

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA
AND
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XXI.

FEBRUARY, 1849.

ARTICLE I.

DEMOSTHENES AND MASSILLON.

Condensed and translated from the work of Dr. Theremin, entitled: "Demosthenes and Massillon.—A Contribution to the History of Eloquence." Berlin, 1845. By J. B. Lyman, M. A.

[LUDWIG Friedrich Franz Theremin was born in 1783 at Gramzow, in the northern part of Prussia, where his father was preacher in the French church. It may be well to state that, of the 800,000 protestants who fled from France at the time of the revocation of the edict of Nantes, some took refuge in the electorate of Brandenburg, where they enjoyed extensive civil privileges. At Prenzlau, a few miles from the native place of the author, most of the inhabitants are said to be their descendants. Hence we conclude, that of these, the congregation to which the elder Theremin preached, was composed; as also that in Berlin, to which Dr. Theremin himself was afterwards called to preach, might in part have been. He studied with his father and at the French gymnasium in Berlin, afterwards at the university in Halle, under the instructions of Dr. Knapp and the philologist and Homeric critic F. A. Wolf. He afterwards spent a year in Geneva, in preparation for the office of the ministry in the French church, and was ordained there in 1808. In 1810 he was called to the Werder church in Berlin, in place of the French preacher von Ancillon, descendant of one of the French protestants, and who had been appointed to the post of instructor of the present king, and was afterwards minister of State. In 1815 he was appointed preacher in the court

church and cathedral, where he accomplished his wish to preach in the German language. In 1824 he was appointed counsellor of the high consistory, and received a situation in the educational department of the ministry of ecclesiastical and medical affairs. And in 1840 he was appointed ordinary professor of theology in Berlin, in the department of Homiletics. He died in 1846.

"Theremin," says the *Conversations-Lexicon der Gegenwart* of 1841, "is one of the most distinguished living preachers, and is so much the greater, the more he possesses this character according to the homiletic principles which he has himself established. For him 'eloquence' is 'a virtue;' an expression which he has adopted as the main title of his work upon the 'fundamental principles of systematic rhetoric,' 2d ed. Berlin, 1837." In this work the author seeks to establish his principle, that 'eloquence is a virtue,' from the consideration of the aim which it pursues; that it has a purpose without itself; that it aims to produce a change in the dispositions or the actions of men, in the various relations of social life. Hence eloquence, as, for example, in an oration of Demosthenes, is interwoven with and cannot be separated from the circumstances of the times.

When an ancient orator arose to address an audience his eloquence was an action, and merited the name none the less and was none the less powerful for making use of speech instead of weapons. But as all activity of man in his relations must be guided by moral principles, the exercise of eloquence, which is no other than such an activity, can be subjected to no other than moral laws. The object of inquiry then is, what are the laws, according to which a free being may influence other free beings? A question which can be answered only from an ethical point of view. Considered in this light eloquence would belong to one of the highest qualities in man. Not that a certain degree of moral perfection suffices for the production of eloquence and renders all else superfluous, which it is accustomed to appropriate to itself from art, learning and science; but that it is reserved for the ethical law to arrange and determine that, which eloquence derives from these various departments. This is precisely what is demanded of a fundamental principle; and it is the ethical law, that determines where, how and in what measure each of the various means necessary to the orator are to be applied. So that eloquence, in all its various forms, is nothing more than the development of the moral impulse; and applied to pulpit oratory, the author remarks in another place, that the inner life of faith is the only source of sacred eloquence.

"As, in this work, the author derives all skill in following the essential laws of rhetoric, and hence all sure results of eloquence, from

the character, morally good, of the orator; so in his own preaching, and in his address, which satisfies, warms, and carries away the hearer, but without awakening *indefinite* emotions, we feel that it is his own participation in such effects, that it is love in the preacher, which constitutes the living fountain of his preaching, a love founded upon the gospel and personal experience of its power. The fresh effusions of his feeling and his zeal, without losing their power, are ruled by a delicate tact, formed after modern and ancient models, and by a circumspection, which, combined with a genuine desire to produce a result in the minds of his hearers, becomes an effort of love. These qualities appear not only in his sermons,¹ but also in various other forms, as in his 'Evening Hours,'² a collection of poems, dialogues and theological treatises; but especially in his treatise, full of heart and spirit, entitled 'Adelbert's Confessions.'³ His work, published in 1823, 'The Doctrine of the Kingdom of God,'⁴ shows what appeared to him the highest idea in his Christian convictions."

In the work before us the author presents two distinguished orators, the one from the ancient, the other from the modern world; the one in political, the other in religious life; but, as the author observes, alike in this, that they both appeared in an age of decline; and both set their faces against the degeneracy of the times.—*Tr.*]

As the father of Demosthenes was an armorer, the son in a sense continued his profession by forging swords of speech. He was born 385 B. C.⁵ Losing his father in his seventh year, his guardians squandering his inheritance, feeble in his bodily structure, absenting himself from the gymnastic exercises of the Athenian youth, stammering in his speech, we may suppose him to have lived, in a great measure, apart from his fellows. A condition not so unfavorable, as it might seem, to the training of an orator; it affords him opportunity to collect the force of his character, which might otherwise be dispersed. And feeling himself separated from society, the desire might be stronger to influence it by the power of his thoughts and words.

¹ His sermons have been published in eight volumes, under various titles, as: *Das Kreuz Christi* (the Cross of Christ), 3 vols. Berlin, 1829; *Zeugnisse von Christo in einer bewegten Zeit* (Testimonies of Christ in an age of agitation). Berlin, 1832.

² *Abendstunden*, 3 vols. Berlin, 1833-39.

³ *Adelbert's Bekenntnisse*. Berlin, 2d ed. 1835.

⁴ *Die Lehre vom Göttlichen Reiche*.

⁵ The accounts are various concerning the year of his birth. We have preferred that which offers the fewest difficulties, in reference to his oratorical development and the events of his after life.

This, in a certain sense, was his position through life; alone, or supported only by a few, to move the masses of the people according to his own views.

In his eighteenth year, and scarcely enrolled among the citizens of Athens, he gave evidence of his courage by instituting a process against his guardians for their breach of trust; a process which continued three or four years, but which the young Athenian gained, yet without obtaining his entire inheritance.

Plato is said to have been his teacher in philosophy, Isaeus instructed him in rhetoric, and Thucydides was his model in style. At first devoted to eloquence in court, he was afterwards attracted to the arena of political life, especially by an oration of Callistratus. He now ventured to appear before an assembly of the people; but with all his carefully turned periods, his antitheses and enthymemes, he failed, was hissed and obliged to leave the stage. He spoke with short breath, a bad pronunciation, and with an absence of all the grace of external eloquence. But this only increased his zeal and redoubled his efforts. We see him speaking with pebbles in his mouth, reciting long periods while ascending a hill, declaiming on the shore of the stormy sea, and, in the quiet and stillness of a subterranean apartment, exercising himself in gesture and attitude. A drawn sword hanging from the ceiling must cure the shrug of his shoulders. Nor was the result less incredible than his efforts. He became as renowned for delivery and gesture as for other and more important qualities as an orator. In undertaking the profession of an orator, he undertook also most zealously to strive for all which belongs to that profession. He certainly therefore considered eloquence as something, which must be acquired, and which one may acquire by a will perseveringly directed to that end. A view quite different from that now prevalent, which regards eloquence as a beautiful native gift, which scarcely needs to be cultivated. Which view is correct, may be seen in the fruits which they bear. In Demosthenes, eloquence appears in its highest living power.

In his thirtieth year he appeared in his oration against the law of Leptines, which must be regarded as a finished masterpiece. According to this law none but the descendants of Harmodius and Aristogiton were to be free from the public burdens; the people were to confer this privilege upon none in the future; and whoever should make a proposition to that effect, should be punished. One year had passed, since the reception of the law; and Demosthenes now appears as counsel for the plaintiffs; one of whom was Ctesippus, son of Chabrias, whose object was to retain the immunity granted to his father.

Although Demosthenes shows, that the advantage of discontinuing the immunities is not so great as might appear, yet this were not a sufficient reason for abrogating the law. A stronger motive is necessary; and that Demosthenes finds in magnanimity and fidelity towards those who, by their actions, have merited well of the State, as Conon and Chabrias; an honor to the orator; as it was also to the Athenians, that they felt the force of the motive, and, according to historical accounts, abrogated the law of Leptines. On account of this predominance of the moral motives, this oration was especially esteemed by the stoic philosopher Panaetius.

The statute of Leptines was also open to attack, when considered in relation to the Attic law; as it did not stand in the best harmony with other laws. With much acuteness the orator makes use of these judicial reasons; and he himself proposes a law, by which abuse in granting immunities may be prevented without violating honor or fidelity. In objecting further to the law, the orator asks whether, while it allows immunities to the descendants of Harmodius and Aristogiton, it shall not be allowed in future to confer the same upon those who should resemble them? We cannot know what circumstances may arise in the future.

We find in this oration no overflowing fulness, no violent ebullitions, no splendid but disproportionate development of individual thoughts; as might perhaps have been expected from the youth of the orator. The style is intermediate, as is suitable upon a subject which demands quiet reflection, rather than the awakening of violent emotions. It has the neatness and elegance of the best writers of the age of Louis XIV. The periods, although simple, are carefully elaborated and rounded; antecedent and conclusion are commonly used to render prominent the contrast between what is done and what ought to be done. All objects and persons, including his opponent, are treated with Attic delicacy and grace; whence Dionysius calls this the most graceful of all orations, *χαριέστατος ἀπάντων λόγων*. We should scarcely have looked for this quality in a man, who, as appears from his history, had adopted many habits, which then appeared eccentric, and had lived less in social intercourse with his fellow men, than his contemporaries. But this example proves that the charm and gracefulness of speech are not so much formed from without, as flowing from the inner source of a moral disposition.

If any fault is to be found with this oration, it is, perhaps, a certain moderateness, combined with its simple elegance; which becomes especially striking when we compare it with the Olynthian and Philippic orations; and especially with that for the Crown, in which the

orator reaches the summit of his magnificent style; and which also, in point of time, is the last that we have from him. So also in the pictures of Raphael, in his earliest period, there is a certain moderateness and coldness. But in his last work, the Transfiguration, his genius unfolds itself in its greatest fulness and power. With the pulpit orator also the power and fulness of thought and richness of feeling, instead of diminishing, will increase with time; but only, it is true, under the condition that he never suffer the deeper fountain, from which they flow, to dry up within. In his political oration "de Symmoriis," occasioned by a report that Artaxerxes Ochus, king of Persia, intended to wage war against Greece, Demosthenes dissuades the excited Athenians from war. This his political position is grounded upon two very sound reasons. If the Athenians commenced the war, they would have to carry it on alone; but if they should wait until the other States were attacked, these would become their most faithful allies: and, secondly, the requisite moneys could be better raised, when actual danger threatened. Nevertheless he advises a new and improved arrangement of the *symmoriae*, and enters very minutely and profoundly into this branch of military administration. These discussions may appear dry to us, but it is an honor to the orator, that he preferred these to an idle splendor.

We here see how Demosthenes despised the glory which he might have reaped from a brilliant declamation, for which a most favorable opportunity was here afforded; how he endeavored solely to gain a right apprehension of the subject, and correctly to judge of its relations; how truth was to him the highest, to which he sacrificed all else. This is found in all his orations. Here lies his greatness and his sterling worth. In this path he has obtained true glory, which can be acquired only by despising false glory. He is a pattern that well merits to be placed before Christian orators. They too, should strive to say, not what is brilliant and gains applause, but what is salutary and useful. They should place their honor in fathoming as deeply as possible the subject which they treat, and then placing it before their hearers as they themselves behold it. They should seek, not the applause of men but their salvation and edification. Thereby they will probably in the end gain honor with men; but if not, they would still have honor with God, the only honor for which the Christian orator should strive.

Before we consider Demosthenes in his struggle against Philip, we must notice an oration relating to a personal affair, that against *Midias*. Demosthenes had been chosen by his class chorus-leader (*χορευτής*) at the festival of Bacchus, that is, he had the duty to clothe

and exercise a chorus for the festival. Midias, a rich and haughty man, had not only placed hindrances in his way, but had struck him in the face, as he appeared with his chorus. Demosthenes here shows the irresistible power of the orator, which hitherto he had not had occasion to exhibit in the same measure.

In this oration, from the personal offence, he constantly rises to the general idea of right and wrong. He represents the crime not only as an offence against the individual, but against the laws in general, as against Bacchus, whose festival was celebrated; and he adduces also many cases of injustice from the life of Midias, thus connecting the idea of virtue with that of right; and thereby showing that Midias had not only violated the laws in a single case, but was, in general, an odious character. The oration was never delivered, but only written; Demosthenes is said to have been induced, by a considerable sum of money from Midias, to keep silent and drop the complaint. But Isidorus of Pelusium maintains, that we must not accuse the magnanimous man of so disgraceful a love of gain.¹

This oration is admirable on account of the unabated emotion which, notwithstanding its length, pervades it from beginning to end; which expresses itself in every sentence, we might say, in every word; a cold and weak passage is not to be found in it. The thoughts are not drawn from without, but from the subject itself, which is fathomed in all its depths.

We have now to regard Demosthenes awake to the dangers that were threatening Greece from the north, from the Macedonian king; and we see him struggling not only against Philip, but against the supineness, the carelessness and the levity of the Athenians, long degenerated from their ancient greatness. But, though zealous against their faults, he ever shows them his confidence, that they will rise to a better disposition, and resolve upon glorious action. His example teaches us, that the confidence which we show to men, is one of the most efficient means of inspiring them for that which is great and noble. The Athenians not only bore the censure of Demosthenes, but, in many respects, at least, fulfilled his expectations. It had indeed been decreed by Providence, which, through Christianity, prepared a reconstruction of society, that Athens should sink from its height; the bloom of heathen States could only be of transient duration. But Athens has to thank Demosthenes that she fell with honor; and that the period which preceded her loss of independence, belonged to the brightest in her history.

¹ Οὐ γὰρ δέχεται τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἀσχοκερδείας μεγαλοψυχία τοῦ ῥήτορος.

The consideration of the orations of Demosthenes, in his struggle with Philip, is peculiarly adapted to confirm the view, that eloquence is action, and, in order to be effective, must be subject to the same laws as action, namely to moral laws. The orations of Demosthenes in this period are his acts, and the orator must not be separated from the statesman. What gives their power to his orations, is, to be sure, in part, the political wisdom unfolded in them; but even this, as it was gained through the incitement of his love of country, is to be regarded as a moral quality. The irresistible effect, however, of his orations is to be ascribed to the grandeur of sentiment, which reigns in them, and to the security and confidence, which can spring only from the conscientiousness of thoroughly upright intentions. Had these qualities been wanting to Demosthenes, all the strenuous efforts of his youth would not have made him a great orator.

In his thirty-third year he delivered the first oration against Philip, which has come down to us, in which he urges the Athenians to form some definite plan against the king, with whom at that time they were in a state neither of peace or war. He was in league with Thessaly against the Phocians, and the Athenians, perceiving the danger that threatened them if he should enter Greece, had sent a fleet to prevent him from passing Thermopylae. Demosthenes demands that the Athenians should send out a fleet to watch the coasts in the possession of Philip, and hinder him in any hostile undertakings. This subject occupies the middle of the oration, which he begins and closes with the most powerful motives, drawn from the ideas of honor and public welfare. He reproaches the Athenians for their supineness, but, in referring to their former history, he would show them also, that nothing need be formidable to them.

It is not probable that this oration led to any definite determination on the part of the people. External, visible effects are not to be looked for from every address which the orator may pronounce. Sufficient, if his whole life leaves a trace behind it. But Demosthenes had, at least, opened the contest, and shown that he had all the requisite qualities in himself for carrying it on with honor: a deep penetration into all the relations of Athens and Greece; courage to say disagreeable truth to his fellow citizens; capacity to treat a subject with power, and at the same time, with the moderation of a man of moral elevation and Attic culture; glowing hatred to the ambition of Philip; and an equal hostility to the degeneracy of his fellow citizens. Thus through this oration, as through worthy Propylaea, we are led to the remaining immortal monuments of his political career.

Some years after this Demosthenes felt himself urged to take a still more decided position against Philip. The king in his plans of conquest, waged war against the city of Olynthus, and the people sent to Athens for assistance. Demosthenes seized this opportunity to summon the people to opposition against Philip. On this subject we have the three Olynthian orations; in which the orator, with far more precision than in the first Philippic, fixes his eye upon his purpose, and with far greater power urges the execution of his proposals. In comparing the three we find in them a remarkable progress, since the orator, from the ideas of outward welfare, penetrates ever more deeply the ideas of integrity and civil virtue. In the first oration he tells them what must be done. In the second everything is transferred to the province of morality; everywhere we meet the thought that Philip is a worthless man; that he owes his power to his faithlessness and his wicked deeds; that the fortune of such a man cannot be of long duration; that ruin must soon overtake him and all his power. "For it is impossible, yes it is impossible, men of Athens," exclaims the orator, "that an unjust, a perjured, and false man should possess a lasting power. Such a power may stand for once and for a short time; it blooms in hope when fortune smiles, but time is lying in wait for it, and it falls to pieces of itself. For, as in a house, a ship and other like things, the lowest must be the strongest, so in actions, the beginning and the foundation must be true and just. But this we do not find in that which Philip has done." Demosthenes paints the worthless life of Philip in the midst of immoral jugglers and buffoons, and then adds: "These things, men of Athens, however unimportant they may seem to many, are to the wise evident signs of his manner of thinking, and of the evil genius which rules him." This view of things which comes here suddenly to light, will astonish every one who reads with attention. It was necessary, to be sure, to hold up some encouragement in opposition to the orators, who disquieted the Athenians by their exaggerations of the power of Philip; but that Demosthenes, instead of untying should cut the knot, by maintaining that the power of the unjust cannot subsist, is worthy of our admiration. Even now every one may not be ripe for such a thought. At the time when Napoleon's power was in its bloom, one might not have found everywhere ready hearers for a doctrine like this; and could an orator among a heathen people, rise to such a moral view of the world?

These observations are made, not so much in praise of the Athenians, as in praise of eloquence. It is wholly of a moral nature; moral ideas are its province, and it cannot be assailed so long as it

remains therein. The boldest thoughts, if they but have a moral foundation, can be pronounced to thousands of assembled men; you may presume upon their assent; you will never be deceived. All feel that the orator must be allowed to address the highest and noblest impulses of human nature; that he must address himself to no other than these. If you wish to persuade a man to a base action, speak to him alone, and turn away your face when you make the base proposition. But he, who should appear before an assembly of thousands, with the advice to renounce honor and freedom, to bear patiently the chains of servitude, among whatever people it might be, would be stoned.

In the third Olynthian oration a new progress may be observed in the development of these moral ideas. The orator, swayed and impelled by them, cannot avoid applying them more fully and powerfully than ever before, against the Athenians themselves; and as he had called Philip a worthless man, and denied him all success for the future, he now lets his own countrymen feel the weight of his patriotic indignation. Leaving Philip and Olynthus in the back ground, he dwells only upon the administration of the State, and the degeneracy of the Athenians produced thereby. With a sadness far too earnest and deep, to relieve itself by derision; to which the melancholy truth itself was sufficient, and which disdained to weaken the impression by rhetorical turns, he draws a comparative picture of the earlier and his own times. This delineation, in which the most important contrasts are placed side by side in definite outlines without amplification, was admired by antiquity.

The Athenians at various times sent help to the Olynthians, yet their city was taken and destroyed, and the Athenians listened to proposals of peace from Philip. After this, Philip threw himself, with his whole power, upon the Phocians, conquered them and destroyed their cities, and thus gained the renown of having put an end to the so-called "holy war." And the Greeks, regarding that as a service, which, in reality, was an important step towards their subjugation, gave him a seat and voice in the Amphictyonic council. When the Athenians were asked concerning their assent to the choice, Demosthenes, in his oration "concerning peace," advises for so trifling a matter, not to commence a war, in which they would have not only Philip but most of the Greeks for their enemies; thus showing again that discretion and correct judgment of relations, which in him, were in so rare union with power and decision.

The greatest political activity of Demosthenes, falls in the period between the peace with Philip and the battle of Chaeronea, where the

freedom of Greece was extinguished. He appears as the chief opponent of the Macedonian party. Philip was extending his conquests and enlarging his power; he had made complaints to the Athenians, concerning the conduct of Diopiteus, whom they had sent to the Chersonesus, at the head of a body of armed colonists. Demosthenes on this occasion, though not wholly justifying Diopiteus, still excusing him, appears against Philip. With the most various turns, now looking to the past, now to the future, he utters or rather thunders forth his thoughts in combination with each other. Through this powerful emotion, swaying the orator, in which the most various conceptions are melted together as to a unity, but at the same time presented with full clearness, one supported by the other, this oration becomes in the highest degree penetrating, and acquires an uncommonly elevated character. Amid the keenest reproaches, escape from his love of country, moving words of recognition; as when he says in the same oration, "And, truly, it is not a like danger, that threatens others and you, for he designs not only to subject the city, but to exterminate it entirely. For he knows too well that ye will not be slaves, nor if you would, would ye know how to be, for ye are accustomed to rule."

In the same year, the forty-third of the orator, we have the third Philippic. Here, in a connected delineation, he shows all the unjust acts of Philip; that he has already violated the peace with the Athenians. Then he turns himself against those who have sold themselves to the king, and demands from the people their punishment. He instructs his fellow citizens upon the great advantages which Philip derived from his changed and more speedy mode of warfare. For their warning he accumulates examples of nations and cities, who had given ear to Philip and his bought flatterers, and who, after the ruin that had come upon them, had painfully, but too late, repented their delusion. In this oration, as it seems to me, Demosthenes has most completely unfolded that stormy, irresistible power, which was peculiar to him. If any one of his orations is the most excellent, it is this or that for the Crown. The latter indeed leaves everything else behind it; but it cannot be denied that its plan is more artificial than one would wish; and that the orator, otherwise animated by the noblest emotions, often descends here to personalities, which one might wish away. The third Philippic, on account of its simple structure, and the ever noble emotion that flows through it, would merit the pre-eminence over it. How great a difference between this oration and that against Leptines, held thirteen years before. Then, he could quietly and gracefully polish his thoughts, as Polykleitas his statues.

But now he had run upon all the cliffs which beset the course of life for every man, especially for him who undertakes to manage great affairs. Here his speech is an angry and thundering stream; in the place of beauty is sublimity; and if gracefulness is no longer compatible with so powerful emotions, yet precisely by these the oration reaches the highest degree of its irresistible power. Where in these orations does Demosthenes pass the limits becoming a noble man? whilst he hurls thunderbolts, he stands there in completely moral dignity. It is so predominant in him, that, correctly speaking, the qualities of his eloquence, which are falsely called art and beauty, must be designated only by names which are borrowed from moral qualities; such as power, boldness, self-sacrifice. The moral faculty here applies all the other powers of the soul, which are likewise in the highest degree active, such as acuteness, reflection and discretion.

Soon however came that great catastrophe in which Athens lost her freedom, Philip was conqueror in the battle of Chaeronea. Though the policy of Demosthenes had not saved his country, yet his fellow citizens honored him; obliged almost daily to answer accumulated accusations in court, he was always acquitted. He was called to pronounce the funeral oration over those who had fallen at Chaeronea. In the same year with that battle, Ctesiphon proposed to the people, that a golden crown should be presented to Demosthenes, in consideration of expenses, which he had defrayed from his own means, for public improvements, as of the services which he had constantly rendered the State. Aeschines, availing himself of the right of protestation, instituted a process against Ctesiphon. Demosthenes appeared as counsel for the defendant, and, on this occasion, delivered his famous oration "for the Crown," in which he enters into a defence of his public life and character. It was in his fifty-fifth year; hence as the oration is the most beautiful, so also is it a late fruit of his eloquence. Aeschines appears as the defender of his own cause, and in his oration, commits, in the outset, the great fault of commencing with the outward question of mere legality, rather than that of worthiness or unworthiness in the life and public administration of Demosthenes. If he had commenced with the latter, and given the other a subordinate situation, his oration, in the commencement, would have acquired that living and powerful elevation which is so necessary to produce strong effect upon the minds of men; but this it must renounce, and, in the outset, lose all its force, so soon as that which is unimportant is made equal to that which is of more consequence. How can we explain his adoption of the plan which he took? Only thereby, it appears to me, that the inner grounds, from the life and administra-

tion of Demosthenes, did not appear to him sufficient; because he himself was not convinced of all the baseness of which his passion led him to accuse Demosthenes; because he despaired of making that perfectly credible to the judges, which he himself did not believe. With a feeling of the dubiousness of his undertaking, the juridical reasons appeared, after all, to afford the greatest assurance; on this account he unfolds these first, without reflecting that from that a deadly coldness must spread itself over the other reasons. In following this unwise plan; in all the faults which sprang from it, and made his defeat inevitable, nothing was in fault, to express it in one word, but his guilty conscience, and the distrust in his own cause, with which it smote him. We may regard it as established, that the forming of the plan of an oration is an act; and it can succeed only by an unimpeded action of the moral powers. If this is true in the political orator, how much more in the sacred orator! If the latter lives only in outward things, and not in the depth of religious intuitions, he will never grasp his subject at that point, whence a fulness of thought naturally develops itself.

If the faults in the oration of Aeschines arise from a wrong moral sentiment, the excellences of the oration of Demosthenes are, in their deepest foundation, moral excellences. Such a defence as this would have been wholly impossible, with an embarrassment and disquietude arising from inward reproaches; it is only conceivable in a man, who is filled with the consciousness of having willed the best, and of having served his country through a long series of years, with unquestioned self-sacrifice. Indeed, without the fullest confidence in his cause, he never could have formed his plan as he did, in which he avoids the faults of his opponent, and paves the way for the most stirring developments. Only when animated by this confidence could he, in passing over subordinate matters, have dwelt ever upon the main point, and placed first the examination of his life, and made the whole decision dependent upon the result.

From the foregoing representation it follows, that to Demosthenes, even if we cannot free his character from all blemish, is due, in the highest degree, the praise of power, decision, perseverance and devotion to his country; that he has succeeded in impressing the stamp of these virtues upon his eloquence, and that it owes to them its high and admirable excellences.

The first feature in the eloquence of Demosthenes, and which may also perhaps be called the first in the ideal of eloquence, is, that his person, its advantageous appearance, and regard for the applause of his hearers, is always sacrificed to the subject and aim of the oration.

He aims not merely to *gain*, but to move the hearer ; he seeks not his applause, but his assent ; in this especially lies his greatness. That the Athenians not only endured him, but declared him the first of orators, shows that they even in an age of decline, were superior to the most cultivated nations of modern times, by their correct estimation of things. If Demosthenes confined himself to his subject, he also completely fathomed it ; he considered it from all sides and in all relations, and penetrated into all its depths. Of all which he could use, not the least thing escaped him. The treasures which he thus gained, and which he brought out from the object itself, placed him in a condition to despise everything foreign to the subject. We must be astonished at the copiousness of the ideas and means which were at his command. Still greater and more glorious treasures than Demosthenes found in the subjects treated by him, are to be found in those which belong to the province of sacred eloquence ; but to be sure, just as great fidelity of investigation is requisite to bring them out from their depths.

But this wealth of ideas must be wrought into shape ; every thought must receive that position, where it is sustained by that which precedes, and itself, in turn, may sustain that which follows ; where it does not stop, but continue the movement ; where it may not only be heard by the hearer without offence, but may strengthen his conviction and increase his emotion. The thoughts of the orator must be waves, of which the one is driven on by the other. In this quality also which lies so deep, Demosthenes surpasses all other orators. His thoughts form a linked series, of which no part can change its place without injury to the whole. The hearer, at the outset, is seized by a salutary power, to which, without resistance, he surrenders the best powers of his inner being ; and as he is led upon a path, where there is no hindrance or interruption, he follows step by step to the end ; not only because he must, but because he also follows gladly and with joy.

In Demosthenes, this firmly linked chain of thought glows with the most living fire of emotion. In modern times there is an inclination to deny him this excellence ; he is accused of addressing only the understanding and not the heart ; that his whole problem is placed in convincing, by arguments, of the justice of his cause, and the utility of his proposals. Were this the case, he would be deficient in the most essential quality of an orator. But is thought incompatible with feeling ? Is not rather the connection of thought a chain, along which the fire of feeling may the more easily pass ? Is not feeling so much the nobler, and hence so much the more powerful in noble natures,

the more it is sustained by thought? We must not indeed seek the more tender feelings in Demosthenes; for developing these, his struggle with Philip offered little occasion. But if we seek the stronger, manly feelings, love of country, enthusiasm for the glory of noble actions, hatred against everything base, indignation against selfishness and faithlessness, the words of Demosthenes, more than of any other man, are penetrated with the fire of these emotions; and it glows in them still, after so many centuries have passed over them.

To this perfection of material corresponds, in Demosthenes, the finished form. From the critics of antiquity, especially Dionysius, he received the highest praise in this respect. His style, says this critic, is not the rough and hard style of Thucydides, nor the soft and polished of Isocrates, but he has taken a happy middle way between them.

His prose is, in its kind, something quite as finished as metrical composition; he bestowed great attention, for example, upon the sequence of long and short syllables; not to produce a symmetrically recurring metre, but to express the most various emotions of the mind by a suitable and ever changing rhythm. In general, by the study of Demosthenes and the ancient critics, we are introduced to mysteries of prose composition, which must awaken our astonishment. It is the opinion of the modern world, that he, who is full with his thoughts, cannot possibly bestow so much care upon the form. But it may be asked, whether it is not necessary, precisely on account of the substance, in order to present it undimmed to the intuition of the hearer, to bestow attention upon the form. But the example of Demosthenes shows us, that, in cultivating the form, we need not separate it from the substance; a fault to be ascribed not to art but to a want of art, since for true art, the most perfect form is nothing else, than the clearest and most transparent appearance of the substance.

At the close of this representation, I give it for consideration, whether these qualities, praised in Demosthenes, may not be transferred to the field of sacred eloquence, and whether it is not the duty of every pulpit orator, to strive to acquire them.

We pass now from Greece to France;¹ from Athens to Paris; from Demosthenes, the first political orator of all times, to Massillon, who, among the pulpit orators of the Catholic church in the age of

¹ We have occupied so much space with Demosthenes, that we shall be obliged to omit very much in the second part, which occupies over 200 pages, more than half the work; and shall confine ourselves chiefly to those parts which relate to the oratorical character of Massillon.—TR.

Louis XIV, appears to me to merit the first place. Demosthenes and Massillon both flourished at the close of the age in which they lived. Demosthenes is one of the last from the period of Attic splendor; Massillon stands on the decline of the age of Louis XIV, an age which has been not unjustly praised; and he lived to see the beginning of the following century, and of the new period which began with it. The second half of the seventeenth century was, in many countries, rich in highly gifted and pious men. In the evangelical church in Germany were Gerhard, Spener and Franke; and France possessed such men as Pascal, Fenelon and Bossuet, to the number of whom Massillon may be worthily added. He was born in 1663 at Hyères, and in his youth attended the school in his native town, established and directed by the priests of the *Oratorium*. He afterwards, in his eighteenth year, became a member of that congregation, and was animated by its spirit, and became himself its ornament. This was a religious society, which had its establishments in various parts of France, and sustained a high religious character. Somewhat resembling this was the congregation of Saint Lazare, founded by Vincent de Paul. When we consider these and other institutions in their activity, we may form a favorable picture of the condition of the Catholic church at that time in France. About this time also arose the struggle between the Jesuits and the Port-Royal. Massillon, shortly after entering the *Oratorium*, resolved to leave, and devote himself to the life of the cloister. Accordingly he entered as novice the abbey of Septfonds; but by means of a letter, which he wrote for the abbot, he attracted the notice of the bishop, who said, that a talent, like his, must not bury itself in a cloister; Massillon returned to the *Oratorium*.

Demosthenes felt himself, in his earliest years, called to be an orator; in Massillon this consciousness slumbered during his youth; he thought himself fitted for every other work, more than proclaiming the word of God. At the urgent request of his superiors, however, he made some essays in preaching, and immediately gained uncommon applause; which they merited, perhaps, on account of what they promised for the future; but by no means for what he then performed. He seems to have had no presentiment at all of the great resources, which he discovered, indeed, only in the progress of his own inner life, and through which he afterwards succeeded in producing so great effects. But in these first attempts, is not to be mistaken an earnest and strict religious sentiment.

In his thirty-third year he was called to Paris, as superintendent of the seminary of Saint Magloire, which was under the direction of the *Oratorium*, and in this capacity delivered several sermons. In these

he shows himself a mature orator; insight and experience are combined with enthusiasm for his profession, which is never wanting to him. The style freed from the burdensome play of rhetorical forms, with all youthful life and freshness, may be called appropriate, noble, and simple.

Soon after Massillon arrived in Paris, he was asked his opinion concerning the most celebrated pulpit orators of that period. He replied that he acknowledged and esteemed the excellences of each, but did not wish to take any of them as a pattern for himself. This expression seems to show, that Massillon, even at that time, was satisfied as to the direction to be pursued by him in proclaiming the Divine word. Public speaking stands in the closest connection with the entire personality; where this has something decided, it not only rejects conscious imitation, but seeks to break new paths for itself, in order to unfold itself the more fully. The most distinguished orators of France, at that time, were Mascaron, Fléchier, Bossuet and Bourdaloue. Massillon may not have heard them all, as they were advanced in life when he went to Paris. The province of feeling was at that time little appropriated for sacred eloquence; and if Massillon was led to this, almost involuntarily, by his personal endowments, he may also have recognized it as the province in which the sacred orator must be especially at home. By this is not to be understood, that he aimed to call forth idle emotions, that move and affect us uselessly, but serve no higher aim; the French character, indeed, is not inclined to such tones of mind; and, with his high idea of the dignity of the preacher's office, Massillon could not possibly have assigned to it so low a mission. It is his design, to awaken the tenderest and most powerful feelings of the heart, on the side of faith and Christian piety; to draw the whole world of feeling into the struggle for holiness, to convert it from a hostile to an auxiliary power. Connected with this, is the fact, that, at least in his best sermons, he does not aim so much to develop doctrines and exhibit commands, as to contend against the prejudices and passions, which hinder the reception of truth and obedience to commands. All this appears to have hovered, though dimly, before his mind, in that answer which he gave.

If the personality, disposition and the principles of an orator point out to him the direction which he is to take, it is still the surrounding world which furnishes the material of his discourses; and from the position which he takes, in the century in which he lives, will the predominant tone and coloring of his addresses, in many respects, be explained. But the period in which Massillon lived, may be called, in respect to the political, literary, religious, and moral life in France, a

time in which decline was commencing. The unjust and ambitious wars of Louis XIV. had exhausted the resources of the country, and alienated the hearts of his subjects, and the French army had suffered many great defeats in the war of the Spanish succession, although the king attained his purpose. The splendid epoch of French literature, which began about the middle of the seventeenth century, was already approaching its end. Massillon lived at a time when he could make use, for his culture, of all the great works of this period, and in him, as in one of the last representatives of this epoch, that which is excellent in them appears to have united in a last glance of light. But he outlived this period, and witnessed the decline of French literature, that afterwards appeared. Towards the close of this century that man was born, who, in the next, became the most noted instrument of the universal decline,—Voltaire.

Moral life had sunk deeply in France, which must probably, among other reasons, be ascribed to the influence of Louis XIV; of the spirit, in which, guided by fanatical and intriguing priests and statesmen, he managed the affairs of the church, we have an example in his persecution of the protestants. He also delivered up the Port-Royal to the hatred of the Jesuits; and procured from the pope the condemnation of a religious work of Fenelon. It marks the court of Louis XIV, that a man like Fenelon found no place there, was thrust from it, and must close his days in honorable exile, as archbishop of Cambray. But this incredibly rapid decline of religion and morality in the French people, cannot be explained, unless we add the corrupt influence of an immoral court.

It seemed necessary to refer to this general decline, especially in morals and religion, in the age of Massillon; since his eloquence can appear in its true light, only when seen upon this dark background. In periods of great corruption, men are accustomed to take a twofold position in relation to their age. Some, without exactly participating in the corruption, in its whole extent, yet swim along with the stream, unconcerned where it may take them. Others, perceiving the danger, escape the whirlpool, and with the power of a morally good will, set themselves against the general movement; such was the position of Demosthenes and Massillon; a position, perhaps, not unfavorable to eloquence. By the greatness and general spread of the evil he contends against, the orator feels himself summoned to the most extraordinary efforts. It was such a violent contest as this, that Massillon carried on; and if his sermons, on this account, are less adapted to the edification of the closet, they are so much the more important as examples of exalted eloquence. From this may be explained that coloring of

andness, which, with all their splendor of style, extends itself over his sermons; and that he sometimes breaks out in certainly blameworthy sighs upon the fruitlessness to be apprehended in his preaching.

After Massillon had preached, with great distinction, in the seminary of Saint Magloire, he resolved to enter upon the great career of Catholic pulpit oratory in France, as Advent and Fast-day preacher. He commenced at Montpellier, and in the following year preached at Paris, where he met with the most extraordinary applause. In the same year, his thirty-sixth, he was called to preach in Versailles before the king and court. He preached the fast-day sermons before the king also in 1701 and 1704. A great effect was produced by a passage in one of these sermons, "upon the small number of the chosen," in which he supposes Christ in the midst of the assembly to judge them, and the various classes of sinners to be separated from the just. The effect of the passage was extraordinary. The king and those around him, the whole assembly were shaken. One will not be able to refrain from rejoicing at this testimony for the power of the Divine word. For it was not the arts of a worldly eloquence, which produced this effect; it was the word of God itself, which smote the heart as with a hammer. To be sure the word of God was here proclaimed to a mighty king, and a splendid court, with a fearlessness and a boldness, which must gain our esteem and veneration for the orator. These advent and fast-day sermons appear to me the best of all his works.

Louis XIV. seems to have entertained great esteem for Massillon, as is evident from the words which he addressed him. "I have heard," says he, "many great preachers in my chapel, and have been very well satisfied with them; but every time that I have heard you, I have been very much dissatisfied with myself." It did not escape the king, that Massillon sought not his own honor, but the welfare of his hearers, their conversion and change of heart. By these words he designated well the spirit of his eloquence; and the praise which he gave him was the best which can be bestowed upon a sacred orator.

He pronounced the funeral oration at the obsequies of the king, a difficult problem for one, who could never have accustomed himself to the tone of flattery; a problem which he solved in a striking and not in the happiest manner, by placing light and shade side by side; bestowing praise, and then destroying it, by the blame immediately added.

It was usual at that time, in France, to reward those, who had delivered a brilliant course of advent and fast-day sermons, with the of-

fice of bishop. This reward Massillon did not receive from Louis XIV; but was afterwards, through the Regent Duke of Orleans, appointed Bishop of Clermont. In the following year he was appointed to preach to Louis XV, then eight years old, and his attendants. In these sermons he commits the great mistake, of undertaking to instruct the young king upon all, which the high office, to which he was destined, demanded; instead of endeavoring to awaken in his mind, for the person of Christ, for his love, his sacrifice and his favors, feelings of adoration, trust and love, and thus plant in the heart of the child the germ of a Christian life. But it may be said in his favor, that the passions of Louis XIV, his ambition and abuse of power, with all their sad consequences, stood in such living and terrifying colors before his eyes, that nothing appeared more necessary and urgent than to warn his successor from such errors; that his principles could not remain without influence upon the young king, if they were laid to heart by those who surrounded him, and were afterwards to guide his steps. And perhaps he flattered himself, if his words should be rescued from oblivion, to leave in them, for the future king, a permanent possession, and a mirror of all kingly virtues.

In 1719, Massillon became member of the French Academy. From this time till his death, in 1742, he remained in his diocese, and devoted himself, with the greatest fidelity, to the administration of his office. His revenues belonged to the poor; and in the ecclesiastical confusion of the times, he appeared as the man of peace.

In giving the description of a pulpit orator, we should aim chiefly to point out the means of religious influence peculiar to him, or which he has applied with particular success. Thereby we receive a clear and definite picture of the preacher himself, and of his work as an orator; we acquire a deeper insight into the nature of eloquence. In attempting to describe Massillon's manner of preaching we shall follow these principles. To this end, in order to point out more definitely the means employed by the preacher, for attaining the end proposed, it will be necessary to divide his sermons into certain classes, according as the most prominent point of view shall be that of *eternal happiness, virtue, duty, or truth.*

In preaching upon *duty*, it is the common procedure to represent the extent of the duty and the motives for fulfilling it. This method has the advantage of developing the thoughts in a connected manner; but it has the disadvantage, that by such considerations, which besides are commonly not unknown to the hearer, the opposition of the heart to the fulfilment of the divine commands is rarely broken. This Mas-

illon probably perceived; and although he pursues this method in several sermons of this class, yet in many has chosen an entirely different method. It rests upon the perfectly correct perception, that the hindrance to the fulfilment of duty lies not in the understanding but in the heart; that men allow the obligation to obey the Divine commands, but by various reasons, which the deluded and inventing heart suggests, seek to excuse the transgression of them. The method consists in this, instead of laboring to establish and recommend the duty directly; to refute these specious grounds of excuse, and so break the opposition of the heart. The development of the thoughts suffers indeed by this; for the connection, which binds together the divine doctrines and commands, is not found in the errors which arise from the corruption of man. But, on the other hand, the hearer is led, to such a degree, into his own heart, that he can no longer evade the question, how it stands with himself, nor conceal the wounded spot within. This method may be regarded as a new discovery, which Massillon has made in the field of eloquence; here he shows his peculiarity and his masterly talent. For the application of this method a great knowledge of the human heart is requisite. But to penetrate so deeply into the heart as Massillon has done, to follow with such perseverance, through all their mazes the thoughts, that would justify themselves; this presupposes a fidelity, a zeal, a love, which can be found only in a truly pious heart.

To the class of sermons, in which the prominent idea is that of *duty*, belong those of our author upon "afflictions," upon "the love of our enemies," on "prayer," on "beneficence," and upon "death," that is, the duty of reflecting upon death.

In speaking of those sermons of Massillon, in which the principal point of view is that of *eternal happiness*, we must recollect that he was a Catholic, and that, according to the doctrines of that church, salvation is not the gift of pure grace to believers, but must be gained by their own efforts and good works; whereas it is the doctrine of the evangelical church, that salvation is a pure gift of grace, imparted upon the sole condition of faith.

Massillon treats the idea of salvation and misery in a twofold way: in the one he describes the conditions belonging to each, this may be called the descriptive method; in the other, he designates the various causes by which we are brought to the one or the other. The description of an object is one of the surest means which eloquence employs to awaken, in reference to that object, the various emotions which determine the will, as inclination and disinclination, desire and fear. But to describe an object is not to portray the various elements

in the conception of that object, but to fill out the general outlines of the conception with elements from the ever new and ever changing life; in characters and relations, to seize and bring to view those points which escape most men, but which every one, as soon as they are pointed out to him, will recognize as true; not to place together these elements in a cold enumeration, but with the glow of emotion, which one wishes to awaken, and which he himself feels, to impress them, as a complete picture, upon the heart of the hearer. That orator alone can give such descriptions, who possesses the gift of observation in a high degree, increased by self-knowledge; and upon whose susceptible and deep feeling these objects produce impressions as quick and lively, as they are constant and enduring. That Massillon possessed these qualities in a high degree may be seen in his descriptions, which by their intuitive truth, their stirring power and life, form one of the most essential excellences of his eloquence.

In the class of those sermons which treat of eternal blessedness, are those upon "the happiness of the pious," "upon the final judgment," the powerful sermon on "the death of the wicked and the pious," in which he paints the misery of the one, and the joy with which the other approaches death. Here belongs also one of his most celebrated sermons, "upon the small number of the chosen," which, as we have mentioned, produced great effect. In one passage of this sermon he declares himself in plain terms against the theatre. Here also belongs the sermon "upon impenitence in death."

The sermons whose prominent idea is that of *virtue*, refer to a permanent form of the spiritual life, to a quality, a disposition, which either belongs to a godly life, and is then encouraged; or is incompatible with that life, and is then combated. To paint the condition of which one speaks; to bring to view the marks, by which it may be shown to be good or sinful; to represent its salutary or corrupting effects; these are commonly the predominant points of view in this class of sermons, and according to these, the sermons of Massillon, in this class, are constructed. To these belong the sermons upon "lukewarmness," "relapse into sin." In these two, and in all of this class, Massillon shows his deep knowledge of the human heart, and his gift in delineating its conditions; and as he always penetrates deeply into the subject, and does not shun theological expositions, there will be no cause to complain of a want of true and important thoughts. Here belong some of his homilies, as those upon "the rich man," "upon the history of Lazarus," and that pearl of his homilies, "upon the lost son."

As examples of sermons according to the idea of *truth*, we will

mention two, the one "upon the immortality of the soul," and that "upon the Divinity of Christ." This last merits the first place among his sermons of this class, and is one of the best of all his sermons; it is excellent in carrying out individual points, and complete as a whole, and is a pattern for the rhetorical treatment of a theological doctrine. The grounds which he adduces are prophecies, miracles, the testimony of Christ, and the character of his teaching. He appeals to the sense of truth and the moral feeling of man for the confirmation of two principles; first, it is inconceivable that God, in the arrangements of his providence, could have had the design to mislead men to error, to idolatry, to the worship of a created being; secondly, it is just as inconceivable, considering the holiness of Christ, which shines forth in his whole life, that he could have rendered himself guilty of deceiving men and robbing God of his honor. The first of these principles he applies to prophecy and miracles, the second to the precepts of Christ and the testimony which he gives of himself; and he shows that a man who makes himself equal with God, and assumes the divine privilege of being loved above all else, has deceived men and robbed God of his glory, unless he himself is true God. In the union of these two principles with these proofs, and in the dialectical movement of the thoughts that arise therefrom; in urging to the dilemma, either to assume that which is inconceivable and awakens abhorrence, or confess the divinity of Christ; in this lies the nerve of the sermon. The sermon is divided into two parts; in the first he seeks to establish the divinity of Christ from the glory of his mission, in the second from the spirit of his mission; the first referring to prophecy and miracles, the second to the doctrines and morals taught by Christ.

Massillon was a believing, pious, and upright man; with this trait, which no true sacred orator must be without, we can begin the delineation of his oratorical character. In the various grades of his ministry he lived only for his calling. His faith was lively and sincere; his moral principles strict, nor does he conceal them; he maintains them in the face of a degenerate age. He chastises the life of courts, and the abuses which had crept into the church, and declares the truth before the king. His intellectual capacities were favorably balanced for the orator; and although he was wanting neither in fancy nor in the gift of deep and connected thought, yet neither of the two is disproportionately prominent, the faculty which appears more prominently than the others in him, is not one of the intellect, but of the heart; it is feeling. And this is awakened in him especially by that, which corresponds to or opposes the moral requisitions. It is awakened by

that which makes men happy or unhappy; he feels the one, as a joy touching himself, the other, as personal pain. This feeling is not inactive in him, it has a practical nature. Without this easily awakened feeling, Massillon would never have been able to gain that deep knowledge of the human heart and life, which distinguishes him. The cold observer never penetrates very deep; the selfish man sees that which can bring advantage, all else remains concealed; to the scorner true forms must appear as caricatures; only love to men, only zeal for their welfare sharpens the sight in their observation, guards from onesidedness, keeps the eye undimmed, and is able even to supply the perceptions, which are wanting, by a correct presentiment. With these qualities, we might expect that Massillon would have broken through the common forms of pulpit eloquence, and sought to pave a new way for himself in proclaiming the Divine word. How could he have hoped by the representation of a duty, and the general motives for conforming to it, to produce a deep impression? His knowledge of the human heart betrayed to him the hindrances which oppose the fulfilling of a duty, whose obligation one acknowledges; he fixes his eye upon these hindrances, and seeks to overcome them; he struggles with the hearer, and in this bears some resemblance to Demosthenes; and where is there a noble and fit development of eloquence, that does not remind us of the Demosthenian.

To another form, which he has so often and with so great skill applied, he must almost necessarily have been led by his peculiarity. The human heart and life stood clear before him; he had looked through all their depths; he had observed so many men in their most important moments, those of suffering and death; and with his deep and lively feeling, the most joyful, but oftener still the most painful impressions had remained to him; he could paint with a pencil dipped in the glow of his own heart.

Not less excellent than in description, does Massillon appear, when he presses upon the wavering hearer, with ever new arguments for repentance and conversion. And for this immediate address, which, as it appears to us, is also one of the most beautiful characteristics of the eloquence of Chrysostom, Massillon was fitted by his deep knowledge of man and his glowing zeal.

It follows from what has been said, that that which is commonly called wealth of thought, that is, a cumulation of such thoughts as address the understanding more than the heart, did not accord at all with the eloquence of Massillon, and with its peculiar character. He chooses and develops only such conceptions as can produce a deep impression upon the feeling and disposition of the hearer; and he does

not leave them till he has made the fullest use of them in this respect, He cannot possibly, therefore, cumulate the thoughts; if he were to do so, one would limit the other in its development, and neither would effect that for which it is designed. It is so with the eloquence of Demosthenes; he also seeks not to surprise and entertain by a change of ideas; a few principal thoughts lie at the ground of each of his orations; and he shows himself inexhaustible only when he applies them most manifoldly, and uses them in the most various manner to accomplish his ends. But this is something, the taste for which is lost in modern times; even the French, from whose native rhetorical taste we should not expect it, are sometimes unjust towards Massillon in this respect. They admire Bossuet's gifted flashes, Bourdaloue's fulness of thought, and undervalue Massillon in comparison with these. We gain little by such comparisons; and it is better to recognize in every one what he has, than demand of him things which he cannot have, because they are at variance with his nature and its greatest excellences. The end, which alone Massillon proposed to himself, and which alone, considering his whole peculiarity, he could propose to himself, was to move his hearers to concern for their salvation, by awakening now the most joyful, now the most painful feelings. For this, flashes of genius and fulness of thought are not the most appropriate means; hence they are not found in him. We must, however, observe that this susceptible feeling, which seems to us most prominent in Massillon's rhetorical character, by no means expresses itself in him beyond the bounds of propriety and moderation.

The style of Massillon is precisely that, which, with such a personality and such intentions, it must be and alone could be. Massillon would address the heart, and describe what passes in the heart and life of man; but for the one as for the other, a diction is entirely unsuitable, which deviates too much from the common mode of expression; a clear and simple style is requisite, and that we find in him. Nowhere do we meet with rhetorical pomp, plays of wit and fancy, and embellishments, which, without strengthening the thought, are to win and entertain the hearer. One is almost compelled to acknowledge that this Frenchman surpasses many of our German pulpit orators in simplicity. This simple style, however, has the highest vivacity, it pours on unceasingly in the most rapid flow, whilst, at the same time, by the most powerful turns, the uniformity of such a rapid course is broken, the attention kept up, and the impression strengthened. A mind like that of our orator must form for itself such a style as this, and it was also necessary, in order to express the emotion with which he spoke. Over this simple and living style is poured

the grace of a morally beautiful character; and what Dionysius said of the oration against Leptines, that it was the most graceful of all orations, might be said of every sermon of Massillon, if one did not commonly, in the earnestness and power of the orator, forget the gracefulness of his style. Even those who place little value upon such qualities, will not perhaps be so unjust, as to blame it in him, who does not seek it from self-love, but possesses it as the necessary bloom of a beautiful nature. I certainly will not undervalue Bossuet and Bourdaloue, in comparison with Massillon, in respect to style; but I may be allowed perhaps to say, only to designate the peculiarities of these three men, that Bossuet speaks ever from the bishop's throne; that Bourdaloue appears surrounded with the scholastic atmosphere of a Jesuit college; that Massillon alone speaks with his audience the cultivated language of society. He has perhaps too many words, and dwells possibly too long on a thought, but this fault flows from the same source as the excellences of his style, from the warmth and fulness of his heart.

ARTICLE II.

DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

Translated from De Wette's Commentary on the XV. Chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. 2d edition. 1845.*

THE occasion of treating this subject was, that some in Corinth denied the truth of the resurrection of the dead (v. 12); but we do not certainly know, what was the character of these doubts and in what connection they stood. It appears, that these Corinthian Christians did not deny the fact of the resurrection of Christ, because the apostle, in his argument, lays this at the foundation, and indeed expressly certifies it, but does not seek to establish it against objections.¹ This conclusion however is not entirely certain, since the apostle writes for the majority of the Corinthian Christians, who had not yet been possessed by those doubts, although dangerously affected by them, rather than against the authors of those doubts (Flatt). In verse 85, it is

* For some account of De Wette and of his merits as a commentator, see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, No. XVIII. p. 263.

¹ Ziegler, *Theologische Abhandlungen*, II. 93. Knapp, *scripta varii argumenti*, etc. p. 316. Meyer.