

30/5 20/10/1872  
4122

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. 9.—JANUARY, 1874.

ART. I.—OUR INDIAN AFFAIRS.\*

By Rev. JOHN C. LOWRIE, D. D., New York City.

WE give this paper a title taken from the official phrase in use at Washington. Each house of Congress has its Committee of Indian Affairs, and one of the Bureaus is so called in the Department of the Interior. The publications referred to below will serve to bring several Indian matters of moment to our consideration; a brief notice of these Reports may be of interest to our readers. The first two of them have probably seldom fallen under their notice. The Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and its accompanying papers, furnish a great amount and variety of information concerning Indian matters. Its index, a new and valuable feature in these Reports, contains the names of one hundred and twenty-nine tribes of Indians, some of them so divided into separate bands as to make fifty-eight more; in all, nearly two hundred tribes or independent bands are treated of in this volume. This is done on no uniform plan, with details often not well arranged, and far from being complete, yet sometimes full and clear. The Report of the Commissioner himself, Gen. F. A. Walker, must be excepted from this remark; it is one of the ablest of these Indian Commissioner Reports, occupying the first hundred pages of the

\* Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior, for the year 1872. Washington. 8 vo., pp. 471.

Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners to the President of the United States, 1872. Washington. 8 vo., pp. 202.

Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May 1873.

Men who carry out God's requirements will do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. None on the order and welfare of the State. For what nation has ever dishonored itself, or endangered its own stability and perpetuity by listening to God's counsels, and trying to shape its policies after God's will? Nor does it fall short in the ideal it furnishes. "Unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," is the aspiration of obedience. And a completer manhood than that presented in the Model Man this world has not and will not see. In every aspect and relation of it obedience works towards freedom. Where the spirit of the Lord is, there, in more than one sense, in all best senses, is liberty. Truth emancipates none so effectually and fully as the truth of Christ. So we may catch up the old strain, and say, in the interest of liberty as well as of conscience, it is better to obey God than men, even though the men be *ourselves*.

---

ART. V.—MATTHEW ARNOLD'S LITERATURE AND DOGMA.\*

By CHARLES A. AIKEN, D.D., Princeton.

THIS work claims to be the joint production of the *Zeitgeist*, of literary culture, and of Dr. Matthew Arnold. Its point of view and its principles are those of the *Zeitgeist*. Its vantage ground in respect to qualification for "a better apprehension of the Bible," and for the better expression of what is apprehended, comes from literary culture, in which those who have heretofore been chiefly engaged in the study and interpretation of the Bible have been lamentably if not ridiculously deficient. The organ of the *Zeitgeist* and of culture in the production of this particular work is Dr. Arnold, to whom we must ascribe its more individual and superficial characteristics, its mathematical computations, its animosities, its other logical and rhetorical peculiarities. Many of these are marked excellences. These could not be

---

\* *Literature and Dogma; an Essay towards a better apprehension of the Bible.* By Matthew Arnold, D.C.L., etc. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1873.

wanting in the work of so accomplished a man. They are elements of fascination and power, and yet their influence must be greatly restricted by the associations in which they stand, and the service to which they are called.

We come uninvited to the perusal and discussion of the author's work. "For persons of this kind (who receive the Bible on the ground supplied either by popular theology or by metaphysical theology) what we say neither will have, nor seeks to have, any constraining force at all." (p. 127.) We may, however, be permitted to have and to express a conviction in regard to the degree in which others, within the circle of the author's purpose, should be constrained by his reasonings.

One word more in regard to the self-announced standpoint and spirit of the author. It is his declared object to save the Bible and its religion from the theologians. "The received theology of the churches and the sects . . . is itself now a hindrance to the Bible rather than a help; nay, to abandon it, to put some other construction on the Bible than this theology puts, to find some other basis for the Bible than this theology finds, is indispensable, if we would have the Bible reach the people." (Preface, p. xii.) The author writes as a Christian, zealous for the establishment in which he was brought up, regarding dissent "almost droll; if it were not . . . so extremely irreligious" (p. xi.), but diluting a little the measure of scorn with which he speaks of Evangelicals of his own Confession. And yet he says (p. xix.) "Mildness and sweet reasonableness is the one established rule for Christian working, and no other rule has it or can it have." Obviously his dealing with theologians, dissenters, and Evangelicals is not within the line of his Christian working. So accomplished a writer cannot be blind to the injurious effect of endless iteration, especially when it takes the form of biting personalities. Having never seen a Spanish bull-fight we draw upon imagination when we try to conceive of a wounded and maddened animal dashing more wildly at the *picador* or the red flag, than does this champion of "mildness and sweet reasonableness" when he catches sight of certain obnoxious ecclesiastics or of the flutter of certain theological formulas. What have these archbishops and bishops done, that Dr. Arnold should for their sakes so mar and weaken his most elaborate and pretentious theological essay? Will none suspect the author of a con-

ceit that for the moment at least interferes with his "Christian working" as above defined, when he apologetically writes (p. 180) that "really, if one thinks seriously of it, it was a kind of impertinence in such professors (of our so-called orthodox theology) to attempt any such criticism (literary and scientific) at all?" How *sweet* the *reasonableness* of a judgment like this: "Great as their literary inexperience is (the allusion is to 'our so-called evangelical Protestants,') and unpractised as is their tact for perceiving the manner in which men use words and what they mean by them, one would think they could understand such a plain caution," etc. (p. 301.)

But we pass from these intimations concerning the style of our author, to direct our unpractised tact toward more serious matters. As this work has been fairly characterized (Rev. J. L. Davies in the *Contemporary Review*, May 1873) as one of the three or four chief gospels offered to our times in lieu of the old gospel that is to be taken from us, we must scrutinize it to ascertain in what it claims to supersede or transcend the "glad tidings" in which the church has for eighteen centuries found rest and strength. If we may accept as fairly discriminating and correct the sketch of M. Reville (*The Academy*, Sept. 1, 1873, p. 327,) we have in the author this "inexplicable mystery;" "a philosopher whose theodicy borders upon what is elsewhere called Pantheism or even Atheism, who admits none of the Bible miracles, who rejects the Trinity of Athanasius and the supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures, and at the same time calls himself a sincere Christian and a devout member of the Established Church of England." M. Reville is a far more sympathizing critic than any of us dissenting Evangelicals can be expected to be. With such a "mystery" we have but few points in common, and the limits of our paper allow us to touch on but few of the points in which we differ.

The immediate aim of the author is "a literary treatment of religious history and ideas," and this with a view *primarily* to the correction of mistakes into which mere reasoners have fallen in their misapprehension and misuse of the Bible, and *ultimately* to the acceptance of the Bible by the masses. "This new religion of the Bible the people may receive; the version now current of the religion of the Bible they never will receive." (p. x.) Of a desire to reach the masses with the Bible we can never

make light. Whether it is desirable to make much effort to reach them with this new religion of the Bible will depend on what the new religion proves to be. It would be unfair to judge of all literary treatment of the Bible by the sample before us; but in vital matters we can see little to choose between the masses remaining in their present relation to the Bible, and their being reached by nothing better than this new religion. We would infinitely rather deal with them on the old basis than on the new. We gladly acknowledge our incidental indebtedness to the author's literary culture for many things that are beautiful and many things that are memorable, for fine discriminations and striking presentations of truth. We charge it not to culture but to himself and the *Zeitgeist* (as they may arrange it between them) if in matters so essential as the nature of God, and the nature of religion, and the nature of the Scriptures, the warrant of faith and the prime objects of faith, we find ourselves less indebted.

The Bible is then to be made attractive to the masses. It is not so, and the fault is assumed to be with our (Evangelical and theological) apprehension and presentation of it. Hence the need of that better apprehension which is to come in the line of literary culture. We are not to maintain that theologians and Evangelical believers have all and always rightly conceived and felicitously exhibited, either the whole nature of the Bible, or the entire system of religious truth which it embodies. But that the theological method and Evangelical conception are wholly at fault, and that the whole fault is with them, we are here to deny and challenge the presentation of proof. We do not understand the propensity of human nature to the apprehension and reception of the Bible and its contents to be so strong, that, if some errors in representation were corrected, the two would rush together. There is a significant record concerning "gospels" that are no gospel\* (Gal. i. 6-9); readiness to receive a "new religion of the Bible" argues nothing against the truth of the old religion.

But waiving this, we hold that the method by which it is here proposed to correct past errors, and so render the Bible and its religion attractive to the masses, is contrary alike to philosophy, experience and Scripture. At the outset Dr. Arnold announces it as the demand of the masses, and he proceeds on the as-

sumption of the rightfulness of the demand, that the old conceptions and doctrines shall give place to such as are "verifiable." The basis of all religious philosophy, and of course of all scriptural exegesis, is to be real and experimental. This is asserted very emphatically to be true of "whatever is to stand" (pp. x. 42, 308, 371). That the masses have adopted this postulate of Positivism is not so clear as that our author has done so. In other particulars he falls in as readily with the tenets of Littré and the Comtian school. But allowing these men within their own coterie to reserve, if they please, the name of science for that which rests on a verifiable basis, is there nothing else that is among men instinctively, universally, and rightfully accepted as true, and made the foundation of their most vital and far-reaching actions? Not only would the faiths of men be marvellously mutilated by the concession of this principle; the action of men would be equally restricted. We apprehend that "the masses" are not confining themselves, and are not likely to confine themselves, either in their beliefs or their activities, to the "verifiable" as their basis. The principle, however, being assumed, no *prestidigitateur* can exhibit more startling transformation scenes than those which at the author's bidding pass over the stage of our religious life. What is "verifiable" in the idea of God? "The stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being,—a real power which makes for righteousness,—a tendency which is *not ourselves* but which appears in our consciousness, by which things fulfil the real law of their being!" (pp. 41-3, *et passim*.) "Whether we will call this *God* or not, is a matter of choice." A choice being left us, we decide not to call this our God. We call for proof that it is before this "stream" that the world has for six thousand years bowed down and worshipped. We call for evidence that any human being can worship this thing. Now and then the author (or his printer by an uncorrected error) speaks of a Power. The capital letter has no rightful place in the system. And is this very tendency as "verifiable" to every man as it is assumed to be? Is it so palpable to the child or to the untrained adult mind, as to furnish a plausible (we do not say rational) explanation of the religious aspirations, wants, endeavors, of all the earth?

But in our author's hands religion is reduced to a minimum as well as, and with, God. On a "verifiable" basis religion can-

not amount to much ; indeed it hardly seems needful to keep in use for it a separate term. "Religion is not simply *morality*, but *morality touched by emotion*" (p. 21). And this application of emotion to morality, making it religion, comes by "habitual dwelling on the rules (of morality) thus reached (by *attending* to one's life), that constant turning them over in the mind, that near and lively experimental sense of their beneficence, which communicates emotion to our thought of them, and thus incalculably heightens their power" (p. 25). Is not this, according to the Ciceronian etymology, of the nature of religion? That must be a peculiar nature whose emotions are kindled very rapidly and intensely by turning over in the mind this "stream of tendency."

The most remarkable feat, perhaps, in the whole series of transformations now passing under our notice, is that by which, under the manipulation of literary culture, the Bible, both Old Testament and New, is made so naturally to teach this doctrine concerning God and religion. If other ideas have been heretofore widely entertained concerning the God and the religion of the Bible, it is because the readers and students of the Bible were not literary. Just at this point, before examining Dr. Arnold's doctrine and exposition of the Scriptures, it occurs to us to solace ourselves for a moment in the company of M. Guizot, to whom the distinction of literary culture will not very easily be denied. "The God of the Bible"—M. Guizot had been speaking just before of the "one sole and primordial power anterior and superior to the gods" of the Hindoos and the Greeks—"is no such sterile abstraction ; he is the one God at the present time as in the origin of all things, the personal God, living, acting and presiding efficiently over the destinies of the world that he has created." "Several words are employed in the Bible as appellations of God. . . . The history of the Hebrews is neither less significant nor less expressive than their language ; it is the history of the relations of the God, One and Immutable, with the people chosen by him to be the special representative of the religious principle, and the regenerating source of religious life in the human race. . . . Amid all the vicissitudes and errors of the people of the Bible, the God of the Bible remains invariably the same, without any tincture of anthropomorphism, without any alteration in the idea which the Hebrews conceive of his nature,

either during their fidelity or their disobedience to his commandments." (*Meditations on Christianity*, pp. 191-95.)

What then are the Scriptures, and what the true principle of their interpretation, that shall yield results acceptable to literary culture? Even the *Zeitgeist* would rather be able to quote the Bible. The Scriptures are simply literature, to be treated like other literature. "To understand that the language of the Bible is fluid, passing, literary, not rigid, fixed, and scientific, is the first step towards a right understanding of the Bible" (p. xv.); and the remedy for our wretched errors is discriminative experience, not such as the Apostle Paul traces to the Holy Spirit, but "getting the power, through reading, to estimate the proportion and relation in what we read." (p. xvi.) "Our mechanical and materializing theology, with its insane license of affirmation about God, its insane license of affirmation about a future state, is really the result of the poverty and inanition of our minds." The language of the Bible being "language *thrown out* at an object of consciousness not fully grasped, which inspired emotion" (p. 41) is to be treated like the language which Dr. Arnold and other literary men throw out. Christ's language in all his teaching is "*literary* ; that is, the language of poetry and emotion, approximative language, thrown out, as it were, at certain great objects which the human mind augurs and feels after, but not language accurately defining them" (p. 124). When Christ speaks of God he is throwing out language at "the not ourselves which makes for righteousness"!

That this is the correct conception of the Scriptures, and a corresponding treatment their right treatment, is verifiable. For "it is simply from experience of the human spirit and its productions, from observing as widely as we can the manner in which men have thought, their way of using words and what they mean by them, and from reasoning on this observation and experience, that we conclude the construction theologians put upon the Bible to be false, and ours the truer one" (p. 334). The argument is from the nature of other literature to the nature of this. All other literature is human, and is fitly treated as human; experience justifies our conclusion and teaches us the true hermeneutics. Therefore this is human and is to be subjected to precisely the same treatment: Can reasoning be more fallacious? Suppose that we reason from the nature of this lit-



erature toward the nature of other literature. And let experience still be our teacher. Let us keep clear of the haunts of theologians and the boudoirs of *litterateurs*. Let "Cotters' Saturday Nights" tell us their experience. Let the chambers where tenderness and solicitude bring their best ministry to the sick, where hearts are breaking over their dead, where consciences pierced by the arrows of the Almighty are wrestling with the memory and consciousness of sin, let these and a thousand other scenes in which words "thrown out" go for what they are really worth, bring us the issues of their experience. Is this literature just like all other literature? Is its root no deeper? Is its top no higher? Have its leaves and its fruits no other balm or healing in them?

Another argument from experience might be based on the strange power exercised by the Bible over the men of letters and the men of science who tell us that it is only part and parcel of the world's literature. Wolfgang Menzel, who if not distinguished for mildness and sweet reasonableness has for a half century occupied a high place as an author and critic, writes: "But one must wonder, why did these people then busy themselves so much with the Bible? Why did they not turn from it, and devote themselves exclusively to heathen studies, if they so despised it? There they sat, the old and young pedants of philosophic orthodoxy, reeking with the sweat of the school, more heavily wrapped in their philosophic pride than in the thickest wigs, Siegfrieds\* more completely encased in horn, their very eyes of horn, and industriously turned all the leaves of the Holy Scriptures back and forward, without cessation or rest, to accomplish the great work of transmuting Christianity into philosophy or revelation into the *Zeitgeist*. The material was stubborn, the labor was from the start senseless. But with slavish persistency they prosecuted their gigantic task. The more they read, as richly and yet more richly the glory and wisdom of the Scriptures opened before them, with so much the more bitterness were their faces distorted, so much the more yellow became their look, so much the more did the liver take the heart's place, so much the more were they provoked and disgusted at the charm from which they still could not escape. A stupid book they said, and busied themselves incessantly with it. A bad, a

\* One of the heroes of the *Nibelungenlied*, whose skin was horn except at one vulnerable point.

dangerous book, they said, and could not let it alone. Humanity must be freed from the spell of this book, they said, and yet their hate cleaved to it as closely as others' love." (*Kritik des modernen Zeitbewusstseins*, p. 116, 117.)

The Bible is then simply one among the world's literary productions that have to do distinctively with conduct. This makes it valuable, for, as we are incessantly told, conduct is approximately three-fourths of life, art and science claiming one-eighth each, more or less. When the Scriptures have seemed to men to speak of God in connection with conduct, they have meant merely a "not ourselves," an influence, a tendency, "that makes for righteousness," connecting happiness as a witness and sanction with righteousness. Heightened emotion quickens imagination, prompts to personification, borrows manifold forms of expression easily misleading empty, inane, technical minds, so that they begin to think of cause, of personal cause, of purpose and law, of administrative and judicial functions in this mere drift of things. We are invited to return to the simplicities of right conception, and try this literary substitution, and see how smoothly and agreeably Old Testament and New will read. "God is an *influence*, and those who would serve him (the author should have said "it") must serve him (it) not by any form of words or rites, but by inward motion and in reality" (p. 199). Christ came "to restore the intuition." This we are told is "a short expression which may give the clearest view" of the work of Christ (p. 190). This intuition which had been lost, although in it Israel's greatness began, is that "the Eternal loveth righteousness; to him that ordereth his conversation aright shall be shown the salvation of God" (p. 185). This is of course a literary expression of the intuition. If we would state the exact facts, these words must be stripped of all emotional, poetical elements and adjuncts, and the case put very baldly.

The author cannot so conjure with ancient Jewish literature as to make it appear that his views were to any considerable extent the views of the Jewish people. He is, therefore, ready with invasions and reinvasions of *Aberglaube*, of excessive, unauthorized beliefs, not only reaching beyond the bounds of legitimate beliefs, but perverting and opposing these. The authors or compilers of these "sacred" books being merely of the people with-

out any peculiar immunities, we shall find them sharing in all the defects common to literary mortals. They not merely apprise us of errors and superstitions current about them; they are plainly of, as well as in, their time. The author has difficulty in satisfying us that his views were taken either by the historians, poets, prophets who composed this literature, or by the patriarchs, legislators, kings or people of whom they write. We are not convinced by his paraphrase that the first half of the Old Testament is a historical romance, based upon facts which were made facts either by the mighty power of some abstraction, or by the mightier power of a misapprehension of an abstraction. We are still disposed to think that a personal God and faith in a personal God can alone explain either Jewish histories or Jewish history. We do not find, as the author's prescription would lead us to expect, that the more we read other histories, the more do they drag down Hebrew history to their own level. And when we turn to the Psalms, the psalms characterized by aspiration, exultation, penitential confession, are to us alike inexplicable on our author's theory. His version of such psalms as the 27th, 42d, 51st and many more would seem to us nothing less than a literary and spiritual monstrosity. As little are we able to accommodate ourselves to a like rendering of the prophets, that leaves out a personal God, and his providential and moral government over Jews and Gentiles, that endorses the neglect of Sabbaths, the despising of altars, the forsaking of sanctuaries, contempt of law and covenant and Messianic hopes. The only trouble with these Jews so berated by the prophets is, that they lived 2,500 years before their time. They lived too much as though they enjoyed the literary culture of the nineteenth century of the Christian Era.

The case is little better when we turn to the New Testament. It is not enough to assume that this is mere literature, and, therefore, liable to the ordinary results of human imperfection. Errors are demonstrable. But more than this; the admission of error is expedient and positively desirable. "To profit fully by the New Testament, the first thing to be done is to make it perfectly clear to oneself that its reporters both could err and did err" (p. 137). The advantage is two-fold. "The very same criticism which shows us the defects of their exegesis and of their demonstrations from miracles, establishes their good faith"

(p. 143). "It is good for the authority of Jesus, that those who establish it by arguments of this sort should be clearly men of their race and time, not above its futile methods of reasoning and demonstration. . . . (Thus) all the more do we make room, so to speak, for Jesus to be inconceivably great and wonderful" (pp. 152-3). Thanks then to them for their "verbal and unintelligent use of Scripture," "the incurable looseness with which the circumstances of what is called and thought a *miracle* are related," etc., etc.!

Now "the New Testament exists to reveal Jesus." But its revelations are made by the hypothesis (it will not be proper to call it *dogma*) of our author very precarious. We have only internal evidence to tell us what Christ really said; for his reporters did not and could not report him correctly, he was so far above them. We have the same evidence to decide what he did. And the internal evidence will need to be adjusted for us and interpreted to us by the *Time-Spirit*, and literary criticism, and —. Dr. Arnold tells us that Christ "came to restore the intuition." It is only within a few months that the world, which had been studying the gospel for 1,800 years, has been informed what the work of Christ really was. Man learned to attend to the springs of conduct, instead of attending merely to conduct. Self-examination, a return upon oneself, finding one's own soul, was the new "method" proposed and introduced by Jesus; self-renunciation is the "secret" of Jesus; and mildness is the spirit of Jesus. (pp. 88, 91, *et passim*.) "The Saviour of Israel is he who makes Israel use his conscience simply and sincerely, who makes him change and sweeten his temper, conquer and annul his sensuality" (p. 101). To such a Messiah the prophets had pointed, in the didactic, not in the predictive way; for according to our author, "to a delicate and penetrating criticism, it has long been manifest that the chief literal fulfilment by Christ of things said by the prophets, was the fulfilment such as would naturally be given by one who nourished his spirit on the prophets and on living and acting their words" (p. 114).

Christ skilfully seizes upon what the Jews supposed to be predictive utterances of the Old Testament prophets. "To rivet the attention on the indications of personal religion furnished by the Old Testament; to take the humble, inward, and suffering '*servant of God*' of the prophets, and to elevate *this* as the

Messiah, the seed of Abraham and David, in whom all nations should be blessed, whose throne should be as the days of heaven, who should redeem his people and restore the kingdom to Israel, was a work of the highest originality" (p. 91). This identification Christ effected, and so made an epoch! "Jesus could not but use the dominant phrases of the Jewish religion, if he was to talk to the Jewish people about religion at all" (p. 221); and while we cannot perfectly trust his reporters in regard to the terms by which he designated himself, "there is no difficulty in supposing him to have used any or all the terms which the Jews in any way used to describe the Messiah" (p. 225). "His concern was with his countrymen's idea of salvation, not with their terms for designating the bringer of it."

As for miracles there is no evidence that he wrought any or pretended to work any, or valued in the least the attestation which they were supposed to give. His unreliable reporters have put them in considerable numbers into the narrative. For that they are responsible and not he. And "there is nothing one would more desire for a person or document one greatly values, than to make them independent of miracles" (p. 133). The *Time-Spirit* is rapidly and thoroughly disposing of them, and it will be decidedly for Christ's advantage if we can throw this burden on the Evangelists rather than upon him. We may leave him the credit of a few cases of "moral therapeutics" (p. 144).

The work of Jesus, as our author conceives it, has been already described. There are a few things of which theologians make much, and suppose Christ to have made much, in respect to which it will be well to see how we are asked to change our notions. The main part of the change which we have been accustomed to call repentance, is "the setting up of an immense new inward movement for obtaining the rule of life" (p. 196). Faith is "the being able to cleave to a power of goodness appealing to our higher and real self, not to our lower and apparent self" (p. 236). "All good and fruitful prayer is in truth, however men may describe it, at bottom nothing else than energy of aspiration towards the Eternal, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness, of aspirations towards it, and co-operation with it. Nothing, therefore, can be more efficacious, more right, more real" (p. 43). Prayer has, however, a strangely strong

tendency to anthropomorphism; it delights to "make believe" that it is dealing with a person, that there is a person at each end of it. Of course the doctrines of a miraculous atonement, of justification, etc., are "astoundingly false," seen by "the light which the *Zeitgeist* is beginning to hold over them" (p. 303). The most offensive and profane paragraphs in the volume, in our view, are those in which the author travesties "the Protestant story of Justification" in his account of an imaginable transaction between three Lord Shaftesburys (pp. 306-7). This has called forth the indignant censure of critics much more indulgent towards liberal theology than ourselves. Of course the whole of Eschatology is disposed of in the same way. On the one hand none of its elements is verifiable, and on the other they are all demonstrably parts of Jewish superstition, and should have died eighteen hundred years ago.

Christ followed his own "method," followed his own "secret" even to the extent of dying for it, and by his sweet reasonableness won a few disciples, and laid the foundations of his church. "For them, it was a thing beyond all doubt that by miracles Christ manifested forth his glory and induced the faithful to believe in him" (p. 154); but in this they were mistaken; it was in fact the internal evidence, and this alone, that made them believers in him. They "were conscious" of the former, they "experienced" the latter kind of evidence (pp. 158-9).

Our three creeds, the Apostles, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, have grown out of "a supposed final charge from Jesus to his apostles: 'Go ye and teach all nations, etc.,' which it is almost impossible he can have given. . . . The genuine charge of Jesus to his apostles was, almost certainly, 'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you,' and not this. So that our three creeds, and with them the whole of our so-called orthodox theology, are founded upon words which Jesus in all probability never uttered" (pp. 279-81). And how is all this to be set right? We are to give up most of the criticism which has been employed on the New Testament, on such matters as the time when, the persons by whom, these books were written, and even the inquiry as to the real words of the writers.

To this literature thus turned adrift, and emptied of all certain contents, we are to devote *literary* criticism, which "is extremely difficult. It calls into play the highest requisites for the study

of letters; great and wide acquaintance with the history of the human mind, knowledge of the manner in which men have thought, their way of using words and what they mean by them, delicacy of perception and quick tact, and, besides all these, a favorable moment and the *Zeitgeist* " (p. 177). This is the nostrum by which the great spiritual evils of our time are to be cured. A Bible agreeing with the old in outward form, but differing from it by the withdrawal of such elements of truth and power as these; the personality and unity of God, the creation of the universe, all divine providence, all personal moral government, all moral responsibility except to oneself, all remedial provisions for sin and guilt, all help toward righteousness (the only thing remaining to be emphasized) except such as may be given by a highly original and exemplary teacher of righteousness, in regard to whom and whose teaching we can (except by intuition) know next to nothing, and in respect to whom and whose teaching most of the past judgments of his own followers now appear to be untrue! This is the way in which the Bible is to be saved to the masses, and the masses for the Bible! We refrain from further exhibition of it or comment on it. While in many vital matters it is very apparent what Dr. Arnold does not believe, it is much more difficult to decide what he does believe. With wearisome repetition on some points there is in others utter lack of clear statement. Personal pronouns are commonly used of God, and personal dispositions ascribed, after a Jewish manner, to what cannot be demonstrated to be anything more than a tendency. Christ is sent but it does not appear who sent him. In following the method and secret of Jesus in his spirit we shall have the witness and sanction of happiness for righteousness; but how this adjustment of righteousness and happiness to human nature is created and guaranteed is not obvious, when only a tendency is verifiable. The doctrine seems to be that things take care of themselves, and in our view they will do it better under the old than under this new religion of the Bible.

We cannot but contrast with this estimate of the Bible, which has been passing under our notice, the tribute of the veteran German critic, to whom we have already referred, Wolfgang Menzel. "It is the book of books, the source of eternal life, of comfort and strength for all the wretched and tried, a shield and weapon for innocence, an awakener of those spiritually asleep,

a guide out of the labyrinth of sin, and finally a terrible judgment to those that persist in sin. A book that has no like on earth, whose contents like the very eye of God should pierce so deep into every soul, that should be so thoroughly true, wiser than all books of law, richer than all books of instruction, more beautiful than all poems of the world, touching the heart more than a mother's speech, and yet of such spiritual depth that even the wisest does not exhaust it, accessible to the simplest, and at the same time elevating, refining to the loftiest and most cultivated, a light more than earthly, pervaded by a glow above that of the sun, a breathing of the eternal, that awakens in the prosperous in the midst of earth's sweet joy a deep homesickness, and fills the sufferer in the bitterest need of earth with unutterable rapture, the word from beyond, before which Belshazzar quaked, and before which Paul himself became speechless and blind, the word that looses and binds, kills and makes alive." (*u. s.*, p. 114).

---

#### ART. VI.—THE LATE COMMERCIAL CRISIS.

By LYMAN H. ATWATER, D.D., LL.D., Princeton.

THE late financial panic, with the consequences of which we are now struggling, is so variously and obviously implicated with morality and religion, that the consideration of its causes, effects and remedies, has a just claim on our pages. It is generally acknowledged to be immediately due to the great diversion of capital from its legitimate objects to premature and unproductive railways; to unprecedented stock speculation and gambling; to unexampled defalcations and breaches of trust; to overworked credit, involving the perilous and immoral risking of the property of others; to unreasonable extravagance of living, begetting undue haste to be rich; all intensified by an inconvertible paper currency, and the capricious speculative fluctuations of price and value thence resulting. All other breaches of faith and morality, which have been so pregnant with public