

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

applies to the awards of the final judgment: "it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee."¹ Now the common doctrine of eternal punishment admits, as we have seen, of degrees innumerable. Though all will be punished without end, the misery of one may be twice as great as that of another. But if the doom of all the wicked is annihilation, and *this* is that "everlasting punishment" spoken of by our Lord, where are the degrees of suffering in non-existence? Beyond doubt it is the vengeance which Christ takes at the day of judgment on them that know not God, that shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom than for Capernaum. But this vengeance is expressly defined to be "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord." If now annihilation be what is meant, how can that be more tolerable for Sodom than Capernaum? But if it be the suffering that *precedes* annihilation, then we have "everlasting destruction," which is the vengeance which Christ takes on the wicked, before it begins. How much better to abide by the plain meaning of Scripture, than thus to involve ourselves and God's word in endless contradictions!

ARTICLE V.

CONGREGATIONALISM AND SYMBOLISM.²

BY PROF. WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, ANDOVER.

THE constitution of the Congregational Library Association proclaims that it is the object of this society, to establish a material centre for the denomination, about which it

¹ Matt. 11: 24.

² An Address delivered before the Congregational Library Association, Boston, May 25th, 1858.

shall collect its scattered elements, and from which it shall radiate its forces. It is its design, in the language of its statutes, "to found and perpetuate a library of books, pamphlets, and manuscripts, and a collection of portraits," and to lay up in its archives "whatever else shall serve to illustrate Puritan history, and promote the general interests of Congregationalism." "It shall also be an object of the Association," says the constitution, "to secure the erection of a suitable building for its library, its meetings, and the general purposes of the body." Interpreting these articles and statutes in a broad and enterprising spirit, we find in them a desire to combine and unify the somewhat diffused characteristics of the Congregational denomination, by furnishing it a visible centre. This species of centre, and this sort of consolidation, though not of the highest order, though external in its instrumentalities, and external in many of its results, is nevertheless of great importance in the history of any organization. The influence of the national temple, the common visible home and resort of all the tribes, upon the Jewish church and state, is well known; and no external event, perhaps no event, contributed more to the downfall of the Old economy, and the Jewish cultus, and thereby to the progress and triumph of the new dispensation with its simpler and more spiritual worship, than did the siege of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the old ancestral temple. That building of the pagan temples which began in Greece, immediately after the Persian war was brought to a glorious close, did more than even that war itself, to bring the various Grecian tribes into something akin to unity; and that so-called Sacred War which was signalized by the robbing of Delphi, and the scattering of its treasures, was at once the cause and the effect of the decline and destruction of Grecian patriotism, and Grecian unity. Mediæval Catholicism embodied its ideas, and centralized its forces, in the great Gothic cathedrals. That outburst of architecture in the thirteenth century, when Rheims, and Rouen, Paris, and Cologne, shot up their spires, and threw out their flying buttresses, with a suddenness and energy that looks like

magic,¹—that majestic series of material centres for the Papal church did much to strengthen it in its corruption, and to postpone the Reformation.

The power and influence, then, of a centripetal point, even though it relate to externals, is not to be despised. It is indeed true that neither the library, nor the musæum, neither the collection, nor the edifice in which the collection is garnered up, can be a substitute for the living spirit of learning in the mind of the individual scholar; and neither can the temple, nor the cathedral, nor any of the mechanism of an ecclesiastical denomination, be regarded of equal importance with the animating principle of piety in the hearts of church members. And yet neither science nor religion, neither the state nor the church, can wholly neglect these outward instruments of organization and union, without somewhat scattering their elements of power, and wasting their force.

Are we not then summoned by this "Library Association" to consider the need of more *centripetal force* in Congregationalism, in order to its greater efficiency as an ecclesiastical denomination? The Congregational edifice, the library, and the portrait-gallery, imply that we require an ecclesiastical home, and are emblematic of the truth that the denomination needs to control its tendencies to vagueness, and diffusion, and to render its distinguishing characteristics more intense by concentration. But this cannot be done by merely erecting a building, or collecting a library and portraits. These are but the secondary, though, as we have remarked, the necessary instrumentalities. Our unity, and our consolidation, as one of the legitimate churches of Christ in the world, must ultimately proceed from a deeper

¹ "The 13th century as a building epoch is perhaps the most brilliant in the whole history of architecture. Not even the great Pharaonic era in Egypt, the age of Pericles in Greece, nor the great period of the Roman Empire, will bear comparison with the 13th century in Europe, whether we look at the extent of the buildings executed, their wonderful variety and constructive elegance, the daring imagination that conceived them, or the power of poetry and of lofty religious feeling that is expressed in every feature and every part of them."—Fergusson's Handbook of Architecture, Part II. Book III. c. 9.

and stronger force than anything visible and material. We have not been born of flesh and blood. We have been begotten of the will of God, with the *word of truth*, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures. Our true growth, and our true strength, must lie in the line of our origin and birth. The ultimate organizing and centralizing influence, therefore, upon which we must place our main reliance as a religious denomination, is the *doctrine*, the *truth*, of God. This is one and homogeneous, and consequently unifies and harmonizes all that comes under its fair and full influence. But this supposes that eye sees to eye; and that there is a common doctrinal faith, and a common doctrinal creed, for the denomination.

Let us then, Brethren and Fathers, consider for a few moments, *the necessity that exists in Congregationalism for a stronger symbolical feeling, and a bolder confidence in creed-statements, in order to its highest efficiency as a Christian denomination.*

Before proceeding to the discussion of this theme, we will cast a swift glance at the ancestral feeling and tendency on this subject. What was the attitude of the fathers and founders of Congregationalism towards the old historical theology that had preceded them, and particularly towards the Symbolism that was then in existence? The answer to this question will require us to notice, very briefly, the theological position of the leading minds in the formative periods of Congregationalism, and the particular public action of the denomination itself.

It is a fact which will not be disputed, that the master spirits among the English Independents of the Cromwellian period were earnest and strong defenders, not merely of the doctrines of the Reformation, but of that particular shaping of them which is found in the creeds of the Calvinistic division of the Protestants. The English church previous to the days of Laud, it is well known, sympathized heartily with the theologians of Zurich and Geneva, and when that large and learned body of divines whose consciences compelled them to dissent from the increasing ecclesiasticism of

the state establishment came out from it, they brought with them the very same *dogmatic* system which had been embodied in the 42 articles of Edward sixth, had been compressed into the 39 articles of Elizabeth, and had been maintained by prelates like Whitgift, and Cranmer, and Usher, as the faith once delivered to the saints. As a natural consequence, the non-conforming theologians in England, however much they differed from one another, and from the old national church, upon secondary subjects, were characterized by an earnest and intelligent zeal for the Old English, which was the Old Calvinistic, faith and creed.

The Independents were not second to any in this feeling. Thomas Goodwin and John Owen, says Anthony Wood, "were the two Atlases and Patriarchs of Independency."¹ These two minds are the true representatives of the English Congregationalism of the 17th century, and they did more than any others to determine its type and character, both in doctrine and practice. Their theological position is as well known as that of Calvin himself. These minds were, also, of that exact and scientific order which requires for its own satisfaction the most unambiguous and self-consistent statement of religious truth. The treatises of the individual divine are, commonly, not so carefully worded as the articles of the council of divines; from the same cause that the best reasoned political disquisitions are not so precise in their statements as the technical phraseology of the political convention, or the political treaty. Yet even the practical treatises of Owen and Goodwin bear a much stronger resemblance than is common, or commonly practicable, in flowing discourse, to the concise and guarded enunciations of the council. The very structure of their sermons, and the very style of their discourses, evinces that these leading Independents were of their own free-will, and with their own clear eye, following on in that strait and narrow way of dogma which is the intellectual parallel to the strait and narrow way of life.

The Independents of England in the Cromwellian period

¹ Neale, II. 291.

had no quarrel with the Presbyterians in respect to matters of doctrine; even as the English Presbyterians had no quarrel with the low-church Episcopalians of this period, so far as relates to points of faith. Owen heartily adopted the Westminster Confession, and Twisse and the whole Westminster Assembly would have been content with the doctrinal part of the 39 articles. The Calvinists of England within the Establishment, and the Calvinists of England without the Establishment, were both alike opposed to Arminianism, and were equally earnest for those well discriminated creed-statements which mark off the faith of Geneva from that of Leyden.

The English Independents differed from the English Presbyterians solely upon the subject of ecclesiastical polity. And when, therefore, they appointed their committee at the Savoy in 1658 (exactly two hundred years ago) to draw up a confession of faith, that should organize the denomination, and hold it together, they instructed them to keep close to the Westminster upon doctrinal points, but to engraft the Congregational form of polity upon the old historical Calvinism that had come down to the Presbyterians themselves through Dort and Geneva.¹

These well-known and familiar facts are sufficient to show, that the founders and fathers of English Congregationalism were imbued with reverence for the ancient symbolism of the Protestant church, and felt that their small and feeble denomination, which was then struggling for existence amidst the convulsions of churches and states, must be held together, and made strong, by the strength of God's truth stated unequivocally and exhaustively in a creed-form.

The Congregational churches of New England were animated by the same feeling. Their leading minds, also, were of the same stamp, and theological affinities, with John Owen and John Howe. The pastor of the Plymouth pilgrims during their sojourn in Holland, the one who commended them to the protection of God when they embarked upon that hazardous voyage, and who told them that the

¹ Neale, II. 178.

Bible was not yet exhausted, and that "more light," he believed, was still to "break forth" from it, was John Robinson. But John Robinson believed in no light from the Bible that did not shine more and more upon the path of the Calvinist. John Robinson was a very vigilant observer of the most subtle and perplexing controversy in modern doctrinal history, that between Calvinism and Arminianism, and took a part in it. Bradford informs us that the pastor of the Pilgrims was "terrible to the Arminians,"¹ and that too, it should be noticed, at a period in the history of Arminianism when the little finger of the progenitor was not so thick as the loins of some of the posterity. The controlling spirits among the clergy of the first New England colonies were also men of the same theological character, and tendencies, with the Owens and the Robinsons. The membership of the first New England churches had been born into the kingdom, through the instrumentality of a style of preaching, and indoctrination, searching, systematic, and orthodox, in the highest degree.

¹ "In these times, also, were the great troubles raised by the Arminians; who, as they greatly molested the whole State, so this city in particular. in which was the chief university; so as there were daily and hot disputes in the schools thereabouts. And as the students and other learned were divided in their opinions herein, so were the two professors or divinity readers themselves, the one daily teaching for it, and the other against it; which grew to that pass, that few of the disciples of the one would hear the other teach. But Mr. Robinson, although he taught thrice a week himself, and wrote sundry books, besides his manifold pains otherwise, yet he went constantly to hear their readings, and heard as well one as the other. By which means he was so well grounded in the controversy, and saw the force of all their arguments, and knew the shifts of the adversary; and being himself very able, none was fitter to buckle with them than himself, as appeared by sundry disputes; so as he began to be terrible to the Arminians; which made Episcopius, the Arminian professor, to put forth his best strength, and set out sundry theses, which by public dispute he would defend against all men. Now Polyander, the other professor, and the chief preachers of the city, desired Mr. Robinson to dispute against him. But he was loth, being a stranger. Yet the other did importune him, and told him that such was the ability and nimbleness of wit of the adversary, that the truth would suffer if he did not help them; so as he condescended, and prepared himself against the time. And when the time came, the Lord did so help him to defend the truth and foil his adversary, as he put him to an apparent nonplus in this great and public audience. And the like he did two or three times upon such like occasions." — Bradford's History of Plymouth Colony, Congregational Board's edition, pp. 256, 257.

It was natural, therefore, that the Congregationalism of the New World should be marked by the same respect for the old historical faith which we have noticed in the English Independency. In 1648, ten years before the English Independents adopted their symbol at Savoy, the vigorous and vital churches scattered through the forests, and among the savages, of New England, sent their delegates to Cambridge, who drew up a confession of which the doctrinal part was adopted verbally from that of Westminster, while the polity of the symbol was made to conform to their own Congregational theory and usage. Thirty-two years after this, the churches of the province of Massachusetts met in synod, and drew up the only *original* symbol that has yet been constructed by an ecclesiastical body of Congregationalists. The Boston Confession of 1680, still retained as its creed by one of the oldest churches in the city of Boston,¹ though modelled very much after those of Westminster and Savoy, purports to be the work of a Congregational Synod, and in this regard has more claim to the respect of the descendants of the Pilgrims than any other symbol. Twenty eight years after the formation of the Boston Confession, the churches in the Connecticut colony sent their representatives to Saybrook to construct a symbol for their use. This synod adopted the Boston Confession of 1680, as an expression of doctrinal belief, and made a fuller statement of what they deemed to be the Congregational polity.

This brief survey is sufficient to show that those who laid the foundations of Congregationalism, in the Old world, and in the New, were in hearty sympathy with that body of doctrine which received its precise and technical statement in the creeds of the Reformation, and more particularly in that carefully discriminated system which was the result of the debate between Calvinism and Arminianism. The carefulness, and the frequency (three times within sixty years), with which symbols were drawn up and sent forth by

¹ The Old South.

the first Congregational churches evinces that both the individual theologian, and the denomination as a whole, craved a distinct, and publicly adopted, rule of faith and practice, as that which should help them to study the Scriptures understandingly, and should bind them together ecclesiastically. Reverence for a common denominational creed belongs, then, historically, to the Congregational church, as it does to all those well-compacted churches whose career constitutes the history of vital Christianity upon earth. In seeking to deepen and strengthen this reverence, we are not going contrary to the primal instinct and native genius of Congregationalism; we are not engrafting any wild shoots into the church of our forefathers; we are simply inhaling and exhaling, their pure, their exact, their thorough-going spirit.

1. Passing now to the discussion of the theme itself, we remark, in the first place, as a reason for a stronger symbolical feeling in Congregationalism, that an intensely free system, like our own, is the one that derives all the advantages, and escapes all the evils, that result from the organic power of a symbol.

Were the church which we honor and love already rigid and solid by reason of an inherent tendency of its own to centralization, there might be reason to fear any and every consolidating influence. But Congregationalism is made up of dynamic forces and flowing lines, and its intrinsic tendency is to liberty and diffusion. There is no church that has so little of form, and figure, and organization, as our own. Like the church gathered in the upper room, its constitution is almost invisible. We are vastly nearer to pure spirit, than to pure matter. Our body is nearly as immaterial as some souls. There is little danger, therefore, that Congregationalism will receive detriment from a centripetal force, particularly if that force does not issue from polity, or judicatories, but from doctrine. And there is no danger that it will proceed from either government or ecclesiastical mechanism. The political structure of our denomination is as well defined and settled as that of the Papacy itself, and stands even less chance of alteration. No centralizing force

can be brought to bear from this quarter. The very attempt to establish judicatures within Congregationalism, and to unify and consolidate the denomination by means of polity, would be suicidal; and therefore, though there may be secessions and departures from it, there can be no internal change of the denomination as a whole, unless we suppose an entire transmutation and transubstantiation of it into something that is not Congregationalism.

The only power, then, that can unify the denomination, and make its various atoms and elements feel that there is a deeper life and bond of union than that of polity, is the power of *doctrine*; the power of a *common faith*; the power of a *self-chosen denominational creed*. And this is both a salutary and safe power, in reference to a system so highly republican as our own. For in this exuberance of democratic life, and this expansive freedom, lies our danger. The centrifugal force, if unbalanced, will shoot the star madly from its sphere. Considering that our natural tendencies are those of growth, progress, and liberty, and that all natural tendencies perpetuate themselves, our watchfulness ought to have reference to such traits as unity, solidarity, and harmony. That which is spontaneous need give us no anxiety; but that which is to be acquired, which is the result of effort and of self-education, should be the chief object in the eye.

We may derive an illustration from the province of political philosophy. The question whether conservatism or progress shall be the preponderating element in the state, will be answered by the wise man in view of the general condition of things in the commonwealth. He whose lot is cast among the hereditary prerogatives and orders of the English state, if he follows the wise course, will side with the Liberals; while the very same man, if called to live and act in the midst of the fierce democracies and conflicts of a new and rankly growing nation like our own, will side with Conservatism. For there is little danger, in the early and formative eras of a nation's history, particularly if there be an immense fund of vital force, and vast continental spaces to

spread over and work in, of too much regulation and education. The training is more liable to err upon the side of laxness than of strictness, when the thews and muscles of a giant are forming, and the gristle is hardening into the bone of a Hercules. Besides this, in a republican commonwealth, if the tendency to centralization does become too strong, and power really begins to steal from the many to the few, the remedy is close at hand, and in the hands of the citizens. In a monarchy, if the just equilibrium has been disturbed, it cannot be restored without a revolution; but the adjustment in a republic takes place by an inevitable law and a tranquil movement, like that which equalizes the pressure of the atmosphere. In all free systems, therefore, where the instinct and the spontaneity runs to liberty and diffusion, the hazard is not in the direction of conservative methods and influences.

All this holds true in its full force of the democratic church, as well as of the democratic state. As there is no lack of inward energy in Congregationalism, and as there is no external restraint from its political structure and arrangement; as there are no judicatures, and nothing, consequently, but good advice by which to hold the denomination together; there is little danger of an excess in the moral and spiritual forces that must do this work, if it be done at all. As that individual who stands up isolated, and independent of all outward restraints, ought for this very reason to feel the strongest possible inward limitation, so should that ecclesiastical body which has least of mechanism and of polity, subject itself to the strongest possible doctrinal and spiritual constraint. Let then the symbol be melted into the soul of the free and vigorous churches. Let it permeate them as quicksilver does the pores of gold. Let the clearly defined, and the accurate dogma become the sinew and fibre of the otherwise loose and slack organization.

2. Secondly, Congregationalism needs a stronger confidence in creed-statements because, as a denomination, it is unusually exposed to the sceptical influences of literary culture and free-thinking.

It so happens that the simplest form of church polity is the dominant one, the "standing order," in the oldest and most highly educated portion of the United States. The Congregational churches of New England are planted in the midst of the most artificial civilization upon the Western continent, and their membership is more exposed to the good and bad influences of secular refinement, and literary cultivation, than is that of any other denomination in the land. The first-settled, and most densely-settled, part of any country always contains more of *irreconcilable* varieties of social, literary, and religious opinion than the newer regions. There may not be more apparent and superficial variety, but there will be vastly more of the latent and profounder differences of sentiment. There are, it is true, a much greater number of sects in our Western states than in the Eastern, but then these sects themselves are founded in religion of some sort, and not in scepticism. The pioneer, though illiterate and rude, it may be, is characterized by religious sensibility, and he is continually thrown into circumstances and emergencies that cause him to feel his dependence upon his Maker. As a consequence, he is like the ancient Athenians, to whom Paul spoke, very much inclined to religion and worship. The older parts of our land, on the other hand, may exhibit fewer external marks of difference; fewer sects may come into existence, and to the eye of the superficial observer, there may seem to be a very general sameness in the external phenomena of the region, and yet there be forming, and formed, beneath, in the hearts and minds of a class of community, a disbelief in all that is properly called religion, that throws them "whole equinoxes apart" from those who are living, thinking, praying, and dying by their side. This radical divergence of the parties from each other is seen whenever any great religious movement takes place. The motley and mottled population of the new region, being only superficially separated, flows together when the common Christian faith and truth is set home with unwonted power and by unwonted influences, while the seemingly homogeneous population of the educated and refined

portions of the country only have their latent and irreconcilable antagonisms elicited by such influences. Hence it is that the extremes of faith and unbelief will always meet, in their severest conflict, in the older and more highly cultivated portions of a country. And that church which is called to defend and propagate the faith amongst such a population, is consequently exposed to unusual temptations and needs uncommon aids and appliances.

Such, if we are not mistaken, is the position and the function of Congregationalism. The most careless observer must acknowledge that there is more of *radical* conflict of opinion in New England than in any other portion of the United States. That scepticism, which invariably springs up out of belles lettres, when belles lettres is divorced from deep thinking, is more rife and forth-putting here than anywhere else. These older states contain more of that religious indifferentism which always arises when literature is separated from philosophy and theology, and which exhibits its opposition to New-Testament Christianity, sometimes by the elegant languor of its over-refinement, and sometimes, when exasperated into some emotion, by a bitterness that borders upon malignity. The Congregational churches are set for the defence and spread of the humbling doctrines of guilt and atonement, among a population which is feeling in an increasing degree the stupefying influences of wealth, and the inflating influences of earthly culture. The structure of society around them, like that of England or France, is growing artificial, and, in so far, irreligious, by the very lapse of time, and the influx of a more elaborate civilization. Loose thinking, and radical differences of opinion upon fundamental subjects, are the natural attendants upon such a social state and condition, and it becomes much more difficult for Christianity under such circumstances to overcome the antagonisms and mould society internally and from the centre. The newer states, and the less sophisticated populations, are much more plastic, and, in all their internal characteristics, much more homogeneous, and hence the church that is planted in them, only needs to enunciate

certain leading truths with boldness, and fluent eloquence, to create currents that will roll like the Mississippi itself through the whole length of the land. But it is different in the older and over-civilized portions of the country. The statements of the pulpit, here, must not only be bold, but exact, and drawn from the deep places. The preacher must be an anatomist, and not merely a painter. He cannot break up moral indifference, or vanquish religious scepticism, in the well-bred and well-read hearer before him, by a merely pictorial method. He must prove himself to be a psychologist, and by an analysis of character, by a subtle penetration into the springs of motive and feeling, elicit some religious consciousness in his careless and unbelieving auditor, and probe it until he writhes. Christianity, among old institutions, and matured methods of mental discipline, must verify itself as the commanding truth, by the energy of its abstraction, the clearness of its discrimination, the penetrating force of its elements, the comprehensiveness of its grasp, and the patient thoroughness of its details.

But all this necessitates the *symbol*. This conflict of opinion in cultivated Christendom can be stilled only by that church which looks down upon it from the higher position furnished by historical Christianity. That denomination which thinks to dispense with the results of past theologizing, and which supposes that, of and by itself, it can solve all the problems that press upon the natural mind, and refute all the arguments advanced by the carnal reason, will find that it has overestimated its strength. It will be forced to fall back into the solid columns that are behind it, and to fight the battle in company with the whole church militant. For the creeds have themselves been born of intellectual conflict; of a deeper conflict than is ever witnessed by any single church, or any single generation, because they are the slow growth of many churches and many generations. The historical symbol contains the key to those very problems which are troubling every new generation of unbelievers, because they are vainly thinking that the individual is wiser than the Christian Church, and wiser

than the human race. That church, consequently, which, calmly and with intelligent insight, has adopted it, and wrought it into its understanding and its affections, will be able to still the conflict that is going on, either by lifting the doubting or opposing mind up to its own serene height of vision, or by an argumentation that leaves the truth triumphant and firm, whatever becomes of the opponent.

3. In the third place, a stronger symbolical feeling is required in Congregationalism, because of the laxness with which the Bible itself is now interpreted by many minds in the Protestant world.

In the preceding division of the discourse we have spoken of the dangers that assail us from that scepticism which rejects the Bible altogether; we have now to speak of those latitudinarian influences which issue, not from a rejection of Revelation, but from an inadequate and defective understanding of it.

When the Scriptures have become venerable and sacred in an old Christian commonwealth, and yet there is a declining interest in their cardinal doctrines, nothing is more natural than an exegesis that empties them of these doctrines. "The Bible is the religion of Protestants" is a dictum accepted at the present day by Protestant parties that stand poles apart in their interpretation of the Bible, and their theological belief. This dictum meant something when the church was just escaping from the crushing authority of tradition and of the Papacy. It taught that the human mind must seek for an *infallible* rule of faith, and source of truth, in the word of God, and not in the church. But the Reformers held, and with very great earnestness too, that the Bible teaches but one set of doctrines, and contains but one homogeneous system. They were themselves strict constructionists and exegetes, and every line and letter of their creeds evinces that *they* could discover within its pages only that same doctrinal system which the Patristic church,¹ as distinguished from the Papal,

¹ And the *Western*, rather than the Eastern, Patristic church, it should always be observed. Luther and Calvin fortified themselves, in their contest with the

had found in them. The Reformers had no notion that the Bible is a nose of wax. It could not be made to teach two or more systems radically contradictory to each other. When, therefore, they called the church back to Divine Revelation, as the only *unerring* source of truth, they did not suppose that they were sending it to a Delphic oracle, uttering ambiguous voices, like those of Paganism. And neither did the first Protestants themselves find two antagonistic lines of doctrine in these Scriptures. From Genesis to the Apocalypse, the modern Protestant church, as had the ancient Patristic before them, discovered but one generic and homogeneous teaching respecting the being and attributes of God, the actual character and destiny of man, and the method of his redemption by a Mediator. And they embodied the results of their profound and systematic study of the Bible, in that remarkable series of symbols, which more than anything else of a human sort, consolidated Protestantism, and gave it a firm fibre and organization, whereby it stood strong amidst all the distractions of the time. Had there been radical differences among the Reformers in their understanding of the Scriptures; had Luther and Calvin been unable to see eye to eye upon the leading truths relating to God, Man, and the God-Man, and had they constructed creeds for the German, Swiss, and Holland churches, that were antagonistic to each other upon these subjects; had there not been in this remarkable age the most profound and exhaustive study of the word of God, and as a consequence, a most *harmonious* understanding of its contents, Protestantism would have been broken down, and crushed into the earth, by the massive, time-honored, though merely mechanical unity of the Papacy.

But in process of time, the term *Protestant* acquires the same vague and loose meaning which the term *Christian* has received. When the disciples of Christ were first called by this name at Antioch, it denoted only those who had

Papal theologian, who asserted that the Protestants were leaving the faith of the "Fathers," by citing the stricter views held by the Latin, rather than the milder tenets adopted by the Greek, divines.

come to a personal sense of sin, and a living faith in the Redeemer. It now, besides this, designates all of the human family who are not Pagans or Mohammedans. In like manner the term *Protestant*, in the beginning, had exclusive reference to religious and doctrinal characteristics, while now, it has certainly an equal reference to intellectual traits. Protestantism, at first, meant justification by faith, in distinction from justification by works. It now means, over and besides this, free-thinking and private judgment, in distinction from hereditary trust and unreasoning assent.¹ As a consequence, the intellectual characteristics of Protestantism are apt to overcome and suppress its evangelical and theological ones, in those periods when civilization and literary culture become separated from doctrinal Christianity. As matter of fact, the Protestantism of the present day includes within itself an amount of rationalistic and anti-evangelical elements, at which the Reformers, the original Protestants, would have stood aghast.

But this condition of things directly affects the interpretation of the Scriptures. All Protestants, of whatever grade, must accept the dictum that distinguishes Protestantism from Popery; otherwise they fall into the ranks of the Pope. Chillingworth's saying: "the Bible is the religion of Protestants," becomes the watchword for Socinus, equally with Calvin, and for all the intermediates between these two representative men. In order, therefore, to an unambiguous and well-accented denominational character, every Protestant denomination requires a symbol that shall express, and proclaim to the world, what *it* finds in the word of God. In the present condition of Protestantism, and amidst the variety of interpretations that are put upon the Scriptures, it is not sufficient for an individual, or a church, to say: "my religion is in the Bible." Well do we remember the

¹ This is the preponderating conception of Protestantism, in Mr. Hallam's representation of the Reformers and of the Reformation. A deeper acquaintance with the *theological* problems and aspects of those men and times would have preserved the history of the "Literature of Europe" from the only grave bias that now injures it.

humor with which a venerable theological teacher was wont to allude to the zeal of a well-meaning man, who proposed to unite into one body all the various denominations that checker and speckle our land, by issuing an edition of the Scriptures with a sufficiency of blank leaves, and inviting all persons to fall to, and subscribe the Bible! It is not enough, in the present condition of Christendom, for an individual to point at the word of God, as it lies upon the table, saying: "my doctrinal belief is between those covers." As we cannot determine in these days of naturalism and pantheism, what lessons the scientific man learns from the book of Nature, until he has stated them in the exact nomenclature and precise phraseology of science, so neither can we decide what teachings the Protestant now finds in the book of Revelation until he has written out his creed.¹

¹ It may be said, that the Congregational churches *do* write out their creed, each one for itself, and therefore do not need a denominational symbol. But upon this method, they are less assisted by a *common and self-authorized* interpretation of the Scriptures, than most other denominations; and less than their ancestors were a century and a half ago, if we are to judge from the denominational action at Cambridge, Boston, and Saybrook. Have we not applied our theory respecting church-discipline, to church-doctrine, somewhat to our own disadvantage, from overlooking the difference between the two things? It is our belief, as it was that of our forefathers, that it is expedient that government and discipline should be confined as strictly as possible to the local church, and that as little as possible even of advice should be called in through councils, associations, or the denomination as a whole. And it also seems to be our belief, as it was not that of our forefathers (judging from their denominational action), that it is equally expedient that the doctrinal creed should be drawn up by every local church for itself, and that a common concert and coöperation of the churches of the denomination, in this regard, is as undesirable as with regard to cases of church discipline. But are we not mistaken in this, from not observing the great difference there is between doctrine and discipline? While it is well that all those secondary affairs which pertain to church government, should be guided by each individual church for itself, and there should be all the variation and adjustment incident to the great number and variety of such affairs, is it as well that the primary matter of doctrinal statement, which from the nature of the case is a fixed quantity, should be exposed to all the liability to variation and divergence from the exact truth, that necessarily attaches to individual and local action repeated every time that a church is formed? This work, unlike the other, does not require to be performed anew every day, and continually. Truth is unchangeable. The creed for the denomination ought, therefore, to be the work of the denomination, and be constructed once for all. But church discipline is required anew and afresh every day, because it grows out of the ever

In order, therefore, that the Congregational churches may escape the evils incident to the great Protestant right of private judgment, and the freedom of speculation which always goes along with it, and may derive only the advantages flowing from it, they need, as a denomination, to state their own judgment, in the most exact and distinct manner, with respect to the meaning and doctrinal contents of the Bible. For in this way alone can they prevent the private judgment of other Protestant parties and denominations from being imposed upon them for their own. As this is a point of some importance, we will dwell upon it for a moment. There is little danger that a denomination like our own should be much affected, in the outset, by those forms of Protestantism which reject the *essential* doctrines of Christianity. The difference between Rationalism and Supernaturalism is too great for influences to pass *directly* from one to the other. The chasm between these parties is so wide that they cannot hear each other's voices across it. The latitudinarian influences (latitudinarian as we must regard them from *our* denominational position) will first come in upon us from those *evangelical* divisions in Protestantism who hold the doctrines of grace, but who, according to our denominational judgment, do not hold them with sufficient *self-consistence and comprehensiveness*, to render their *creed*, and their *theologizing*, as accurate as our own. The nice point, and therefore the point of most danger, for Congregationalism, and for all other denominations that occupy the same doctrinal position with it, is the right adjustment of its relations, not to downright heresy, but to a looser and less defined form of orthodoxy than Congregationalism thinks itself can stand upon. We may illustrate our meaning by reference to the great controversy which has gone on from the very first ages to the present time, between the two grand divisions of evangelical Christendom. We refer to that standing difference of opin-

changing circumstances of the day. It may and must, therefore, be administered by the day, — that is, whenever the occasion arises, and by the local body alone, because the local body alone is concerned in the speciality of the case.

ion among believers in the *general* doctrines of grace, which, in the Patristic church, showed itself in the Augustinian and Semi-Pelagian divisions, and, in the Protestant church, in the Calvinistic and Arminian controversies. In these two great divisions of ancient and modern evangelical Christendom, we find a difference of sentiment, not with regard to the *general* facts and truths of New Testament Christianity, but with respect to the more *specific* and *exact* definitions of them.¹ And it is with reference to this *specific* enunciation of the general doctrines of grace that the principal controversy has gone on, and is still going on, within the evangelical world. For it is a great mistake to suppose that the Patristic church was very much convulsed by the controversy with mere and sheer Pelagianism; or that the Protestant church has been very much excited or tasked by mere and sheer Socinianism. Both of these schemes are so totally different from the plain teachings of the entire and un-mutilated Scripture, that there was no opportunity for a profound argument, and a permanent debate; and hence both schemes alike dropped back into their own private and local circles, while the great mass of the Patristic, as of the Protestant church, retained, and defended the *evangelical* theology. But upon *this* basis of *general* evangelism, there was an opportunity for an argument, and an honest difference of sentiment, among believers in Christ. The Ancient Semi-Pelagian,

¹ "That man is no longer in his pure and primitive moral condition, and that the mere cultivation of his present natural powers and susceptibilities cannot possibly suffice for the attainment of the true end of his creation; that, on the contrary, his original divinely-created nature has become corrupted and ruined by the dominion within him of the principle of self-will, and that in order to live conformably with his own original constitution, and to practise holiness from a holy disposition, he needs an inward change through a divine power, — all this, in a *general* form of statement, had been the doctrine of the church from the first. It was only when still more *strict* definitions and statements were attempted, — and particularly when such questions as these arose: Is there in the fallen soul any power of self-restoration? if so, to what degree? and what is its relation to the renewing power of the Holy Spirit? — that the church of the first four centuries found it-self not fully agreed. There was constantly a difference, in this respect, between the Oriental and Occidental churches, and to some extent also within the Occidental church itself." — Guericke's Church History, § 91.

like the Modern Arminian, while confessing his sin, and trusting in the blood of Christ, could sincerely urge what he believed to be a strong argument against the doctrines of predestination and irresistible grace,¹ and that particular statement of the doctrine of sin out of which the doctrines of predestination and irresistible grace issue as necessary corollaries. And his opponent showed his respect for that belief, by entering into the debate, and defending what he believed to be the more exact, and self-consistent, and all-comprehending statement of that same evangelical system. Not with reference, then, to the tenets of Pelagius and Socinus, but to those of Chrysostom and Arminius, as distinguished from those of Augustine and Calvin, do the Congregational churches need a strong symbolical feeling that will identify them yet more thoroughly with the stricter of those two great systems of theology, whose fraternal (and may it ever be fraternal) conflict and debate constitutes the sum and substance of evangelical doctrinal history.

For Congregationalism, it is agreed upon all sides, does not adopt the Arminian system as its doctrinal basis. The early history of the denomination has shown that the fathers and founders were strictly Calvinistic, in reference to the points at issue between Geneva and Leyden. Says the respected secretary of this Library Association, at the close of a most instructive historical sketch of the Congregational churches in Massachusetts: "Calvinism as a system of religious faith, and Puritanism as a code of morals (the two toughest things that ever entered into the composition of human character) were the original soul and body of these Congregational churches." And this Calvinism, he adds, was "that unadulterated Calvinism which had been filtered of every Arminian particle by the Synod of Dort, whose ablest defender was John Robinson."² And no one

¹ "Irresistible," it is needless to remark, not in the sense of never being resisted by the enmity of the carnal mind (Rom. 8: 7), but in the sense of being able to overcome, and actually overcoming, the utmost energy and intensity of that resistance.

² Congregationalist, Feb. 12, 1858. These valuable sketches have recently
VOL. XV. No. 59.

can follow the tremendous cogency of that logic by which the great head of New England theology crushes to its minutest fibre the Arminian theory of indetermination, and the Arminian statement of the doctrine of Original Sin, without perceiving that there was a most profound harmony and agreement between the mind at Northampton, and the minds at Dort and Westminster. The successors of Edwards, New England divines of all varieties, alike repel the charge of Arminianizing proclivities; and, though there may be a difference of opinion respecting the success with which the several schools that have arisen among us have untied the knots, and unravelled the intricacies of the Calvinistic system, there can be no doubt that all of our leading thinkers have intended, and done their utmost, to be true to the historical faith of their denomination.

The influence of the symbol is required to strengthen and perpetuate in Congregationalism this same primitive energy and decision in favor of the stricter of the two systems of evangelical theology. For the creed-statement evinces that there is no logical middle position between Calvinism and Arminianism, and that the choice of an individual or a denomination, consequently, lies between the one or the other. Semi-Pelagianism was a real mid-point between the tenets of Augustine and those of Pelagius; but there is no true intermediate between the system of Arminius and that of Calvin. In the history of doctrine there are sometimes semi-quavers, but demi-semi-quavers never. In marking off the true scientific difference in this way, — in making up the exact issue, — between the two great theological systems of Christendom, that are kindred but not equivalents, the historical creed is an educating force of the highest value to a denomination. It imparts frankness and clearness to all minds within it, and frankness and clearness are twin sisters to generosity and catholicity.

4. Fourthly, a stronger symbolical feeling, operating in Congregationalism, would tend to harmonize its own theo-

been collected, and published with additions, by the Congregational Board of Publication.

logians among themselves. It is the genius and tendency of our highly republican system to call out vigorous and independent thinking. As a consequence, our denomination more than others, has from the beginning been stimulated, and sometimes startled, by the uprising of those salient minds who become the nuclei of parties, and the heads of schools. Minor and somewhat local systems, each in its own time and place, have thus radiated their influence through the denomination, have come more or less into collision with each other, and have thereby imparted to Congregationalism that varied and somewhat parti-colored aspect which it wears when compared with ecclesiastical bodies in which there is less boldness of speculation. This is the genius of Congregationalism, and we would not transform it if we could. This desire to evince the reasonableness of Christianity, this inquisitive and enterprising temper, this scholasticism of the nineteenth century, is the vitality by which theological science in every age has been built up. But vital force must always have materials to work upon, and ideas to work by. And these we would find, *for the theologian*, in the denominational symbol. For it is not enough to refer *him* to the Bible without note or comment. Were he a convicted sinner only, and were it his object to seek his own personal salvation, this direction would be sufficient. But he is a theologian, and as such it is his purpose to construct a great comprehensive system that shall do justice to the entire word of God,—that shall not omit a single truth, and shall place every doctrine in its right relations and proportions,—and therefore he, in the capacity, and exercising the function, of a *theologian*, must be assisted in this collection and combination of the contents of Revelation by the labor of all his predecessors. To shut up a single individual with the mere text of the Scriptures, and demand that, by his own unassisted studies and meditations upon it, he should during his own life-time build up a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity like that of Nice, of the doctrine of the Person of Christ like that of Chalcedon, of the doctrine of the Atonement like that of the Augsburg and Helvetic

Confessions, of the doctrines of Sin and Predestination like that of Dort and Westminster, would be to require an impossibility. It would be like demanding that a theologian of the year 150 should construct, in his single day and generation, the entire systematic theology of the year 1850; that a Justin Martyr, e. g., should anticipate and perform the entire thinking of a thousand minds and of seventeen hundred years! And yet the substance and staple of all this vast and comprehensive system of divinity was in that Bible which Justin Martyr possessed without note or comment.

The *theorizing* spirit of the individual divine needs, therefore, to be both aided and guided by symbolism. In proportion as individual thinkers can bear in mind that the church which they honor and love has already earned a definite theological character, and has given expression to its theological preferences in its own self-chosen symbol, they will come under a unifying influence. Their differences and idiosyncracies, instead of being exaggerated by themselves or their adherents, will be modified, and harmonized, by the central system under which all stand, and to which the whole body has given assent. There will be no loss of mental vigor upon this method, nor of true mental originality, any more than there is when the mathematician's genius is guided, and stimulated, by the axioms and theorems of a science that was wrought out before he was born. He does not copy, but he reproduces, the mathematical processes of the past, within his own intellect, and in and by this reproduction is conducted to fresh and original products that are also in the true scientific line. In what other way will the active and ingenious minds of a denomination be likely to see eye to eye, and the sum-total of their speculations constitute a homogeneous theology, except as they revere the symbolism of their ancestors? It is when differing, and perhaps diverging, minds are called upon to defend the peculiarities of a common denominational faith, that their differences are dissolved. So long as it is an open question what the common faith is, and the thinkers of a denomination are at leisure to cultivate their peculiarities,

so long there must be collision and debate. But the very instant it appears that there is a recognized denominational creed, and it becomes necessary to maintain this creed as vital to the very existence and growth of the denomination, all sincere members of it rally to the defence; and the tendency of defences, as the whole history of Apologies proves, is to harmonize and unite.¹

5. Fifthly, and finally, Congregationalism needs a stronger symbolical feeling, in order to success in its present endeavor to extend its denominational limits.

The two forms of evangelical Christianity which are to spread over the United States are the Calvinistic and the Arminian. The history of the church upon this Western continent will be substantially the same with its history in the Eastern. One portion of American Christendom will demand the more exact and self-consistent statement of Biblical doctrine, while the other portion will be content with that less precise, and comprehensive, enunciation of it, which emphasizes, indeed, with evangelical energy the doctrine of forgiveness through the blood of Christ, but rejects the predestination and irresistible grace that *secures* the vital acceptance of the Gospel provision. Throughout the land, there will be those, on the one hand, who, in the phrase of Edward Irving, "will rest content with the infant state of Christ, and see no more in the rich treasures of God's word than a free gift to all men, shrinking back with a feeling of dismay from such parts of the sacred volume as favor a system of doctrine suited to the manly state of Christian life;" and those on the other, who "will not be content evermore to dwell in the outer court of the holy temple, but who resolve for their soul's better peace and higher joy to enter into the holy and most holy place, which is no longer veiled

¹ When the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction was attacked by Duns Scotus, Thomas Aquinas rushed to its defence, and in so doing substantially retracted positions which he himself had previously taken; because he *now* saw, as he did not before, that it was impossible to defend the faith of the church if he retained them. And the whole history of Calvinism proves that it has been enunciated with most unanimity, and defended with greatest power, when the Calvinistic divines were hardest pressed by their Arminian opponents.

and forbidden, and find a full declaration of the deepest secrets of their faith, expression for their inmost knowledge of the truth, and forms for their most profound feeling, upon the peculiar, and appropriate, and never-failing love of a covenant God towards his own peculiar people."¹ The American church, like the old Patristic, like the modern European, will crave, according to the grade of its Christian culture, either the milk that is for babes, or the meat that is for strong men.

Congregationalism now proposes to go from East to West, from North to South, upon its mission of love. Outside of its old ancestral home, it is not yet strong. It enters into a friendly rivalry with other branches of Christ's church, upon fields which they have preoccupied, and upon which it has yet to get a firm foothold. Shall it give up, or modify, its old historical character, and adopt the laxer of the two great systems of evangelical doctrine, and seek to build up churches upon the same doctrinal basis with the pioneering, the fervid, the beloved² Methodist? If it does, it will fail; first, because it will not be true to its own genius and antecedents, and second, because the wonderfully effective and persistent "method" of Methodism will absorb all its acquisitions, upon *this* basis, into itself.

It only remains, therefore, for Congregationalism to carry into the new regions which it proposes to enter, the very same doctrine, and the very same creed, which it brought over from England and Holland. The denominations with which it has most affinity, and with which it will come into nearest contact, are themselves built upon the Calvinistic foundation. They have become strong and consolidated in those regions by their persevering attachment to their historical symbol. If they are true to Christ and the New Testament, they will welcome, and not repel, all who stand upon the same doctrinal platform with themselves. The

¹ Irving's Preface to Horne on the Psalms.

² We use this word advisedly. We feel a deep and warm affection towards that large denomination which goes everywhere preaching the doctrine of man's *guilt*, and his forgiveness through *atoning blood*.

merely secondary matter of polity will never, in the long run, alienate denominations who are one in doctrine, and in the experimental consciousness that grows out of doctrine. Standing firm upon the creed of Owen and Robinson, and equally firm upon the polity of Owen and Robinson, who can doubt that an advancing career is in reserve for the Congregational churches? Thorough orthodoxy (which means thorough accuracy) in the technical statement, in friendly alliance with the utmost freedom and simplicity in the political structure, — the longest and firmest of roots bursting out into the brightest and most delicate of flowers, — this will be a phase of Christianity that must attract and influence. It lies within the province of Congregationalism to originate and exemplify a style of Christianity that will be somewhat unique in the history of the church. Exactitude of doctrine has sometimes been associated, in ecclesiastical history, with rigid and stately forms of polity. The muscle has been enveloped in tissues as tough and fibrous as itself. It is now competent for the most republican of the polities to clothe the bone and the sinew in the warm and flexile flesh; to exhibit the most profound and scientific type of truth in the most simple form of church government, and the most ethereal style of church life. In so doing, Congregationalism will find a welcome from all the true friends of Christ the world over. And particularly will it be welcomed by that large portion of evangelical Christendom to whom the theology of Augustine and Calvin is precious as the apple of the eye. There can be no collision and no hostile rivalry, between denominations that see eye to eye, in respect to an exact and a living orthodoxy. How was it in the days when the Reformers on the Continent fraternized with the Reformers in the British islands? There was much more difference between the Presbyterianism of Geneva and the Episcopacy of London, than there is between the Presbyterianism of the Middle and Southern States, and the Congregationalism of New England. Yet how respectful was the feeling of Richard Hooker, the great defender of prelacy, towards John Calvin. Read the Zurich Letters, and see how deep

was the interest which the English prelates took in the prosperity of the Swiss pastors. And yet there was no sacrifice of principle, or of conviction, upon either side, even in regard to polity. Bishops Grindal and Jewell will not be called lax Episcopalians. John Calvin and Henry Bullinger will not be regarded as indifferent Presbyterians. Each stood firm upon his own ecclesiastical position, and each labored, in every legitimate manner, for the upbuilding of the particular branch of Christ's church with which birth, and education, and personal conviction had connected him. But both knew that there is a higher, a more august thing than the external regimen of the visible church. Both felt the mutual respect, and the mutual fellowship, which springs out of a common reception of a common type of doctrine.

And so will it be upon the wider arena of denominational life and action. By identifying itself, always and everywhere, with that theological system whose most fitting material symbol is Plymouth rock, while yet it maintains, always and everywhere, that simple and spiritualizing form of polity which is in such perfect keeping with the doctrine which it enshrines; by uniting the firmness and solidity of the œcumenical symbol with the freedom and flexibility of the local — church, Congregationalism will receive the "God speed" of the church universal. Go where it may, upon this continent or upon other continents, it will hear from the lips of the worn and weary penitent, the warm words of the hymn :

"Brethren! where your altar burns,
Oh! receive me into rest."

We have thus, Brethren and Fathers, considered some of the reasons for the cultivation, among ourselves, of a stronger symbolical feeling, and a bolder confidence in creed-statements. In so doing, we are well aware that we tread upon difficult ground. In the minds of some, the symbol has come to be associated with rigid, and more or less monarchical forms of church polity. The adoption of an exact denominational creed seems to carry with it the renun-

ciation of Congregational freedom, and to pave the way for judicatures, and a central government in the church.

But there is no necessary connection between strict doctrine and high-church polity. Each subject stands, or falls, upon its own merits. No one will deny that John Owen was as thorough a Calvinist as ever drew breath; and that he was as thorough a Congregationalist is equally certain. What hinders any denomination from being inspired with the very spirit of Dort and Westminster, so far as doctrine is concerned, while yet it cleaves to the most democratic republicanism in polity?

For this matter of doctrine is an inward conviction, a voluntary adoption, if it is anything at all. The denominational symbol is not to be forced upon a denomination. It cannot be. It must be the free act, the self-chosen creed, of the churches. Hence we have spoken of a symbolical *feeling*, a denominational *confidence* and *respect* towards creeds, rather than of any particular measure, or method, by which a symbol might be cunningly insinuated into a church, or sprung upon it as a surprise. That which is inward and spiritual must first exist, in order to that which is outward and formal. While, therefore, we would not, if we could, impose and inflict a creed upon any unwilling church, we confess that we would, if we could, inspire every church upon the globe, with an intelligent and cordial affection for that "form of sound words," around which the sublimest recollections of the church militant have clustered, and out of which its purest and best religious experience has sprung.

To deepen a feeling which already exists in Congregationalism; to strengthen a confidence which has never died out, has been the purpose of these remarks. Whether this feeling and confidence should once more give itself expression in the formal action of the denomination is a question that will be answered variously. But will not all agree that the action of the denomination at Cambridge, and Boston, and Saybrook, has never been *repudiated*; that if Congregationalism has any corporate existence, and any organic life, by which it maintains its identity from generation to gene-

ration, it is *still committed to the symbols* that were then and there made public. Shall we not do well, then, to cherish the recollection of what was done when the foundations of the Puritan church were laid in this Western world? Associated and assembled, as we are, to collect and preserve the memorials of our denominational history, ought we not, more than ever, to think of, and prize, that *system of truth* which has made us historic, which has given us our position among the churches of Christ in the world, which is the secret of our active and tenacious vitality, and without which we should long ago have crumbled and disappeared like the seven churches of Asia?

ARTICLE VI.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

1. — RAWLINSON'S HERODOTUS.¹

THE full title of this work, which we give in the note below, clearly indicates its character and object. The first two volumes have already been received in this country, and the others may be expected soon. They are beautifully printed and illustrated; they are books which are a real delight to the eye, and the only pain which they give is from their price. The work is very appropriately dedicated to Rt. Hon. F. W. Gladstone, who finds time, in his superabundant activity, to devote himself to statesmanship, to theology, and to classical learning; and has recently, for his own amusement, amid the turmoil of political life, written three ponderous and beautiful volumes on Homer. A fit companion to this English Herodotus is the splen-

¹ The History of Herodotus: a new English Version, edited with copious Notes and Appendices illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information, and embodying the chief results, historical and ethnographical, which have been obtained in the progress of cuneiform and hieroglyphical discovery. By the Rev. G. Rawlinson, M. A., assisted by Sir Hen. Rawlinson and Sir J. G. Wilkinson. In 4 vols. Vol. I. (Book I.) 8vo. pp. 698. Vol. II. (Books II. and III.) pp. 616. London, Murray. 18s. per volume.