlin, under the Patriarch of Constantinople. Nearly all the bishops appointed by the Patriarch were Greeks, who did not understand the Servian language, and had no sympathy with the national aspirations of the Servians. The latter, therefore, were greatly dissatisfied with their Greek bishops. This feeling was fostered by Austria after it had obtained possession of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The history of the past relations between the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Servian nationality was referred to, to prove that any jurisdiction of Constantinople over Servia was a usurpation. At the time when Servia was a

powerful kingdom it had a Patriarch of its own at Ipek, whose independence was recognized by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Subsequently a large number of Servians, including the Patriarch of Ipek, emigrated to and settled upon Austrian territory; and in the course of time the Austrian Government deemed it good policy to establish within its own borders a Servian patriarchate at Carlovitz, which claims to be the heir and legitimate successor of the patriarchate of Ipek. The proposition to place all the Churches of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Patriarchate of Carlovitz appears, therefore, to be quite natural, and a measure of this kind would have the great political advantage of promoting the permanent political union of these provinces with Austria. At the end of November, 1879, the Patriarch of Carlovitz and the Bishops of Ofen and Neusalz were summoned to Vienna and Pesth to be consulted on this subject by the Governments of Austria proper and Hungary.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Advent of Christ; An Elucidation of the great Prophecy of our Lord, with special Reference to the Question, Whether Christ will make his Appearing before or after his Millennial Kingdom, together with an Answer to the Question, Did the Apostles expect the Advent of Christ in their own Day? By FRANZ L. NAGLER. 24mo., pp. 222. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

We have given above a translation of the title of a small book written in the Germanic dialect of our great Teutonic speech. Mr. Nagler avows that he once believed, but has now renounced, the doctrine of a premillennial advent. And as he indorses largely, but in a perfectly independent spirit and with some acute criticisms, many of the views which we have put forth distinctively from all other commentators, giving us full and frank credit, our hope is that our commentary, when fully completed, will prove a future safeguard for our people against those periodical fits of expecting the immediate advent which have proved so great a detriment to religion.

Full of mischiefs especially have been the interpretations of the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, both by English commentators, as Whitby and Clarke, and German commentators, such as Stier and Lange. Both have violated the fundamental principles of exegesis in misconstruing that chapter, and have made it pregnant with infidelity and heresy. Modern Universalism was born of the allegorizing of that chapter.

The readers of our commentary on Matt. xxiv and xxv are aware that we hold the phrase "these things," in the disciples'

questions and the Lord's answer, as designating the temporal troubles of the downfall of Jerusalem and the Jews, and thereby marking a clear distinction throughout between that downfall and the second advent. Mr. Nagler endeavors, in divers sharp ways, to spoil this our nice fix. He quotes Mark, and he might have quoted Luke, as giving the question, not about the "coming," but about "these things" solely, asking what should be "the sign" of their completion. That is, as we interpret, they furnish the question *only about the troubles*, and not about the advent. Matthew, on the other hand, furnishes the question about "the sign" of the advent alone; yet he really gives "the sign" (xxiv, 15) of the crisis when they shall take their flight from the city's destruction. Our conclusion, then, is, that each evangelist makes an omission. Matthew omits the word "sign" in reference to the destruction, Mark and Luke omit the inquiry as to the advent. "These things," therefore, is still without contradiction, limited to the temporal troubles.

Again, Mr. Nagler quotes Luke xxi, 28, "When *these things* begin to come to pass, lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh," and questions whether the city's destruction furnished any such ground of jubilation. We understand our Lord as bidding them not hang their heads in fear and despondency as Jews bound to destruction, but to lift up their brows at the moment of their deliverance from both the despotism and doom of Jerusalem and Judaism, and their escape to their refuge in Pella.

But Mr. Nagler thinks our limitation of "these things" to the troubles is contradicted by Luke xxi, 36, "Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape *all these things* that shall come to pass and to stand before the Son of Man." A proper paraphrase of Luke xxi, 36, we think, would be: Watch and pray, that you, my disciples, may escape *all these* tribulations through which you will be called to pass without apostasy, and may stand uncondemned before Christ's judgment bar. Compare Matt. xxiv, 13.

To those who doubt whether so relative a phrase as *these things* should have so substantive a meaning as our interpretation assumes, we suggest: 1. This phrase, as applied to predicted events, occurs in the three reports of these discourses no less than seventeen times, and must have been actually spoken eight times. The fact that all three evangelists report the phrase with such unanimity implies their strong impression of its prominence; and the fact of its repeated use by our Lord implies a definite and

substantial import. 2. In all these eight instances at least five clearly designate the troubles of the Jews, and not the second advent. First, in the question of the disciples, as given by Matthew, there is an obvious antithesis between *these things* and *coming*. That this antithesis is real is demonstrated by the repetition of the antithesis in the answer, "*these things* (so Luke) must be, but the end is not yet." Here even Mr. Nagler will admit that *these things* and *end*, the troubles and the advent, are opposites, and exclude each other. Second, (Matt. xxiv, 8,) "*All these* are the beginning of sorrows," where, clearly, the troubles are meant. Third, (Luke xxi, 12,) Before *all these things*; where *these things* refers to the earthquakes and commotions of the previous verse; and so must designate the troubles, and not the advent. Fourth, (Luke xxi, 36,) "Ye may escape all these things, and stand before the Son of man;" where *these things* are first to be escaped before and antithetical to the advent. Fifth, (Matt. xxiii, 36,) "All these things," namely, the temporal punishments for their ancestral sins, "shall come upon this generation." Now these five cases inductively prove that the other three cases must have this meaning, if they will possibly bear it. And then the *sixth*, (Luke xxi, 28,) "When these things shall begin to come to pass," and, seventh, (verse 31,) applying the parable of the fig-tree, "When ye see these things come to pass," must not refer to the advent, because that event was not, like the blossom of the fig-tree, a gradually appearing process, but a sudden and unwarned event, "like a thief in the night." We think, then, we fairly prove that seven of the eight cases refer to the temporal troubles, and, therefore, so must the eighth; namely, Matt. xxiv, 34, "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until *all these things* be fulfilled." This celebrated passage does not declare that the advent should take place in that generation, but that the troubles should. And if this argument is valid, our interpretation of that discourse must stand uninvalidated.

We still decline a solution of the difficulties of this discourse by a false definition of "generation." For, 1. The meaning *race* is without, or nearly without, precedent. Delitzsch is indeed quoted as having found a few instances in the Septuagint; but that, if true, does not justify our rejecting its sense in all other Greek literature and fixing it here. 2. Our admission, quoted by Mr. Nagler, that the word in Luke xii, 8 means "kind, class, species," means only "kind, class, species," viewed contemporaneously, not as in a line of descent through time. 3. Even were the meaning

"race" admissible the parallel passage, (xxiii, 36,) "Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation," decides that a contemporaneous generation is meant. The antithesis is between the sins of previous generations and the concentrated penalty upon "this generation." 4. The meaning "race" gives an inane sense to the words. The meaning, then, is, The Jewish race shall not pass away until the destruction of Jerusalem and the judgment-day are completed! That perverts the passage from telling how soon "these things" shall take place, answering the question "when," to telling us how long the Jewish race shall endure. We may add that, according to Robinson's "New Testament Lexicon," a generation was, Hebraically, understood to include a hundred years, so that the destruction of the city would be included within the period.

We cordially commend the work of Mr. Nagler, especially to the attention of our German brethren, who bring from the dear old "Fatherland" some dreamy Chiliastic theories, which the free, fresh air of our America should blow away.

Faith and Character. By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.

It is long since we opened a volume of sermons so real and wholesome as these. Many pulpit utterances are pervaded by an air of unreality such that the hearers find nothing in them which touches upon their own duties or experience. The terms are conventional and meaningless, or the statements are strained until they become false. In fact, we would not expose a thoughtful child to the utterances of many pulpits whereof we know, for any consideration, because of the artificial and unreal nature of the ministrations. The pulpit in general has not yet got fully clear of the notion that the aim of Christ is to get men into a physical paradise, instead of saving them from sin and sinning. The Universalist pulpit of the last generation was almost entirely possessed with the notion that hell is the only thing to be dreaded. Dr. Vincent has a more Christian conception. Holy character is made the great aim of life; and each sermon deals either with the relations and bearings of character, or with the principle of faith in the unseen as its only permanent basis. The right of God to our lives, and the power of Christ to save and sanctify all who will accept him, are dwelt upon and emphasized in the most earnest and tender manner. The piety of our time needs nothing more than to learn the Christian way

of looking at our earthly life. It is not a prison, not an exile, not an accident, but a divine order in which God gives himself to us for our discipline and development. The daily duty, the dreary routine, the unhonored lot—all these express the divine will concerning us; and by accepting them as such we can exalt and glorify them by our faithfulness and courage and honor. Christ redeems the present life no less than the future, and reconciles us to it. We commend the work in hand as a help to the realization of this thought.

B.

Commentary on the New Testament. Intended for Popular Use. By D. D. WHELOS, LL.D. Vol. V. Titus—Revelation. 12mo., pp. 483. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.

We have some hope that about the time this Quarterly is in the hands of its readers the fifth and last volume of our Commentary on the New Testament will be upon the salesman's counter. In the slender train of our life's history, our readers will excuse us for saying, this completion is an epoch. Gratitude to a gracious Providence that has spared and strengthened us to this end, gladness that it is beyond contingency, solemnity as if at the loss of a dear friend who has vacated his place, are very natural and excusable feelings. The favor with which the work has been received has cheered us in the labor. And we shall be greatly disappointed if our closing volume be not as favorably received as either of its predecessors, and the closing book, the apocalypse, as favorably as any book we have touched in the canon.

Not much later we hope our publishers will be able to furnish forth two more of the volumes of the Old Testament Commentary. The one is by Drs. Burr, Hunter, and Hyde; and the other, on the Psalms, by Dr. Hibbard. We doubt not that both these books will be highly acceptable to the Church. We much regret that, by circumstances beyond our own control, the Old Testament series has been so long delayed. We did expect, at the last General Conference, that the close of the present quadrennium would see the entire work, both Old Testament and New, completed. We can only now say that it is only delayed, not abandoned.

The Doctrine of Man. The Seventh Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By JOHN LAIDLAW, M.A., Minister of Free West Church, Aberdeen. 8vo., pp. 397. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1879.

This work consists of six lectures, delivered in 1878 at the Free Church College of Edinburgh. They discuss the idea of Man as presented in the Bible, with ample erudition, ancient and modern,

with no little insight, and in a fresh and copious style. The development of the subject opens a series of important and interesting topics, discussed in a vigorous spirit, if not always with a satisfactory result. Lecture First analyzes the biblical account of man's creation, in which the two narratives of man's creation, given in Genesis, are critically examined and pronounced to be varying, yet consistent, and supplementing each other. This is compared with the evolutionary theories, the evidences of which, together with those adduced in behalf of pre-Adamic man, are pronounced to be, as yet, insufficient. Lecture Second examines the nature of man as biblically presented, introducing an ample discussion of the trinity of man's constitution. Lecture Third inquires into the import of the divine image in which man was created, with a discussion of the true nature of man unfallen. Lecture Fifth contemplates man as fallen, and Sixth the psychologic nature of the new life, which brings up the nature of regeneration and sanctification. Lecture Sixth surveys man's future destiny, including his immortality and resurrection. There are many points on which we differ with the author in his conclusions. His theology is, of course, Calvinistic. We do not think his views of the threefoldness of man's constitution to be clear or conclusive. His doctrine of man's future affirms a "resurrection" verbally only, and really maintains not a *resurrection* of the body, but a substitution of a new body. Yet his volume is well worth the attention of the theological student.

The Typology of Scripture. Viewed in Connection with the whole Series of the Divine Dispensations. By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D. 8vo., vol. i, pp. 420; vol. ii, pp. 484. New York: N. Tibbals & Sons.

For the biblical student, specially interested in the study of the Old Testament and its relations to the New, these volumes are of priceless value. Dr. Fairbairn was a fresh and penetrative thinker—modern without being revolutionary, and rational without being rationalistic. The types of Scripture in former times had been handled in a most wild and lawless spirit. With a fine mastery of the erudition of the subject, and a clear insight into its principles, he traced the laws by which types are regulated, and drew out the true methods of interpretation with great truth and beauty. The result greatly elucidates the connection between the two great volumes of Revelation. The two divine dispensations are revealed as one great whole, and the two testaments appear as one great organic Book. Let our theological scholars master the contents of this biblical master-piece.

Studies on the Baptismal Question ; Including a Review of Dr. Dale's "Inquiry into the Usage of Baptizo." By REV. DAVID B. FORD. 8vo. Pp. 416. Boston: H. A. Young & Co. New York: Ward & Drummond. 1879.

Mr. Ford's book is a learned and able reply to Dr. Dale's very elaborate discussion of the mode of baptism. Nearly every theological student, in some part of his career, desires to investigate this subject; and when he has finished his research, is very apt to wish a relief from the subject ever after. We have no doubt that, on scripture grounds, the proofs of uniform immersion are an entire failure, and that affusion alone represents that outpouring of the Spirit which baptism is intended to symbolize.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Natural Science and Religion: Two Lectures delivered to the Theological School of Yale College. By ASA GRAY. 12mo, pp. 111. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.


The distinguished Harvard professor, in view of the proofs afforded to his mind in his department of Botany, early accepted the doctrines of Darwin. He so did, notwithstanding his orthodox religious views, holding, as he does, the reality of revelation, and the incarnation, and the truth of the Apostolic and Nicene creeds. The religious inquirer into the genuineness of the new announcements of science very naturally turns to him with full confidence that he does not, like a Huxley or a Haeckel, readily incline to make science the pretext for irreligious skepticism. We have, then, in these lectures not a disproof of genetic derivationism, but a presentation of the method by which a Christian scientist reconciles his views of derivationism with his views of the Bible. How can a Darwinist be a consistent believer in orthodox Christianity?

On the Mosaic account of man's creation the professor gives only the following touch: "Man, in short, is a partaker of the natural as well as of the spiritual. And the evolutionist may say with the apostle, 'Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual.' Man, 'formed of the dust of the ground,' endowed with 'the breath of life,' 'became a living soul.' Is there any warrant for affirming that these processes were instantaneous?" This about coincides with a brief reconciliation of the two views given by us soon after the publication of Mr. Darwin's first book, in which we concluded that if the same assumption in regard to time were

made in our interpretation of Gen. ii, 7, as is usually adopted in the cosmogony of the first chapter, the reconciliation would not be difficult. The cosmogony is an extended development; why not the anthropology?

Toward "the Scriptures" Prof. Gray is reverent and loyal in spirit. But his maxim rather is "the Bible contains the word of God," than "the Bible is the word of God." Of the Mosaic books, he says: "When fundamental principles of the cosmogony in Genesis are found to coincide with established facts and probable inferences, the coincidence has its value; and wherever the particulars are incongruous, the discrepancy does not distress us; I may add, does not concern us. I trust that the veneration rightly due to the Old Testament is not impaired by the ascertaining that the Mosaic is not an original but a compiled cosmogony. Its glory is, that while its materials were the earlier property of the race, they were in this record purged of polytheism and Nature-worship, and impregnated with ideas which we suppose the world will never outgrow. For its fundamental note is, the declaration of one God, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things, visible and invisible—a declaration which, if physical science is unable to establish, it is equally unable to overthrow." And again: "I suppose that the Old Testament carried the earlier revelation and the germs of Christianity, as the apostles carried the treasures of the gospel, in earthen vessels. I trust it is reverent, I am confident it is safe and wise, to consider that revelation in its essence concerns things moral and spiritual; and that the knowledge of God's character and will which has descended from the fountain-head in the earlier ages has come down to us, through annalists and prophets and psalmists, in a mingled stream, more or less tinged or rendered turbid by the earthly channels through which it has worn its way. The stream brings down precious gold, and so may be called a golden stream; but the water—the vehicle of transportation—is not gold. Moreover, the analogy of our inquiry into design in Nature may teach us that we may be unable always accurately to sift out the gold from the earthly sediment."—P. 107.

While Prof. Gray usually talks like a hearty Darwinian, a single page seems to class him with Mivart, whose name, we believe, he never mentions. Thus he says, on page 76: "While I see how variations of a given organ or structure can be led on to great modification, *I cannot conceive how non-existent organs come thus to be*, how wholly new parts are initiated, how any thing can



be led on which is not there to be taken hold of. Nor am I at all helped in this respect by being shown that the new organs are developed little by little."

If we rightly understand Professor Gray, he maintains that at the bottom the distinction between the animal and vegetable kingdoms not only is concealed, but that it has no existence. At base they are not only apparently, but really, one. Now to our philosophy, if not to our science, not claiming any science, it does seem that such a statement cannot possibly be true. The difference, we venture to imagine, between an animal and a vegetable is the difference between *mind* and *no mind*; between a certain *something* and *nothing*. An animal, however low in grade, has at any rate the lowest grade of mind, a minimum of sensation. And that minimum, according to a distinction elsewhere wittily and wisely made by the professor, "though very little, is very important." It is a minimum in a new direction; toward intelligence, wisdom, omniscience. It belongs to the infinite world of mind, and not to the finite world of matter. Where that minimum begins physics may be unable to tell us, but has no right to tell us that it has no beginning at all. As between the vegetable and mineral the great distinction is life or no life, so the distinction between animal and vegetable is sense or no sense. Life may interfuse with inorganic matter, and form an ocean of "bathybius," but, destitute both of mind and organism, it is below the humblest vegetable. And then the so-called "sensitive plant," lying upon your warm palm, may mimic a crawling creature, yet be no more *living* than the snow-flake that melts upon that same palm. The vegetable fly-trap may catch its victim ever so expertly, and we may wonder at the design that formed so funny a *herus nature*; but it no more invades the field of animal life than does the still-spring mouse-trap. It seems to us wonderful that our scientists should so often entrap themselves by making the word *life* embrace the idea of *mind*, fallaciously holding psychology to be but a department of biology, which is nothing more than the vicious tendency first started by Comte to eliminate mind from the world, and leave us nothing but brain and nerve.

Communism and Socialism in their History and Theory. A Sketch by THEODORE D. WOOLSEY. 12mo., pp. 309. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.

Will the time come, some fifty years hence, when the name of Dennis Kearney will be embalmed in eulogistic biography by some future Oliver Johnson? Will the volume that furnishes

those "sketches of the" agrarian "movement in America, and of the man who was its founder and moral leader," sail with colors flying on the smooth tide of popular approbation when, through revolution and bloodshed, an equalization of human conditions shall be attained? Mr. Johnson professedly rings out his denunciations of the ministry and Church in order to furnish a warning for the future, teaching the Church to lead in the van of all reformatory revolutions. Very well. Must we, then, put ourselves under the guidance of Mr. K., just as we did not under Mr. G. ! We think there can be no doubt that Mr. K. is quite the equal of Mr. G. in sincerity, in heroism, in his earnest sense of real wrongs, and, saving some profanity, charged, perhaps truly, by his enemies, as moderate in his spirit and language. That the social wrongs of which Mr. Kearney complains are real and terrible, though there are few that now take the pains or the courage to say or describe, there cannot be a doubt. How much more tyrannical were the plantation lords of 1830 than the railroad kings of 1880? Into how much deeper degradation were the enslaved negroes of that day depressed by the slave-whipping oligarch than are our city slums and all the children of ignorance, penury, and sin, by our money oligarchs? What serf was ever obliged by the whip to walk more strait to his task than the factory or shop-hand by the fear of starvation to his work? And now that the apostle of immediate agrarianization has arisen, he is treated just as the apostle of immediate emancipation was before him. All classes are just as solid against him. Politicians of all parties, editors of all newspapers, merchant princes, and railroad kings, are all unanimously hostile. And as for the Church!—out upon her. She is madly slighting Oliver Johnson's warning to jump under the banner of the next wild-cat reformer that turns up! Her laity are corrupted by the money-power, and her ministers are "dumb dogs that will not bark." O! if the Church were only right, Kearneyism would in a moment be supreme! The Church is the bulwark of plutocracy! The Church is the prop of Mammonism. If every pulpit, every Church, would as one man turn about and adopt *immediate agrarianization*, the money-power would be overthrown, all the laws of property would be reconstructed, every man would be as poor and as rich as every other man, and the Five Points would be equal to the Fifth Avenue. And where is Oliver Johnson himself? Does he take his own warning? Is he lending his vigorous pen to the service of Kearney? Or has he, too, be-

come conservative? We hear not his voice in the new reform, and fear that he is temporizing. We fear that he is saying to himself that the evils of which Mr. Kearney complains are too inextricably interwoven into the present system of society to be removed by an "immediate" shock; that organic evils must be gradually removed by patient effort, by providential development, and by advancing time; that it is a delicate question that is involved, and that, however great the evil existing, the mode of its "immediate" removal is not clear to human ken; that the laws of property and the inequalities of human condition are clearly recognized in the Scriptures; that Mr. Kearney is not a wise leader, his party are not sound men, and that bloodshed and anarchy would result from pressing his principles and measures. Alas! Mr. J., if he thus reasons, is clearly apostatizing. He is an apologist for plutocracy. He is just as bad as Lyman Beecher, Wilbur Fisk, and Leonard Bacon. He ought to proclaim that all plutocracy is sin, and must be "immediately" abandoned. He must allow no "gradual" reforms. He is reasoning just as the earlier opponents of Garrison reasoned, and as men of sound brain and good common sense must ever reason; but that class of men Mr. Johnson holds up to all sorts of contempt in his preposterous biography of his fetish.

Contemplated from the stand-point of a rational humanity, Dr. Woolsey's subject is of momentous importance. Communism has a past history, as here presented, full of wiser warnings than the Garrisonian biographer is able to furnish. Dr. Woolsey analyzes the principles upon which Communism is based, the forces it has at command, and the probability of its triumph. We earnestly commend the book to the earnest study of humanitarian thinkers.

The Emotions. By JAS. M'COSE, D.D., LL.D. N. Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1880.

English philosophic, indeed, we might say all philosophic, literature has been relatively barren of treatises on the emotions or sensibilities. This deficiency arises largely from the nature of the subject itself. The cognitive powers admit of easy discrimination and of tolerably exact statement; but it is a peculiarity of feeling that it cannot be expressed in any formula, but must be realized in an experience. A simply cognitive, or thinking, being would never be able to understand an emotion; for the categories of pure thought afford no medium for its expression. Again, the variety of feelings and of shades of feeling is so great as almost to defy any attempt at classification beyond

the most vague and worthless. And the classifications which are possible are descriptive only, and afford us no insight into the genesis of our feelings, and no new power over them. In the realm of pure thought, on the other hand, there is a certain inner connection of reason, so that we not only see how, but why. The emotions partake of the nature of life. It is in the emotions that the value and beauty and significance of life are found; but, like life, they cannot be understood—they can only be lived.

There is, then, a wide place for Dr. M'Cosh's work. The field is large, and the laborers few. All the more important is it, therefore, that the work be well done. And here we must say, that, thankful as we are for what we have got, the work is disappointing. It is mainly descriptive, and is written throughout in a popular rather than in a philosophical style. It gives a very pleasant account of the various emotions, and the average thinker will ask for nothing more. But the divisions are very general, and even cross each other in a way which scandalizes the critic. The work is, perhaps, to be recommended for the general reader and the practical man, rather than for the philosophical student of the emotions. One point we miss entirely—the significance of feeling for the mental life. The doctor insists that the idea must precede the feeling; but there is a large realm in which feeling fashions the idea. On this account many of the Germans have made the sensibility more fundamental than the intellect, and have made the latter purely instrumental to the former. This is the meaning of their claim, that logic and metaphysics must be founded on æsthetics. And very much can be said for this claim from the side both of psychology and of speculation. These deeper questions we had hoped to find discussed in the present work, but have been disappointed. Perhaps the doctor would demur to this criticism on the ground of a distinction between the feelings and the emotions which he makes in the beginning; but we find no ground offered for the distinction when made, and it is not heard of in the course of the work. Still our criticism is of what is left undone, rather than of what is done. The sin is more of omission than of commission.

Ecclesiastical Law and Rules of Evidence, with Special Reference to the Jurisprudence of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Hon. WILLIAM J. HENRY and WILLIAM L. HARRIS, D.D., LL.D. 8vo., pp. 511. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1879.

Years ago, when he was younger than he is now, and filled but the chair of a western professorship, we pronounced Dr. Har-

ris one of the most judicial minds of the Church. He was the proper churchman to be associated with an eminent jurist to furnish a volume on our Ecclesiastical Law. We hope in our next number to furnish a full review of the work from a professional and amply competent hand.

History, Biography, and Topography.

William Lloyd Garrison and his Times; or, Sketches of the Antislavery Movement in America, and of the Man who was its Founder and Moral Leader. By OLIVER JOHNSON. With an Introduction by JOHN G. WHITTIER. 12mo., pp. 432. Boston: B. B. Russell & Co. New York: Charles Drew. 1880.

Mr. Johnson is a whole-souled devotee. He is both a devout worshiper of his fetish, and a cordial hater of all who bow not the knee at the same shrine. It was the lot of the Editor of this Quarterly to interrupt the full flow of his commemoration of his hero in the "New York Tribune," and so it is said Editor's doom to be victimized in the book in the best Garrisonian style. In our articles in the "Tribune" we fully admitted the great merits of Mr. Garrison's character; but we showed the points which made him a defective leader. We quoted Mr. Johnson's declaration in 1856 that this Editor was a genuine antislavery man, and traced our course, showing that, though a true antislavery man, we ever kept aloof, from beginning to end, from Mr. G. and his peculiarities. We showed that our own Church, although not by any means blameless in the concessions she made to slavery, yet she had an antislavery history of her own of which she was reasonably proud. Mr. Johnson was treated courteously throughout, and in most of his articles was courteous in reply. Yet the Garrisonianism could not but leak out, and when he made the remark that Dr. Whedon's posterity would be ashamed of him he uttered a mendacity that sunk him below the level of decent discussion.

In our article written professedly from memory, away from documents, at the sea-shore, we said that we voted for the antislavery candidate "somewhere about 1834." Mr. Johnson has since examined the files of "Zion's Herald," in Boston, and found that in 1835 this editor charged that the movement would bring politics into the Church, and finds it hard to believe our statement that we voted the antislavery ticket in thirty-four. But we did not say we did so vote at that date. An obituary of Mr. Gillette, the anti-slavery candidate, published some few weeks

since in the papers, puts the date, as our present recollections are, at 1837; which, in a recollective period of between forty and fifty years, is, as we said, somewhere about 1834. There was no inconsistency in our opposing the bringing the slavery discussion into the Church in 1835, and our voting as a citizen in 1837 for either a Whig, a Democratic, or an Antislavery candidate. In either case we doubtless deemed that our political suffrage need not be brought into ecclesiastical discussion. Later in the history, indeed, when slavery itself invaded Church as well as State to render herself supreme, we did our best to rally both State and Church against her.

Mr. Johnson informs us jubilantly that a new edition of Mr. Matlack's history of the antislavery movement will soon appear. We trust it will. It was prepared by Mr. M. with our cordial approbation; and its manuscript lies on our editorial table, and it will be recommended to our house for publication. It is written by as true and as early an antislavery man as Mr. Johnson, but by a man whose sufferings as an antislavery man never drove him into semi-infidelity. It will be found perfectly free from Garrison worship. Mr. Garrison, so far as we have noted, is but twice mentioned; the first time with a disapprobation, and the second as a subject of a brief biographical item. Of the comparative antislaveryism of Methodism among the denominations, Mr. J. will find himself very conclusively contradicted. Mr. Matlack candidly states the views of the anti-abolitionists, very much in the style of impartial history and not of a partisan pamphlet.

Civil Service in Great Britain. A History of Abuses and Reforms, and their Bearing upon American Politics. By DORMAN B. EATON. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880. 8vo., pp. 469.

Mr. Eaton was chairman of the Civil Service Commission under President Grant, and has written this work after more than a year's residence in England, under request from President Hayes. It is a full survey of the history of patronage from the time of the Conqueror, when all England was divided up as spoils among the victors, down to the time when competitive examinations conferred office according to merit, to the destruction of patronage, under the laws of a wise civil service system. As a historical work, it is written with an ability, and possesses an interest in its narrative, entitling it to take rank with the best histories of our day; and its value as a repository of facts upon a great living question gives it especial claims to the public attention.

The great value of the work is that it shows the reform to be a positive reality. It is no schoolman's dream, no theorist's romance. How the work was opposed and was obliged to struggle without precedent to guide its way, how it gradually conquered and became a fixed system, what that system is, how it secures its invaluable results, are all described. Of the nature and method of the reform there can be no doubt. What is wanted, is the diffusion of information through the public mind, and the arousing of the public will to action. For this purpose we want another complete volume. Mr. Eaton, or some other competent man, should give us a history of American political patronage from the foundation of our government to the present hour. The usual statement is that General Jackson began the spoils system, which has ever since spread corruption and debasement through our American politics. It was under him that Secretary Marcy proclaimed the sentiment that "to the victor belongs the spoils," and our elections have ever since been, to a large degree, battles for the seizure and distribution of the plunder—that plunder being the salaries paid from the people's pockets for what ought to be the people's service.

Under General Grant the reform was inaugurated, and when first elected he no doubt intended to emancipate the government from the sway of professional politics. But the "strong man" proved weak in the professional hands; he tamely surrendered, and his sin has been his punishment. For with unimpeachable personal honesty it was his sad penalty to have an administration overwhelmingly disgraced by official corruptions. President Hayes proved stronger than the "strong man." Some tangible reforms have been established under his administration. We wish we could say that they promised to be as permanent as they are tangible. But neither of the prominent candidates named on either side suggest any hope that any trace of the improvements will stand against the rush of the full tide of public corruption.

It is the stupendous mass of spoils at stake in our pending presidential election that creates the great danger. The nation is divided into two great hostile camps, ready to spring to battle for millions of official salaries. This enormous prize carries the strife down from the highest to the lowest, and from the center to the extreme boundaries. It is for this reason that violence, trading, and bribery are unscrupulously practiced, and bloodshed and war, ready to carry carnage into our public streets, are now being threatened. Our republic cannot stand under this system,

grown to such stupendous dimensions. Take away the spoils system, make subordinate offices depend upon tried ability, irrespective of political opinions, and four fifths of the violence of our politics will be diminished.

How can this reform be established? Not by the political profession itself, for that is now created by the spoils system. And here Mr. Eaton's book is eminently instructive. It shows us the way. Let information be diffused through the public mind. Let the moral sentiment of the country speak. Let our religious press open its columns. Nay, as matter of true moral character, it is fit topic for the pulpit. Above all, let the "independent voter" assert, maintain, and exert his unalienable right to "scratch." The caucus and the conclave are terribly afraid of that "scratch." And well they may be, for their corrupt life is very liable to be "scratched" out of existence.

Missions and Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By Rev. J. M. REID, D. D. With Maps and Illustrations. 12mo. Vol. I, pp. 462. Vol. II, pp. 471. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

The Church will receive with a hearty welcome this beautiful narrative of our missionary history. It is written in the fresh idiomatic style of our faithful Missionary Secretary. It begins with the first movement of our missionary life, in 1819, and ends at the hour of writing. In its series of engravings and maps it furnishes an interesting view of the fields where our beloved missionaries are toiling, and aids us to be in spirit with them amid their toils. It refreshes the soul to be able to survey, in brief but full compass, our past missionary work, and the survey cannot but be effective in animating the Church with the missionary spirit. Perhaps it will be a new fact to some sonorous Garrisonian declaimers against the American Churches that the first of the foreign missionary enterprises of our Church was our mission to Africa, to give civilization and Christianity to the negroes. That great philanthropic movement, the American Colonization Society, led the way. Not under its auspices, yet adopting the field opened by the pioneer agents of that noble society, our Church sent to the African shores some of the most heroic missionaries of our history. The names of Samuel J. Mills and of Ashman will ever be memorable in the work of the Colonization Society; and John Seys, if not rightly styled "the father of our Church in Liberia," was a model missionary. But rarely has the missionary martyr spirit shone more purely than in the career

of Melville B. Cox. He started for this field with full impression that he would there be entombed; and asked that his epitaph should be, "Let a thousand fall before Africa be given up!" We hope soon to furnish a full review of this standard book.

The Logic of Christian Evidences. By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT. Andover: Warren T. Draper. 12mo., pp. 312. 1880.

Mr. Wright is one of the editors of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and is so distinguished for his mastery of both science and theology as to render him an able mediator between them both. He is an able advocate for Darwinism, and with a calm boldness has defended that theory in extended articles in that evangelical Quarterly. He has even furnished to its pages an ingenious article showing the accordance of Darwinism with Calvinism; an affinity which we are not inclined just now to controvert. We have no controversy with thinkers who are able to hold the new Evolution in combination with Christianity, but would like to have them tell how the harmonization can be clearly shown. Mr. Wright, so far as we recollect, is clearer in his reconciliation of Darwinism with theism and with Calvinism than with Genesis. The difficulty is less theological than exegetical.

The present little volume deals briefly and acutely with Christian evidences. It is divided into Three Parts. The title of the book fits most precisely to the First Part. Here he examines the logic of science, and shows its accord with the logic of Christian evidence. The Second Part discusses the evidences of theism and of the supernaturalism of Christianity. The Third Part shows the logical conclusiveness of the proofs of historical Christianity. It is a very compact volume, and we should think that even a Thomas Paine would rise from its perusal with the consciousness that it furnishes a hard nut for the skeptical hammer to crack.

Die Deutsch-Amerikanische Kanzel. Eine Auswahl Predigten von den berühmtesten Kanzelrednern der Englischen Sprache, in's Deutsche übersetzt. Von FR. KOPP. Nebst Einer Anzahl in deutscher Sprache gehaltener Vorträge. 8vo., pp. 586. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879.

Our German brother, Dr. Kopp, has here given a selection of sermons in a volume of goodly magnitude, from various authors, translated from the English, with an addition of a number of original specimens. It is dedicated to the venerated Dr. Nast, with a beautiful frontispiece likeness of him. It commences with a preface by Dr. Leibhart, and a preface to the second

edition by the author. We have, then; a historic sketch of German Methodism and its grounds. Sermons are given by Bishop Edward Thomson, Spurgeon, Talmage, J. P. Newman, Joseph Beaumont, Charles H. Fowler, Eddy, Bishop Janes, George Whitefield, Beecher, Bishop Simpson, William M'Kinley, De La Matyr, Punshon, Bishop Foster, Bishop Ames, Moody, and President Foss. This will be an invaluable volume for our German ministry and people, and for all who read the Teuton dialect.

The Illustrated History of Methodism in Great Britain and America, from the Days of the Wesleys to the Present Time. By REV. W. H. DANIELS, A. M. With an Introduction by Bishop HARRIS, D. D., LL. D. Illustrated with 250 Engravings, Maps, and Charts. 8vo., pp. 784. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis: Hitchcock & Walden. 1880.

Wesley and historical Methodism, like Napoleon and the wars of the empire, appear in countless shapes, the most popular of which, and so most widely diffused, perhaps, is this now presented form. While written in the hearty spirit of a true son of the great movement, Mr. Daniels' book is remarkable for its breadth and catholicity. It may be read with satisfaction by all branches of American Methodism, and even English, and wherever the great movement has rolled its waves. We learn with satisfaction that it is having a rapid sale.

Educational.

A Sanskrit Grammar, including both the Classical Language and the older Dialects of Veda and Brahmana. By WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

Scholarship has achieved nothing more remarkable in the last decade than the helps it has perfected for the study of Sanskrit. Few of the present generation of classic scholars, born to the luxury of Passow and Freund—where, for the trouble of examination, one may find all considerable difficulties, even in unusual authors, grappled with for him—accustomed, moreover, to texts emended and smoothed to a degree that probably not seldom simplifies the language originally written—can imagine, unless initiated, the discouragements encountered by the student of the Vedas in 1870. The clue of traditional interpretation which with the ancient glosses preserves for us the meaning of almost every word in the Greek and Roman classics, is largely wanting to the native interpreters of these priceless monuments of the early Aryans. The differences between the Sanskrit of the Rig,

the oldest of the Vedas, and the later or classical Sanskrit, have been well likened to those which separate the speech of Chaucer from modern English. The many words lost to tradition during the period of so great changes the native commentators make but the clumsiest efforts to supply—efforts which seldom amount to more than blind conjecture. The task of restoring these missing links by searching out and identifying their corresponding forms with meanings known, in the other Indo-European languages, had been going on quietly in a few philological “workshops,” chiefly German, for almost a generation; but there was no easy lexicographical access to the results of this patient labor. Each Vedic student was forced, to a greater or less degree, to be his own comparative philologist, and needed a scholarship broad enough to construct for himself lost meanings by identification with words not only in Latin and Greek, but also Gothic, Lithuanic, and Celtic. Of dictionaries then extant Bopp’s “Glossary,” with which every body began to read Sanskrit, was good through the *Hitopadesha* and *Bhagavadgita*. Beyond this there were available only Wilson and Benfey—the mere beginnings of a scientific lexicography.

Of grammatical helps there was as great a dearth. The facts of the language were still too imperfectly known to allow the general assertions of which the complete grammar must consist. The methods of the authors who had ventured upon the task of setting in order the facts that were known of the Sanskrit, were often exceedingly faulty. They were seldom content to make statements of what they and other students had observed of Sanskrit usages in their reading, but suffered themselves to copy, often extensively, from the books of Panini, and other native treatises—marvels of learning and confusion. These would be proper sources from which to draw, were the whole system of Brahmanic learning less abstract, and at all concrete and practical. But the zeal and patience of pundit scholarship is largely devoted to the task of fixing what would be the proper form, if this or that rare, or perhaps impossible, word should ever need to be written, as many as half a dozen rules or exceptions, sometimes wrought with great labor into metrical form, being required, in some instances, for a single root. Of texts, however, there had begun to be available most required by common readers, and excellently edited; the greatest need of all having been supplied by Aufrecht’s edition of the “*Rig Veda*,” in 1863.

But the years of patient labor that had been given by a few

enthusiastic scholars to the study of Sanskrit were nearing their autumn of fruition. When the great "St. Petersburg Lexicon" under the editorship of Boehtlingk and Roth had considerably passed the point where its accumulated *lieferungen* might aid the scholar, the very excellent compendious dictionary of Monier Williams, Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford, appeared in 1872. Grassman's glossary to the "Rig Veda" followed, to which a complete metric translation was soon added. With the final completion, also, of the great "St. Petersburg Dictionary," in 1875, the last important need of professional Sanscritists had been supplied, while the lack of a grammar for beginners, conceived and executed upon like scientific philological principles, seemed as unlikely as ever to draw off from the labor of original research any one capable of preparing the work.

But the enterprise of a German publishing house was destined to be the means of providing the needed treatise. Messrs. Breitkopf & Härtel, of Leipzig, had projected a series of manuals introductory to the study of several of the Indo-European languages, and were fortunate enough to induce Prof. Whitney, during his visit to Germany, in 1875, to prepare the volume devoted to Sanskrit. The work has been more or less in hand since then, and the past year was spent by Prof. Whitney in Germany for the purpose of supervising its issue from the press in both its English and German forms. This volume, somewhat larger than the nature of the series would have led us to expect, (the first volume, "Lautphysiologie," filling only 150 pages, while this, the second of the series, 486,) was out in time for the first semester of German lectures.

The first remark one is prompted to make after examining the volume is, It is *complete*. So much is yet to be determined by further and more minute investigation of Sanskrit usage, that one is surprised to see how much specific treatment Prof. Whitney has been able to include in it. Thus we have the accent definitely treated, and for the first time in such a work, with reference to all cases of its occurrence. It will be, perhaps, remembered that Prof. Whitney was one of the first Orientalists to treat of the Sanskrit accent, and his paper on this subject, presented to the American Oriental Society as long ago as 1855, is still authority among scholars. Syntax is also treated so far as materials admit, and, for the present, properly under each class of words in the etymological part of the book. More than all, we have all forms treated historically, with a fullness which will

prepare the observant learner for later studies in comparative grammar. Prof. Whitney has been fortunate in being able to command the labors of several industrious scholars, who have placed at his service the results of years of labor, particularly upon roots and Vedic and Brahmana forms. This mass of material, together with that of Prof. Whitney's own collating, has made it possible to follow a historic plan, beginning with Vedic and descending through the Brahmana to the later classic forms and usages. The method is rigidly scientific, or inductive, nothing being admitted upon authority, but only as established by the observed facts of the language. The whole has been wrought into excellent shape, and exhibits a rare example of sound, scholarly judgment and good taste. Of course, it puts aside all other manuals for the early study of Sanskrit, and by its unexpected fullness of treatment and embodiment of rare forms will serve also as a work of reference for many years.

In this close and manifold approximation to a perfect grammar Prof. Whitney has achieved, probably, the most useful, certainly the most difficult, labor of his scholarship. We have long been proud of having in him a scholar who is acknowledged by themselves to rival the great philologists of the Old World; and no less are we proud of one so loyal to truth, so impatient of all pretense and sham, and, though so eminent among his countrymen, so modest and unassuming.

The great result is, that the book makes immeasurably easier the task of approaching this most difficult language, and this when some knowledge of it is fast becoming indispensable for the common classic instructor. The time is undoubtedly near when the study of Latin and Greek will be put to its most natural use, and the privilege of knowing them more highly prized, as affording the opportunity of understanding the genesis and history of our modern languages. With "Comparative Philology" thus admitted to the curricula of our colleges and higher academies, Sanskrit must have a place forward among the studies that shall prepare the instructors, as now the teachers in the German gymnasia, for their work. And it cannot be long before it will be necessary, also, for the professor of English literature who makes any pretensions to knowledge in his department, to have studied the elements of that language which most nearly represents the speech of our earliest Japhetic ancestry. What light Sanskrit can throw upon anomalies in English, Mr. Oliphant has well shown in his volume on "Old and Middle English." Indeed,

it is to the historic student of English, especially, we believe, that a knowledge of Sanscrit is of the greatest practical benefit. s.

♦ ♦ ♦

Literature and Fiction.

An English Version of the Younger, or Prose Edda. With an Introduction, Notes, Vocabulary, and Index. By RASMUS B. ANDERSON. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Price \$2 00.

Professor Anderson thus adds to his growing series upon Norse themes an important volume; for the Elder and Younger Edda are the basis of all we know or can know of the early Scandinavian social life and history. There is, indeed, but little material for the study of the second great Aryan immigration apart from what the Icelanders have embalmed in their Eddas and sagas. Of the progress of the Teutons westward we know from Cæsar that they had reached the Rhine half a century before Christ. Tacitus gleans a few characteristics of this strange people from Rome's military contest with them; but, except the invaluable fragment of the translation of the Bible made into Gothic by Bishop Ulfilas in 384, we have no trace or record of the restless barbarians who obliterated the power of Rome and rejuvenated Europe. But far in the North the legend of Beowulf was saved to us in England, though emended by Christian hands, while it remained for the *ultima thule*, the far-off Iceland, to preserve until modern times the speech of the Northern Goths, or Norsemen, almost unaltered, and in it the treasures of legend and mythology on which its history and philology depend. The Eddas are the religious books of the Norse; hence this volume of the Younger Edda is mainly-occupied with their mythology. Our author does not lay claim to original work, but to have collected and adapted material from the best authorities, and to furnish thus the most complete exposition of the Edda yet made in any language. The volume is surely not less than its pretensions. We cannot but regret that the author's enthusiasm has led him to confound the scientific interest of the Eddas with a literary value they cannot be held to possess. We should be surprised if the book "charms" a single reader not in some sense a student of Northern subjects. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. The crude legends and sagas of the Norsemen never please even their direct descendants until recast by a Fryxell or a Tegnér. But the book will edify if it does not charm, and should add much to what we are glad to believe is a growing interest in Northern themes. s.

Periodicals.

Church Extension Annual, including the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the year 1879.
Church Extension Rooms, 1026 Arch-street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Says Chaplain McCabe: "I can secure the erection of a church every day if I only have \$250 to spend in each case." Thereupon the response of the Church should be, "You shall have \$250 every day in the year." The map in this annual is an outline of the entire United States, with a blue cross to indicate a Church aided by this society. Clusters of blue crosses mark particular sections, and a lonely cross or two gleams up in others. There is a nice little wilderness of crosses in the North-west, covering a large area in Iowa, southern Minnesota, and southern Wisconsin, extending southward to cover eastern Nebraska and Kansas. In the South there is a cluster in northern Tennessee, north-western Georgia, in south-eastern Texas, with a sprinkling through most of the Southern States. There are three crosses in Florida, and a lonely cross in Mississippi. Our faithful secretary, Dr. Kynett, reports that there have been four quadrenniums of the existence of the society; the first a period of doubt and danger, the second of completed organization, the third of strengthening and growth, the fourth of maturity, prosperity, and secure permanence. It is becoming, and should become, one of the mighty arms of Church aggression on the domains of sin and Satan.

Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the National Association of Local Preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. Held in the North Second-street Methodist Episcopal Church, Troy, N. Y., October 18-21, 1879. With an Appendix containing Reports, Memoirs, etc.

The date of this annual meeting of the "National Association of Local Preachers" indicates that it has passed the period of immature youth. Its claim to a national name was sustained by membership from as far south as Baltimore and Kentucky. An able address was delivered by the president, Rev. Dr. Wheeler, editor of the "Methodist." Dr. Wheeler well argued that it was wise in the Church to maintain, in her local preachers, a body of organized lay workers, instead of being infested with a lot of irresponsible "evangelists, who are little better than tramps." He recalls to memory the local preachers memorable in our history—as Embury, Webb, Thomas E. Bond—and reminds us of numbers of living, efficient workers. He pleads, loyally, for a fuller recognition of the brave guerrilla corps by the Church mili-

tant. An essay by T. A. Goodwin, on "The Coming Local Preacher," was put on file for the good-coming time when the organized auxiliaries would be a still more efficient aid to the regular army.

Twelfth Annual Report of the Freedmen's Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church for 1879. 8vo. Cincinnati: Western Methodist Book Concern Print. 1880.

It is the school-master who is doing the noblest work in solving the negro problem healthfully for both races. The way to raise the negro is not to force him up to a position, but to furnish him with the qualification by which he can place himself there. We rejoice, therefore, that Dr. Rust is able to report a prosperous year. He presents a full view of the educational institutions that are promising well for the future. The Exodus, so far as it has extended, will have rather favorable effects than otherwise, as tending to produce efforts for a better and fairer adjustment between races. It is yet too small a movement on comparison with the great whole to produce much injury to Dr. Rust's enterprise. The addresses by Dr. Curry and Bishop Peck are able and not accusatory in spirit against any portion of the Southern people. The speakers take no pains to produce the impression that the society is aggressive against the best interests of the Southern section or of Southern Methodism.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Roma Sotterranea, Die Römischen Katakomben. Eine Darstellung der älteren und neueren Forschungen, besonders derjenigen de Rossi's. Bearbeitet von Dr. FRANZ X. KRAUS. Zweite Auflage. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, Freiburg in Breisgau. 1879. 9

The Germans have been behind the English in the special department of research in the catacombs. This work is the most thorough one produced by them, and has been prepared after laborious personal examination, and by the study of such authors as De Rossi, Northcote, and Brownlow. The treatment is broad and thorough. The introduction is after the German usage, which is a *résumé* of the literature of the whole subject. The discovery of the catacombs was made in 1578, and the literature has grown from a few fragmentary notices to a broad and interesting archaeological science. The first students of subterranean Rome were Pomponius, Leto, Baronius, Ciaconi, De Wingham, and L'Hereux, and they died before grasping the mag-

nitude of the subject which fascinated them. The work of Kraus marks the progress of the science through these three intervening centuries. After the introduction, the general divisions are: Book First, "The Origin of the Catacombs." This contains a general description of the catacombs, the political and social condition of the first Roman Christians, Roman law and usages, with reference to burials, and the beginning of the catacombs. Book Second treats the "History of the Catacombs," giving their condition in the first and second centuries; then from the beginning of the third century to the toleration of Constantine, in 312; then to the plundering of Rome by the Goths in 410; and then to the oblivion of the catacombs for a long period of centuries. The Third Book is employed entirely on the most important catacomb, that of St. Callistus. Book Fourth discusses "Ancient Christian Art," its symbols, allegorical images, liturgical tracery, and sarcophagi. The Fifth Book is occupied with the construction and development of the catacombs. Book Sixth is a full description of the inscriptions; Seventh, of the contents of the graves of the catacombs; and Eighth, a general survey of all the Roman subterranean life. The illustrations of the work of Kraus are of a high order, and are the best reproduction of the exceedingly costly work of De Rossi which has appeared. In addition to these, the author, by his living in Rome and having access to all the antiquities, and especially by his intercourse with De Rossi himself, has given many inscriptions and diagrams which had never before been presented to the public. These illustrations are of two kinds; those on wood, distributed with the letter-press throughout the work, and those in colors, on large plates, at the end of the volume. The last of these is a full descriptive map of the whole of subterranean Rome, as large and full as Murray's or Baedeker's map of the city above it. The work closes with a rich glossary, explanatory of all the inscriptions contained in the catacombs, and a copious index of the whole work. We should like to see this book of Kraus translated. It has something of the coloring which would naturally come from the Church of which he is a member, but it is of such scope and scholarship that one can readily overlook the author's confessional standpoint. To the honor of the American Church it must be added that this important study has not been forgotten by us. Withrow's work is a classic, and it is a matter of congratulation that his excellent book on the catacombs has been issued by *our* Book Concern.

Ursprung und erste Entwickelung der Kirche Chirsti, in Vorträgen über die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas. Von Dr. H. V. Andrea. Frankfort-au-Main: Heyder & Zimmer.

Dr. Andrea is a layman, who has devoted his entire leisure to theological study. He is known to Americans through his work on Job, but the present work is the ripest fruit of his busy pen. His plan is to give the argument of each section of the Acts of the Apostles, and then to illustrate and elucidate it. He does not introduce textual criticism, or broaden his pages with copious foot-notes or exegetical terms, but aims at a popular exposition of the book. He seems to have examined the whole department of exegesis on Acts, to have grouped the leading thoughts around a common point, and to aim at a forcible presentation of the general ideas of the writer. The work consists of fifty-eight lectures, each with a general title. We then have a genealogical table of the Asmonean and Idumean families, a complete table of chronology of the apostolical period, and an exceeding beautiful colored map of the missionary tours of Paul. A full index closes the work. The value of Dr. Andrea's important contribution to biblical study consists in its combination of thorough scholarship and perspicuous and popular style. We hope he will yield still more such fruit, on other New Testament books.

Miscellaneous.

The World of Prayer; or Prayer in Relation to Personal Religion. By Dr. D. G. MONRAD. Translated from the Fourth German Edition by the Rev. J. S. BANKS. 12mo., pp. 239. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1879.

The Interpreter's House; or, Sermons to Children. By WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON. 12mo., pp. 349. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1880.

Fifty Bible Reasons for Continuing a Methodist Stated, Proved, and Illustrated. By N. B. COOKSEY. Small 18mo., pp. 128. Cincinnati: Printed at the Western Methodist Book Concern for the Author. 1879.

The Chautauqua Text Books. Paper Covers. Small 18mo.—No. 16. *Roman History.* By J. H. VINCENT, D.D. Pp. 80.—No. 17. *Roger Ascham and John Sturm.* By W. F. PHELPS, A.M. Pp. 53.—No. 18. *Christian Evidences.* By J. H. VINCENT, D.D. Pp. 60.—No. 19. *The Book of Books.* By J. M. FREEMAN, D.D. Pp. 64.—No. 20. *The Chautauqua Hand Book.* By J. H. VINCENT, D.D. Pp. 61.—No. 21. *American History.* By J. L. HURLBUT, A.M. Pp. 76. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1879, 1880.

A History of Our Own Times, from the Ascension of Queen Victoria to the Berlin Congress. By JUSTIN MCCARTHY. In two Volumes. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 559. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

Songs from the Published Writings of Alfred Tennyson, Set to Music by Various Composers. Edited by W. G. CUSINS. With a Portrait and Original Illustrations by Winslow Homer, C. S. Reinhart, A. Fredericks, and Jessie Curtis. 4to. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.

A magnificent exhibition of the poet laureate.

- Philosophy of Methodism.* By REV. WARD W. HUNT, A.M. Watertown, N. Y. 1880.
- Studies in the New Testament.* By CHARLES S. ROBINSON, D.D. 12mo., pp. 316. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.
- Sporting Adventures in the Far West.* By JOHN MORTIMER MURPHY. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 469. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- English Men of Letters.* Edited by JOHN MORLEY. *Nathaniel Hawthorne.* By HENRY JAMES, JUN. Pp. 177.—*Robert Southey.* By EDWARD DOWDEN. 12mo., pp. 197. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- The Holy Bible, According to the Authorized Version, (A. D. 1611,) With an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church.* Edited by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, etc. *New Testament, Vol. II: St. John—The Acts of the Apostles.* 8vo., pp. 534. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1880.
- Christian Union Necessary for Religious Progress and Defense.* Address before the Evangelical Alliance, in Basle, Switzerland. By JOHN F. HURST, D.D. 8vo., pp. 35. Paper Covers. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1880.
- The Three Brothers: Sketches of the Lives of Rev. Aurora Seager, Rev. Micah Seager, Rev. Schuyler Seager, D.D.* By Rev. E. LATIMER. With an Introduction by D. P. KIDDER, D.D. 12mo., pp. 58. Paper Covers. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1880.
- The Expositor.* Feb. 1880. Edited by Rev. SAMUEL COX. Contents: 1. The Value of the Patristic Writings for the Criticism and Exegesis of the Bible, by Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D. 2. Christianity's First Invitation to the World, by Rev. George Matheson, D.D. 3. The Call and Commission of Isaiah, by Rev. P. THOMSON, M.A. 4. Two New Testament Synonyms: *vōc* and *ἄκρον*, by Professor John Massie, M.A. 5. Brief Notices. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* Fall Conferences of 1879. 8vo., paper. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden.
- The Catholic Church in the United States.* Its Rise, Relations with the Republic, Growth, and Future Prospects. By Rev. I. T. HECKER. 8vo., pp. 26. Paper. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1879.
- Studies of the Greek Poets.* By JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS. 16mo. Two Vols. Vol. I, pp. 488; Vol. II, pp. 419. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1880.
- Probably no work in the English language gives a view of the Greek poets with such mastery of the literature, such a critical spirit, and such a beauty of English style, as these two volumes.
- FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY, 4to. paper: *Memoirs of Madame De Kénusat.* 1802-1808. Edited with a Preface and Notes, by her Grandson, PAUL DE REMUSAT. Translated by MRS. CASHEL HOEY and MR. JOHN LILLIE, Part II. *The Munster Circuit: Tales, Trials, and Traditions.* By J. R. O'FLANAGAN.—*Queen of the Moon.* By CHARLES GIBRON.—*Friend and Lover.* By IZA DUFFUS HARDY.—*Mademoiselle De Mezac.* By the Author of "Heaps of Money."—*The Nineteenth Century, a History.* By ROBERT MACKENZIE.—*A Sylvan Queen.* By the Author of "Rachel's Secret," etc.—*Tom Singleton: Dragoon and Dramatist.* By W. W. FOLLETT SYNGE.—*The Return of the Princess.* By JACQUES VINCENT.

Notices of the following books are postponed to the next number:

Haupt's Epistle of John. Scribner's.

Samson on Wines. National Temperance Society and Publication House.

Ferrar's St. Paul. E. P. Dutton.

Walter on Space and Matter. Estes & Lauriat.

400000

