

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1866.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Eloquence a Virtue; or, Outlines of a Systematic Rhetoric.* Translated from the German of Dr. FRANCIS THEREMIN, by WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD. With an Introductory Essay.

Demosthenes und Massillon, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beredsamkeit. Von Dr. FRANZ THEREMIN. Berlin, 1845.

Elements of the Art of Rhetoric. Adapted for use in Colleges and Academies, and for Private Study. By HENRY N. DAY.

THE design in placing the titles of these books at the head of our article is not to prepare the way for an elaborate critique of the volumes which bear them, but rather to call attention to them as containing in substance, and that in its best expression, what of value has been said in systematic form on the general subject of which they treat. They are plain books, and easily accessible, and we therefore cheerfully leave the vindication of this our statement regarding them, the thorough testing of which we bespeak, to a careful examination of the works themselves, by those interested in the increase and elevation of the oratorical power of the pulpit; merely premising that “Demosthenes und Massillon” is the presentation of the abstract principles of “Eloquence a Virtue” in concrete shape, or as

you become acquainted with missionaries in this way, the more you will honour them. The more you know of their work in its actual progress and results, the more you will be interested in it, and the more earnestly you will desire to see it consummated.

ART. VI.—*Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ.* Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866.

Preface Supplementary to Ecce Homo.

MOST of our readers hardly need to be told that, in the domain of religious literature, *Ecce Homo* has been, at least in Britain and America, quite the sensation book of the season, having already gone through its twelfth edition in England. It is rare that any work on Christianity has for the time commanded more general attention or elicited more general comment and criticism, friendly or adverse, in most of the accredited organs of religious opinion. This fact, rather than any novelty in its topics or special power in treating them, has laid a necessity upon us of examining its contents. We confess to some surprise at the sensation the book has made. We attribute it more to the boldness of its pretensions and the brilliancy of its rhetoric, than to any intrinsic power. We detect in the author some culture, some freshness, sparkle, and polish of style; little depth or breadth, as a thinker, an exegete, a scholar, a philosopher, or a theologian. Some of our reasons for this judgment will soon appear. The truths it contains are among the rudiments taught in Christian training and nurture, in the Sabbath-school and the nurseries. Its errors are for the most part too stale or too shallow to invest the book with any special intrinsic importance. The elementary truths concerning the person and work of Christ which it disowns or ignores, and which every Christian child knows, are far more momentous than all that it sets forth without them.

The extraordinary reception given to this book arises, we apprehend, from some extraordinary state of the public mind in Protestant Christendom. Some prevailing excitement or distemper in society will often give books an immense ephemeral popularity, that have no elements of permanent acceptance or influence. Dr. Bellamy once preached a sermon during a thunder-storm which, owing to that circumstance, produced such an impression upon the people, that they requested a copy for publication. He told them he would grant it, "if they would print the thunder and lightning with it." Many a theological or political pamphlet has exercised prodigious influence when addressed to an excited state of the public mind, which had not vitality enough to outlive that excitement. The scientific skepticism of our day, the rationalism in the church which leans towards infidelity, the timid ignorance of many real Christians, have done much towards giving this book its abnormal prominence. Some weak believers have accounted it quite an addition to their armour, offensive and defensive. They have evidently been in a state to be thankful for the smallest favours, not suspecting that they lose more than they gain by every such vindication, not of Christianity, but of something else in its name. Sceptics and destructives look with interest to see, if indeed it does build up or guard what they have been fain to destroy. Meanwhile, intelligent Christians look with amazement and alarm on the wide acceptance and popularity of a work which undertakes to commend the religion of Jesus Christ, by ignoring its most essential or distinctive elements.

There are two aspects in which such an exposition of the Life and Work of Christ may be viewed, one referring to our judgment of the intrinsic merits of the book itself—the other to the proper estimate of the author's position or tendencies. The former may be in itself very defective, erratic, even fatally heretical. The latter, in regard to his internal stand-point and religious tendencies, as manifested by such a production, must be estimated, not by this alone, but by his antecedents taken in connection with it. Two men are moving; one downward, from the heights of truth to the abyss of error, the other upward, from the slough of error to the summit of truth. They

both meet midway between the top and bottom. They are at the same point. But one is moving downward, the other upward—can there be a doubt that he who is struggling upward towards the goal of truth, is vastly nearer to it in his inner soul than he who has met him while gliding away from it? So two men may publish the same book, considerably above average Socinianism or vulgar Rationalism, but equally below the standard, of scriptural doctrine and fundamental Christian truth. But the one is struggling up out of the toils of rationalistic and sceptical fallacies in which he has been trained, or long entangled. The other is falling away from the truth as it is in Jesus, to which he had formerly clung. Can there be a doubt which is the truer and sounder man, closer to Christ, and further from perdition?

Although the author still keeps his own secret, he is reputed to be a man of Socinian antecedents, struggling upward towards a higher conception of Christ and his religion than bald Unitarianism often reaches.* There is much in the whole tone and structure of the book to favour such an hypothesis. It is written as if by a man feeling that he has detected truths once unseen or unrecognized by himself, and now endeavouring to commend them to those in whose sight Christ and his gospel had borne very much the character of myths or impostures, at all events of being destitute of Divine inspiration and authority. He is apparently setting forth the transcendent excellence of Christ's character and teaching, and the proofs of superhuman power thence arising, to those who deny or overlook them. But in

* The following is going the rounds of the newspapers :

“*The Author of ‘Ecce Homo.’*—The *Bookseller* for July 31st has the shrewd conjecture that the author of *Ecce Homo* is Mr. Richard Holt Hutton, one of the editors of the *London Spectator*. ‘We believe,’ the writer says, ‘that we shall not be very far from the mark when we guess that he will probably be found in the editorial chair of a London newspaper, and that he formerly edited a review which we regret to say is now discontinued. In early life the gentleman in question was a Unitarian, closely connected with a celebrated literary family of that denomination; later in life his views became more advanced, while his faith contracted; but more recently he has attached himself to the Church of England, and will be frequently seen attending the ministry of the Rev. F. D. Maurice. If this guess prove correct, many of our readers will have no difficulty in recognizing the writer of *Ecce Homo* by the above description.’—*Presbyterian.*”

his whole procedure he seems to us to effect his purpose more by lowering Christianity to men than by lifting men up to Christianity. And in doing this, with large pretension, he gives us the thin shadow of morality for the glorious gospel of the blessed God; and besides negative errors of omission, falls into gross blunders and crudities of interpretation, by putting the fictions of his own imagination in place of the simple narratives of the evangelists.

We extract from his *Preface Supplementary*, which appears to have been issued in reply to criticisms upon the original book, the following synopsis of his main doctrine regarding Christ, as found in the Gospel by Mark, substantially repeated by Matthew and Luke, and, to some extent, by John—the only books of Scripture which the author treats as of authority, and these only partially so, in the premises.

“1. Christ assumed a position of authority, different from that assumed by ordinary teachers: Mark i. 22.

2. He claimed to be the Messiah: viii. 29, 30; xii. 6; xiv. 62.

3. Under this title he claimed an inexpressible personal rank and dignity: xii. 36, 37; xiii. 6, 7.

4. He claimed the right to revise and give a free interpretation to the Mosaic Law: ii. 27; x. 4.

5. He claimed the power of forgiving sins: ii. 10.

6. He commanded a number of men to attach themselves to his person, ii. 14; x. 21; to the society thus formed he gave special rules of life, x. 43, 44; made his name a bond of union among them, ix. 37—41; and contemplated the continuance of the society under the same conditions after his departure: xiii. 13.

7. He was believed by his followers to work miracles.

8. These miracles were principally miracles of healing.

9. The society he founded was gathered, in the first instance, from the Jews: vii. 27; but it was intended ultimately to embrace the Gentiles also: xiii. 10.

10. Though he assumed the character of King and Messiah, he declined to undertake the ordinary functions of kings: xii. 14.

11. He required from his disciples personal devotion, and

the adoption of his example as their rule of life: viii. 34, 35; x. 45.

12. He spoke of a Holy Spirit as inspiring himself; iii. 20—30; and also as inspiring his followers: xiii. 11.

13. He spoke much of the importance of having good feelings as well as good deeds: vii. 15—23; ix. 50.

14. He demanded positive and, as it were, original acts of virtue passing beyond the routine of obligation: x. 21.

15. He denounced vehemently those whose morality was of an outward, mechanical kind, and he named them hypoerites: vii. 1—13.

16. By these denunciations, and by his claims to Messiahship, he placed himself in deadly opposition to the Scribes and Pharisees: xii.

17. He required from his followers a spirit of devotion to the welfare of their fellow-creatures: ix. 35; xii. 31; and he declared himself to be actuated by the same spirit: x. 45.

18. Accordingly he went much among sick people, healing them, sometimes with strong signs of emotion: vii. 34.

19. He enjoined upon his followers a similar philanthropy: x. 21, 44—5; vi. 13.

20. He occupied himself also with curing moral disease, and particularly in the outcasts of society: ii. 16, 17.

21. He taught the forgiveness of injuries: xi. 25.

Now of these propositions, which have been deduced from St. Mark, it is to be observed, in the first place, that they are equally deducible, with scarcely the alteration of a word, from each of the other three Gospels. The only exception to this is that the author of the Fourth Gospel, who confines himself very much to generalities, does not speak definitely of the forgiveness of injuries or of the duty of relieving men's physical wants. On the other hand, he attests more strongly than the other Evangelists the prominence which was given, in Christ's moral teaching, to love. As forgiveness and philanthropy are among the most obvious manifestations of love, we may certainly say that St. John, too, though not expressly, yet implicitly, attests that they were prescribed by Christ."

Among all these, what the author counts peculiar and dis-

tinctive of Christianity, is the formation of a society by our Saviour to promote morality among men. He says,

“Let us ask ourselves what was the ultimate object of Christ’s scheme. When the Divine Society was established and organized, what did he expect to accomplish? To the question, we may suppose he would have answered, the object of the Divine Society is that God’s will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven. In the language of our own day, its object was the improvement of morality.” *Ecce Homo*, p. 100.

So also in his *Supplementary Preface*: “Resting then upon a basis of absolutely uniform testimony, upon facts merely illustrated and explained by less certain tradition, the writer has endeavoured to describe a moralist speaking with authority and perpetuating his doctrine by means of a society. *It is this union of morals and politics that he finds to be characteristic of Christianity.*”

It is not then that Christ reveals or requires any virtues or duties not previously enjoined by the philosophers, or otherwise known to men, but that he has organized a society to enforce them, which constitutes the differential quality of Christianity. We quote still further from the *Preface Supplementary*, because it is the author’s own interpretation of his book, and sets out his views in the shortest spaces.

“What states are to the moral virtues of justice and honesty, and armies to the virtues of courage and subordination, that the Christian church is intended to be to all virtues alike, but especially to those which are nursed by no other organization, philanthropy, mercy, forgiveness, &c. When, therefore, the writer has spoken of these virtues as having been introduced among mankind by Christ, he does not mean to say that they had never before been declared by philosophers to be virtues. He has expressly guarded himself, and that several times (see particularly p. 142), against this misunderstanding. He has expressly said (p. 182) that the province of Christianity is not the province of the moralist. But the difference between stating the principles of morality and putting men into a condition to practise them,—between introducing new truths to the lecture-room of the philosopher and introducing them to the markets, and councils, and homes of men,—this difference, though it

seems to some of his readers vague or slight, seems to the writer vast and all-important. He knows something of what is in Seneca and Epictetus, and he duly respects the moralities taught there; but he 'yields all blessing to the name of Him that made them current coin.'

"That Christ has improved the ideal morality of philosophers is not what the writer wishes to maintain, though probably it is true. Nor does he assert, what may also be true, that Christ has improved the moral practice of the average of men."

Thus the author makes the distinctive element in Christianity, not the revelation of peculiar truths, or the requirement of peculiar services and duties correspondent therewith, but the formation of a society, called the church, to nourish and develop the virtues already recognized among men, and inculcated by heathen moralists and philosophers. What now, according to our author, are these virtues thus cherished and propagated by this church, and what are the appliances and forces peculiar to it for promoting them? The virtues specially noted and discussed by him are philanthropy, mercy, resentment, forgiveness. The special power for promoting them is found, first, in what the writer styles "the enthusiasm of humanity" inspired by the person, life, influence, and example of Christ, as a new and extraordinary manifestation in the world, and as the Founder and Head of this new organization; and secondly, His enthusiasm invigorated by the social, organic, disciplinary influence of this society and its symbols. This enthusiasm is a "divine inspiration," in the subject of it, which makes him a "law unto himself," and emancipates him from all the fetters of outward literal law, even though that law be divine. "This then it is which is wanted to raise the feeling of humanity into an enthusiasm; when the precept of love has been given, an image must be set before the eyes of those who are called upon to obey it, an ideal or type of man which may be noble and amiable enough to raise the whole race and make the meanest member of it sacred with reflected glory.

"Did not Christ do this? Did the command to love go forth to those who had never seen a human being they could revere? Could his followers turn upon him and say, How can we love a creature so degraded, full of vile wants and contemptible pas-

sions . . . It is precisely what was wanting to raise the love of man as man to enthusiasm. An eternal glory has been shed upon the human race by the love Christ bore to it. And it was because the Edict of Universal Love went forth to men whose hearts were in no eynical mood, but possessed with a spirit of devotion to a man, that words which at any other time, however grandly they might sound, would have been but words, penetrated so deeply, and along with the law of love the power of love was given. Therefore also the first Christians were enabled to dispense with philosophical phrases, and instead of saying that they loved the ideal of man in man, could simply say and feel that they loved Christ in every man.

“We have here the very kernel of the Christian moral scheme. We have distinctly before us the end Christ proposed to himself, and the means he considered adequate to the attainment of it. His object was, instead of drawing up, after the example of previous legislators, a list of actions prescribed, allowed, and prohibited, to give his disciples a universal test by which they might discover what it was right and what it was wrong to do. Now, as the difficulty of discovering what is right arises commonly from the prevalence of self-interest in our minds, and as we commonly behave rightly to any one for whom we feel affection or sympathy, Christ considered that he who could feel sympathy for all would behave rightly to all. But how to give to the meagre and narrow hearts of men such enlargement? How to make them capable of a universal sympathy? Christ believed it possible to bind men to their kind, but on one condition—that they were first bound fast to himself. He stood forth as the representative of men, he identified himself with the cause, and with the interests of all human beings, he was destined, as he began before long obscurely to intimate, to lay down his life for them. Few of us sympathize originally and directly with this devotion; few of us can perceive in human nature itself any merit sufficient to evoke it. But it is not so hard to love and venerate him who felt it. So vast a passion of love, a devotion so comprehensive, elevated, deliberate, and profound, has not elsewhere been in any degree approached save by some of his imitators. And as love provokes love, many have found it possible to conceive for Christ an attach-

ment the closeness of which no words can describe, a veneration so possessing and absorbing the man within them, that they have said, 'I live no more, but Christ lives in me.' Now such a feeling carries with it of necessity the feeling of love for all human beings. It matters no longer what quality men may exhibit; amiable or unamiable, as the brothers of Christ, as belonging to his sacred and consecrated kind, as the objects of his love in life and death, they must be dear to all to whom he is dear. And those who would for a moment know his heart and understand his life must begin by thinking of the whole race of man, and of each member of the race, with awful reverence and hope.

"Love, wheresoever it appears, is in its measure a law-making power. 'Love is *dutiful* in thought and deed.' And as the lover of his country is free from the temptation to treason, so is he who loves Christ secure from the temptation to injure any human being." *Ecce Homo*, pp. 179—80.

This enthusiasm is what is meant by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, both as to his nature, and his indwelling in the souls of Christians whereby they are Christ's.

"It was fully understood by the early church that the enthusiastic or elevated condition of mind was the distinctive and essential mark of a Christian. St. Paul, having asked some converts whether they had received this divine inspiration since their conversion, and receiving for answer that they had not heard there was any such divine inspiration abroad, demanded in amazement what then they had been baptized into." Pp. 160—1.

The Holy Ghost then of *Ecce Homo* is this divine inspiration or "enthusiasm of humanity," which he describes as follows: "Our investigation into the character of the law under which the members of the Christian commonwealth are called to live, has led us to the discovery that in the strict sense of the word no such law exists, it being characteristic of this commonwealth that every member of it is a lawgiver to himself. Every Christian, we learn, has a divine inspiration which dictates to him in all circumstances the right course of action, which inspiration is the passion of humanity raised to a high energy by contemplation of Christ's character, and by the society of those in

whom the same enthusiasm exists. We cease, therefore, henceforth to speak of a Christian law, and endeavour instead to describe in its large outlines the Christian character; that is to say, the new views, feelings, and habits produced in the Christian by his guiding enthusiasm." P. 195.

And still further: "It was the inspiration, the law-making power, that gave Christ and his disciples courage to shake themselves *free from the fetters even of a divine law.*" P. 198.

It is scarcely necessary to say that this annuls all objective laws, all scriptural authority, all divine truths and precepts, beyond the "passion," "enthusiasm," that is to say, the feelings and impulses of each individual soul. These feelings, whether in Christ or his followers, are inspiration, the only inspiration, and the only Holy Ghost or author of inspiration known to this writer. Such a christology speaks for itself, and is beneath criticism. But the author's system, as a whole, is scarcely more erratic and superficial than many of its details, to some of the more remarkable of which we ask attention, as we bring this review to a close. We cannot stop to spread before our readers his evasive uncertainty in regard to the reality and extent of Christ's miracles, and the normal authority of the word, or any portion thereof; or the myths and arbitrary glosses which, with strange audacity, he superinduces upon such plain evangelical narratives as those concerning our Saviour's temptation, the woman taken in adultery, the portraiture of John the Baptist; the prayer of our Lord on the cross for his crucifiers, and, in general, the unbridled license which he uses with the text and exegesis of Scripture. Many of these have been forcibly exhibited in an able but just critique on the volume, in the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1866. We cannot forbear, however, calling attention to some points which reveal more fully the drift of his system.

He claims that Christ amplified and elevated the sphere of morality, by giving it a positive character. The Old Testament was mainly prohibitory. The New Testament deals chiefly in positive commands. His language is, p. 201, "Now in what consisted precisely the addition made by Christ to morality? It has been already shown that Christ raised the feeling of humanity from being a feeble restraining power to be

an inspiring passion. The Christian moral reformation may indeed be summed up in this—humanity changed from a restraint to a motive. We shall be prepared therefore to find that while earlier moralities had dealt chiefly in prohibitions, Christianity deals in positive commands. And precisely this is the case, precisely this difference made the Old Testament seem antiquated to the first Christians. They had passed from a region of passive into a region of active morality. The old legal formula began *'thou shalt not,'* the new begins with *'thou shalt.'* The young man who had kept the whole law—that is, who had refrained from a number of actions—is commanded to do something, to sell his goods and feed the poor. Condemnation passed under the Mosaic law upon him who had sinned, who had done something forbidden—the soul that sinneth shall die;—Christ's condemnation is pronounced upon those who had not done good, I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat."

It would be difficult to stray further from the truth. The Old Testament, in general and in detail, not only charges us to "cease to do evil," but to "learn to do well." The decalogue, even where its form is negative, carries, according to the understanding of all Christendom, and as interpreted throughout the Scriptures, the implication of the contrary positive virtues. And surely, it can scarcely be questioned that the New Testament abounds in prohibitions as well as commands. Christ disowns and consigns to perdition the workers of iniquity. Are not bitterness, wrath, clamour, evil-speaking, fornication, uncleanness, covetousness, lying, all unfruitful works of darkness, abundantly prohibited there under direst threatenings? Why then venture such rash and groundless representations of the teachings of Scripture? Why such wresting them from their obvious import to give plausibility to a chimera of his own imagination?

But what now does our author set forth to be the conditions of membership in the church, and the import of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper?

In regard to the former he says: "Assuredly those who represent Christ as presenting to men an abstruse theology, and saying to them peremptorily, 'Believe, or be damned,' have the coarsest conception of our Saviour in the world. He will

reject, he tells us, those who refuse to clothe the naked or tend the sick, those whose lamps have gone out, those who have buried their talents, not those whose minds are poorly furnished with theological knowledge." Pp. 90, 91. The truth or falsity of all this depends entirely on what the author means by "abstruse theology," "theological knowledge," &c. He not obscurely indicates in the chapter on membership in Christ's kingdom, from which the foregoing is extracted, that such things as the Divinity, Atonement, and Resurrection of our Lord, are so included in them, that belief in them should not be exacted as a condition of admission into Christ's kingdom. But this is more explicitly and unquestionably put in his account of the qualifications for Baptism. Construing our Lord's declarations to Nicodemus in the extreme literal and ritualistic sense as averring that there is "no way into the Theocracy (church) but through baptism," he gives us the following view of the qualifications for this sacrament. "But among the followers of the Legislator there is but one common quality. All, except a very few adventurers who have joined him under a mistake and will soon withdraw, have some degree of what he calls faith. All look up to him, trust in him, are prepared to obey him and to sacrifice something for him. He requires no more. This is a valid title to citizenship in the Theocracy. But in habits and character they differ as much as the individuals in any other crowd. Some are sunk in vice, others lead blameless lives; some have cultivated minds, others are rude peasants; some offer to Jehovah prayers conceived in the style of Hebrew psalmists and prophets, others worship some monstrous idol of the terrified imagination or passionless abstraction of philosophy. It is the object of the society into which this *motley crowd* are now gathered gradually to elevate each member of it, to cure him of vice, to soften his rudeness, to deliver him from the dominion of superstitious fears or intellectual conceits. But this is the point towards which the society tends, not that with which it begins." Pp. 94, 95.

This would seem to teach that, no matter what enormities of belief any may entertain, even in regard to Christ himself, and although they may be as yet unreclaimed idolaters or profligates, they still have a right to membership in this society—

the Christian church. All that is required is a willingness to be enrolled among Christ's followers and to be baptized, even though they bow down to dumb idols, or conceive of him as a Socrates, a Voltaire, a Nimrod, or a Napoleon. A simple answer to all this is our Lord's last and great commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not, shall be damned." The Ethiopian eunuch was admitted to baptism only on condition of believing with all his heart, and he confessed his faith that Jesus was the Son of God. To what purpose then does this author tell us in his *Preface Supplementary*, that "Christ, instead of declaring beneficence to be a virtue, merges all virtue in beneficence. In his account of the judgment of men (Matt. xxv), all that we commonly call morality disappears; not a word is said of honesty, purity, fidelity; active beneficence is made the one and only test: those who have fed the hungry are accepted, those who have not done so are rejected. And the same view of virtue as necessarily and principally an activity is presented in the Parable of the Talents, where all that men possess is represented as capital belonging to the Supreme King, the interest of which He exacts under the heaviest penalties," &c. &c.

Is not this clearly negatived by the general tenor, and the explicit, repeated, manifold averments of our Lord and his apostles? Does he not declare in regard to the unregenerate, the unbelieving, the impenitent, the unconverted, the doers of iniquity, that they cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, or escape perdition? And do not his inspired apostles teach in his name that "neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God"? that all liars shall have their part in the lake of fire? and that nothing shall enter heaven that defileth or maketh a lie?

But let us look at the author's account of the Lord's Supper and its import. "A common meal is the most natural and universal way of expressing, maintaining, and as it were ratifying relations of friendship. The spirit of antiquity regarded the meals of human beings as having the nature of sacred rites

(*sacra mensæ*). If therefore it sounds degrading to compare the Christian Communion to a club-dinner, this is not owing to any essential difference between the two things, but to the fact that the moderns connect less dignified associations with meals than the ancients did, and that most clubs have a far less serious object than the Christian Society. The Christian Communion *is* a club-dinner: but the club is the New Jerusalem; God and Christ are members of it; death makes no vacancy in its lists, but at its banquet-table the perfected spirits of just men, with an innumerable company of angels, sit down beside those who have not yet surrendered their bodies to the grave." *Ecce Homo*, p. 178.

And again: "It is precisely this intense personal devotion, this habitual feeding on the character of Christ, so that the essential nature of the Master seems to pass into and become the essential nature of the servant—loyalty carried to the point of self-annihilation—that is expressed by the words 'eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ.'" P. 190.

This needs no comment. The work, as a whole, is one more of the multiform attempts of sceptical ingenuity to make out a Christ, without any "doctrine of Christ," a Christianity, without any doctrine of Christianity. Of course it is a failure. Even the laudatory article in the *North British Review*, in which the writer shrinks from all rebuke beyond the most tender and dainty criticism, signalizes this great defect, and avers the impossibility of finding any renovating power in Christ disjoined from a true doctrine of Christ. It is not possible for such views of our Saviour as amount to a "false Christ," or to no Christ, to exert any genuine saving or transforming efficacy upon men. No view of Jesus which ignores or repudiates the "truth as it is in Jesus," can avail to renew and sanctify the soul. It is not a being of some unknown order that is our Redeemer, nor some merely superhuman creature; not a man only, nor God only; but a person who is both God and man, the Word made flesh, God blessed over all for ever. This glorious being indeed was the greatest of Teachers and Martyrs. But he was no mere teacher or martyr. To have been all this and no more, would have left him still impotent to kindle any "enthusiasm of humanity," any faith which works

by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. It is as "bearing our sins," and being "made a curse for us" on the cross, that this cross becomes the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, and that his blood cleanseth from all sin. It is by his Holy Spirit, as a Divine Person—not as a mere "enthusiasm of humanity," indwelling and inworking in us that we are made "new creatures in Christ Jesus." The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. As to all this, let history be our witness. Where has Christianity been a power on earth, after the divinity, vicarious sacrifice, resurrection of Christ, and the renewing work of the Holy Ghost have died out from the faith of men? Indeed, when these have gone, what of Christianity is left? The philanthropic virtues still surviving among Socinians are but the inheritance handed down from the ancestral faith they have repudiated; the last reflections and radiations from that Sun of Righteousness which is now left beyond the horizon of their faith.

We see announced as in preparation another work by the author of "Ecce Homo," entitled, "Christ as the Creator of Modern Theology and Religion." We look for little light on this subject from one who is capable of offering the contents of this volume as a fit presentation of Christ—one which he may fairly summon men to behold as a just portraiture of the Incarnate Son of God.

We cannot better give a summation of our views of this production than in the concluding words of the article in the *London Quarterly Review* for April, 1866, above referred to.

"To refute all the errors which abound in 'Ecce Homo,' would be tedious and useless. The author claims to have studied the subject with especial regard to the facts, and he perverts the commonest particulars, which lie on the surface of the Gospels. He writes with an affectation of philosophical depth, and numerous passages in his treatise exhibit either ignorance or defiance of the elementary principles which are familiar to children and peasants. He disguises every-day truths by a pomp of disquisition and a wordiness of style which darken what is simple instead of elucidating what is obscure. His diffuse phraseology is wanting in precision, and his ideas

are often in the last degree vague and sometimes contradictory. His performance is just the reverse of its pretensions, and is inaccurate, superficial, and unsound. Whatever may be his creed—which he has carefully concealed—his want of candour in dealing with his authorities, his presumption, and his rashness, deserve the severest censure. That his book should have obtained the suffrages of any members of the Church of England, is melancholy evidence of their slight acquaintance with their faith and their Bibles. . . . Happily, there is a vast body of educated men who are better informed, and while error is perpetually changing its form and is only born to die, the grand truths of Christianity are passed on with accelerated impulse from generation to generation. They were never more in the ascendant than now; and there is this good, at least, in the assaults of adversaries, that they promote inquiry and help to establish the revelation they were designed to overthrow.”

ART. VII.—*The Hebrew Prophets, translated afresh from the original with regard to the Anglican version, and with illustrations for English readers.* By ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D. D., Vicar of Broad-Chalke, Wilts, formerly Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge. Vol. I.—The Prophets of Israel and Judah during the Assyrian Empire. 8vo. pp. 450. London and Edinburgh. 1866.

THIS book has no particular claim to attention from any novelty in its contents, its methods or results. It is, however, noteworthy as marking a fresh stage in the process which has for some time been going forward, and which bids fair to transfer to our own religious literature, if not to our own shores, the battle which has been waging in Germany from the beginning of the present century.

The English and American churches are accustomed to contests with avowed opposers, with philosophical deists who deny the reality of revealed religion, and frivolous scoffers who mock