

of consolation, and successfully realizes the great problem of human life in this world.

Christian brethren, how is it that we know so little of the power and blessedness of faith in our own souls? How is it that we show so little of its power and blessedness in our lives? The great want of the times is the want of a clear, vital, confident faith. May God hasten the time when it shall be the truthful utterance of our individual experience as Christian men, confirmed by our lives as others know them: "The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God."

ARTICLE IV.

THEODORE PARKER AND ADONIRAM JUDSON.

BY REV. N. M. WILLIAMS, METHUEN, MASS.

THE current of events is giving weighty significance to the question: What kind of a ministry do the wants of men require? In attempting to make some little contribution to the answer, it may be advantageous to adopt the concrete method instead of the abstract. We propose, therefore, to compare Theodore Parker and Adoniram Judson as *representatives of opposite types of ministers*. Whichever of these types the world needs, churches, colleges, and theological seminaries should endeavor to aid in supplying.

In the selection of Judson as the representative of the one type, it is assumed that there is no substantial difference between a missionary and a minister at home. Both are preachers to men, and both are more or less engaged in the work of the pastor. The selection of the recent preacher of the Music Hall as the representative of the other type, is determined by the consideration that the style of ministers to which Mr. Parker belongs is that to which the "advanced" thought of England and the United States is

strongly tending. If there is any such thing as a "Termination Rock" in the new course of thought, that would seem to be the spot from which in part to form our judgment relative to the desirableness of working the ministry out to it. That body of ministers with which Mr. Parker may be regarded as forming, with others, the extreme left, has its extreme right in the evangelical church itself. It is proper therefore that the comparison should have reference to him, rather than to one who has not been thoroughly ripened off. Let us look at the two men with candor. Let us have no prejudice concerning either. Let us be controlled by fidelity to truth, by liberality toward persons. If we shall indulge in what the friends of either must regard as severity, let it be only the severity of facts. We shall doubtless find something in each that is adapted to our wants in training men for the ministry. In neither shall we find perfection. It is worthy of consideration that they were born in the same community, their native towns almost adjoining, and grouped with the neighboring cities, constituting one of the most thoroughly Christian communities in the world. What these men taught, and with what spirit they taught, are the two points which the general aim of the Article will require us to consider.

What did these men teach? What did they teach concerning the character of MEN?

"Sin," says Mr. Parker, "is one of the incidents of our attempt to get command over all our faculties. In learning to read, to write, how children mistake the letters, miscall the sounds, miswrite the words. Sin is a corresponding incident. We learn self-command by experiments which fail." "Sin, with its consequent pain, is transient as errors and mistakes." "If the first step is a fall, the step is still a progress, the fall is forward." "As blunders of the spirit are outgrown and half forgot, so it is with sin, — the world's sin, your sin and mine." "The pain of sin is the condition of growth." "Liability to sin is the indispensable condition of human freedom." "Men often exaggerate the amount

of sin. Murderers and thieves have a better nature which shall one day be awakened." "Suppose I am the blackest of sinners and should die such, still I am a child of God, of the infinite God; he foresaw the consequences of my faculties, of the freedom he gave me, of the circumstances which girt me round, and do you think he knows not how to bring me back, that he has not other circumstances in store to waken other faculties and lead me home, compensating my variable hate with his own constant love?" "Wise men begin to see that the majority of criminals are the victims of society more than its foes. There are licentious girls whom the errors of society force unconscious into degradation, into crime." "Each man has a right to perfect creation — creation from perfect motives of perfect material, as perfect means for a perfect purpose." "I have a natural, inalienable right to the providence of the infinite God; this providence is the duty of God." "If half the people are left uncared for by the powerful class, and turn out badly, steal, rob, and murder, knowing no better, have the men who have been careless a right to complain at the result?" In a letter, written from Rome in his last sickness, to Rev. J. Freeman Clark, Mr. Parker affirms that the thing which ministers mean by sin has no more existence than phlogiston, which was adopted to explain combustion. Sins are defined as conscious violations of natural right. "I seldom use the word sin, it is damaged phraseology, tainted with infamous notions of man and God. O James, I think the Christian doctrine of sin is the devil's own, and I hate it, hate it utterly." He thanks God that in the heathen classics we find no consciousness of sin. "In my body," he says "even now when it is really not worth much, there dwelleth many a good thing, spite of consumption and St. Paul." He attends the funeral of a child five or six years old. The father has no belief in the soul's immortality, and so Mr. Parker goes home and records that the man seemed a worthy man, humane, but with an unlucky method of philosophy.

The *Life and Correspondence* yields no proof that he was

accustomed to confess sin to the Supreme Being. According to the representations of the compiler, the nearest he comes to confession is in the following words taken from the prayer which he offered in the Music Hall the day after the unveiling of Beethoven's statue: "May we chastise ourselves for every mean and wicked thing." In a letter to Dr. Francis he says: "I have done wrong things no doubt; but the more I think of it, the more the general tendency of my path seems to me the true one." He appears never to have had a vivid consciousness of ill-desert, and what little sense of ill-desert he had seems to have become less as he advanced in years. Such were the teachings of Theodore Parker relative to sin. What were those of Adoniram Judson?

With Judson sin is not a mere attempt to get command of our faculties, but it is an awful, voluntary perversion of our free powers to evil. It is more than a violation of natural laws; it is a deliberate rebellion of the soul against the righteous will of a personal God. Judson taught, not that men have a better nature which works itself up through the superincumbent evil, and crowds the evil down and out, but that by nature love to the Creator is totally wanting in the human spirit. Instead of teaching that men are prone to exaggerate the amount of sin, he held that no man is conscious of all the sin within him, and that most men have but an extremely superficial knowledge of the evil of their own hearts or of the hearts of others. Apology for sin or the sinner never escaped his lips or his pen. He aimed to make Burmans, Karens, his own children, himself, feel that sin is the greatest conceivable wrong, admitting no apology, no extenuation, having in itself no possible limit of duration, but in its very nature self-perpetuating, eternal. He taught that each man comes into life, not with a "perfect creation," of "perfect material," but with inherited bias to evil.

Deeper consciousness of sin no man, it would seem, can have had. "In myself," he says, "I am absolute nothingness; and when by grace I get a glimpse of divine things, I tremble lest the next moment will snatch it away." "Grief

for the dear departed," he says in a letter, "combines with sorrow for present sin, and my tears flow at the same time over the forsaken grave of my love and over the loathsome sepulchre of my own heart." Writing to one of his missionary sisters he says: "I hope you will pray for me, for you have not such inveterate habits to struggle with as I have contracted through a long course of religious [?] sinning. Oh my past years in Rangoon are spectres to haunt my soul, and they seem to laugh at me as they shake the chains they have riveted on me. I can now do little more than beg my younger brethren and sisters not to live as I have done, until the Ethiopian becomes so black that his sin cannot be changed." He kneels before God with the last leaf of the Burman Bible in his hand, imploring forgiveness for all the sins which have polluted his labors in translating. "I have never done," he writes to one¹ who is still lingering among us in daily expectation of meeting him before the Redeemer's throne, "I have never done a single action which can claim the least merit or praise." He is again in his native country. His name has long been sounded throughout the world. In the judgment of others he stands first on the roll of suffering, self-denying, spiritual, successful missionaries. The press, announcing his arrival, extols his character and labors. The largest church edifices in the land cannot contain the multitudes that long to see his face and catch some whisper from his lips. But with what self-abasement he shrinks from the public eye! What unconsciousness of deserving such tributes! A great welcome-meeting is held in one of the most cultivated communities of New England. He returns to the dwelling of his host, his subsequent biographer. He conducts the evening family worship. "His prayer on that occasion," says Dr. Wayland, "can never be forgotten by those who heard it. So lowly abasement in the presence of unspotted holiness, such earnest pleadings for pardon for the imperfection of those services for which man praised him, so utter renunciation of all merit for anything

¹ Hon. Heman Lincoln.

that he had ever done, and so entire reliance for acceptance with God only on the merits and atonement of the Gospel sacrifice for sin, I think it was never my happiness to hear on any other occasion. Such I believe was the habitual temper of his mind that the more his brethren were disposed to exalt him, the more deeply did he seem to feel his own deficiencies, and the more humble was his prostration at the foot of the cross." His address in Washington was in the same spirit. "It has been said," he remarked, "that human praise to human ears is always sweet; but to me, as a missionary of the cross, it is only so when offered through me to my Lord." A miserable sinner in the sight of God; this is the sentiment which Adoniram Judson ever cherished, and not unfrequently expressed. Such were the sentiments of these men concerning sin.

Their respective views were radically and eternally contradictory. Whichever should be preached must be preached exclusively of the other. Which view is in the Bible? Put the sentiments of each of these men successively upon the lips of David, and which will accord with the spirit of the fifty-first Psalm? Put them on the lips of Paul, and which will blend with the representations found in the seventh chapter of Romans? Weave them separately into the sayings of Jesus Christ, and putting the two patterns side by side, in which shall we see incongruity? Let the pulpits of Christendom preach that each man, having a right to perfect creation, comes into the world perfectly created; that sin is an incident needful to one's development; that Edward W. Green when he shot young Converse fell forward; that when the little Joyce children, weaving their pretty wreaths in the fragrant woods of Roxbury were assaulted and abused and murdered, the fiend fell forward; let men preach in the prisons of the world: Take heart! for the deeds which brought you hither were but incidents of your attempt to get command of your faculties; let them go to the hells of great cities and cry: Courage! you are getting command of your faculties; let them gather together on some moun-

tain side all the defaulters and burglars and incendiaries and brothel keepers and thieves and liars that infest society, and preach to them this: that their several doings are but incidents needful to their development; let them preach in the sayats of the East that the universal falsehood, theft, and licentiousness of Burmah are proof that the people are universally falling forward; let this be the prevalent style of preaching relative to sin; let this be the doctrine which our institutions of learning shall teach to students for the ministry, and how soon will the people of the earth be made spiritual and devout? A poor old woman is sitting at her apple-stand with her knitting work, in the shade of a tree at the gate of a city park, to get means with which to buy her bread. As I tell her that the bill which she has shown me is counterfeit, she says with trembling lips and many tears that she just took it from a very well-dressed gentleman to whom she had sold more fruit than she had sold all the morning besides, and to whom she had given nearly every cent of her change. How great the comfort I can give her! "True, mother, it was a base, very base, most contemptible act; but did you never hear what the great Theodore Parker says? He says that sin is an incident needful to one's development. The man has done a wicked, mean thing; but dry up your tears, good mother, and go cheerfully to work again, for the man is developing into goodness! He fell, but he fell forward!"

Beyond all question there are needed as deep consciousness of sin in the teachers of religion, as skilful and courageous dissection of the character of men, as in the age of Augustine or Paul. Not less in the most refined communities of New England than in the debased villages of Africa, are needed pulpit views of sin which shall not be a whit less thorough than those which were preached by Adoniram Judson. Depravity inherited; sin, voluntary rebellion against the will of a personal God, losing none of its power or desert by the progress of human thought; eternal condemnation threatened to every man that commits it,—these comprise

that doctrine of sin which every minister must preach without fear, without apology, and which, therefore, churches, education societies, and ordaining councils must demand of those who ask to be helped into the ministry. If such views of sin are becoming, under the rationalizing tendencies of English and American thinking, more repulsive, not only to much of the educated mind of our country, but to the mass of the people, that is precisely the reason why our young men should be trained to preach them with unsparing plainness.

What did Theodore Parker and Adoniram Judson teach concerning Jesus Christ? At twenty-four years of age Mr. Parker believed that Jesus Christ was miraculously conceived. At twenty-six he wrote a poetic description of Jesus:

“ Jesus, there is no dearer name than thine
 Which time has blazoned on his mighty scroll;
 No wreaths nor garland ever did entwine
 So fair a temple of so vast a soul.
 There every virtue set his triumph seal,—
 Wisdom, conjoined with strength and radiant grace,—
 In a sweet copy heaven to reveal,
 And stamp perfection on a mortal face;
 Once on the earth went thou before men’s eyes,
 That did not half thy beauteous brightness see;
 E’en as the emmet does not read the skies,
 Nor our weak orbs look through immensity.”

At the age of thirty-one years he wrote: “ Whether such a being [a man ‘wiser, better, holier’ than Jesus] ever will be created, no one can tell but he who possesses the riddle of the world ”; at thirty-four: “ I do not know that he [Jesus] did not teach some errors also. . . . That God has greater men in store I doubt not ”; at thirty-six he wrote: “ I can’t say there never will be a greater man in morality and religion, though I can conceive of none now. Who knows what is possible for man? If Jesus had lived now, I think he would have been greater; yes, if he had lived to be forty, fifty, sixty, or seventy years old; why not? How much of the excellence of Jesus came from organization I don’t know. . . . May we not one day have a man with the

philanthropic genius of a Socrates, the poetic of a Homer, the practical of a Napoleon, and the religion of a Christ?" At thirty-eight he said: "He [Jesus] was in some things fettered by the follies of his nation"; at forty-two: "When he [Jesus] reached the age of thirty he must have made mistakes in his intellectual processes, and in his moral and religious processes. We always stumble in new things; the greatest men must do so." At forty-nine he affirms that the black washer-woman on Negro Hill, as, with a frowsy broom and mop and a tub or two, she keeps the wolf away from her unfathered babies, all fugitives from slavery, and thence looks up to that dear God whom she so feels within her heart a present help in her hour of need,—which is her every hour,—to him seems not less glorious than Jesus of Nazareth on his mountain uttering his beatitudes. The common forms of idolatry 'among the pious' Mr. Parker declares to be 1. The Bible; 2. Jesus Christ. He would not say that Jesus had a complete comprehension of all the meaning of his own words. "I make a distinction," he says, "between his theology and his religion. His theology seems to have had many Jewish notions in it, wholly untenable in our day." "His theology contained a considerable mixture of error."

The progress of his mind may be stated more briefly thus:

At twenty-four years of age he believes in the miraculous conception of Jesus; at twenty-six he believes Jesus to be perfect; at thirty-one he has no opinion whether a better man will ever be created; at thirty-four he has no doubt that God has greater men in store; at thirty-eight he believes that Jesus was fettered by the follies of his age; at forty-two he believes that Jesus made mistakes in his moral and religious processes; at forty-nine he considers Jesus as not more glorious than a black washer-woman on Negro Hill working to save her babes from starvation.

As to salvation by Christ, that is quite out of the record. Men not being lost, there can be no need of effort to save them. "The minister of the future, we are told, will not

aim to add the imputed righteousness of a good man to help us to an unreal heaven. Think of the eight and twenty thousand Protestant churches of America, with their eight and twenty-thousand Protestant ministers, with a free press and a free pulpit, and think of their influence if every man of them believed in the infinite God, and taught that the service of God was by natural piety within and natural morality without; that there was no such thing as imputed righteousness or salvation by Christ; but that real righteousness was honored before God, and salvation by character, by effort, by prayer, and by toil, was the work. Then what a nation should we have; aye, what a world!"

"All the great historic forms of religion," says Mr. Parker, "the Brahminic, the Hebrew, Classic, Buddhistic, Christian, Mohammedan, profess to have come miraculously from God, not normally from man; and spite of the excellence which they contain, and the vast service the humblest of them has done, yet each must ere long prove a hinderance to human welfare. I wonder ministers don't see that Christianity is one leaf in this immense tree [religion], and must fall when its work is done. Christianity is one form of religion among many." We see, then, what sort of a Christ we must educate our young men to preach if they ought to take Theodore Parker as the model.

The Christ which Adoniram Judson preached is as different as were the sentiments of the two concerning sin. The apostle of Burmah held that Jesus Christ is not merely one of the few great men whom the revolution of time throws off from our common humanity, but he held that no other being of similar origin and character has ever appeared among men or ever will. He taught that in the beginning he was with God and was God, that he came into the world with a nature secured against even the least conceivable tendency to sin, and that he continued to the last unsoiled by the pollution with which he was daily in contact. Holding that men are lost, he taught that Jesus Christ is the Saviour; holding that men are dead, he taught that none

but God can make them alive ; holding that God's law had been dishonored, he taught that Jesus Christ had restored it to its glory by his sufferings and death ; holding that the law denounces a penalty against sin, he taught that the sufferings of Christ are substitutional ; holding that the law requires perfect righteousness, he taught that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him that believes ; holding that the reason cannot be satisfied with one's claim to a supernatural mission unless supported by well-attested supernatural works, he taught the duty of cheerfully accepting the record of the Saviour's miracles ; holding the evidence to be conclusive that Jesus was sent by God, he taught that all the processes of his mind were secured against the possibility of error. He taught all this, not as dogmas of the schools, but as the life of his once enthralled but afterward liberated spirit. With Judson the authority of Jesus Christ was decisive ; with Parker Jesus was not permitted even an equal share of weight with " the intuitions of reason." Judson's intellect, keener than Parker's, better balanced, not so intensely realistic, with greater power of concentration and a much wider sweep of generalization, bowed to Jesus Christ in everything ; the intellect of the Music Hall preacher bowed only to Theodore Parker. According to both, Jesus believed in an actual, personal devil. Parker knew better ; Judson made no pretence to knowing anything at all concerning the subject except what Jesus taught him. Parker never took Jesus Christ as the sovereign of his soul ; Judson knew no other sovereign. Parker did not love Jesus as his personal Saviour ; for, according to " the intuitions of reason," Jesus had no more to do with his salvation than Alexander the coppersmith ; Judson mourned that he loved him so little. Judson died for Christ a hundred times over in the prisons of Ava and Oungpenla ; Parker, sooner than he would have died for Jesus Christ as his Saviour, would have died to prove to the world that Jesus was not more glorious than some trustful " washer-woman on Negro Hill." Judson spent life in preaching Christ up against the idolatry

of Oriental empires. Parker spent life in preaching Christ down as already one of the great "idols" of men. "Oh let me travel through this country," exclaims the missionary, "and bear testimony to the truth all the way from Rangoon to Ava, and show the path to that glory which I am anticipating. Oh, if Christ will only sanctify me and strengthen me, I feel that I can do all things."

" In these deserts let me labor,
On these mountains let me tell,
How he died — the blessed Saviour, —
To redeem a world from hell."

So it is Christ as the Almighty Saviour whom Judson preaches, whether speaking to the king, the prince, the pundit, the British military commander, the sailor, or the uncultivated Karen. While the Boston preacher, as we have seen, thought more disparagingly of Christ even to the last year of his life, the missionary declared, as he drew near to the end of his great work, that he had never in all his life before had such delightful views of the unfathomable love and infinite condescension of the Saviour as were daily opening before him. "Oh, the love of Christ," he would suddenly exclaim, while his eye kindled and the tears chased each other down his cheek.

Now if the Christ of the recent aspirant to the leadership of American thought is the Christ of God and of history, the churches should have the courage to demand that every applicant for a license shall preach such a Christ. We should strike immediately and boldly for a change. If the Jesus that Mr. Parker preached is the Jesus that he ought to have preached, the Jesus whom evangelical ministers preach is one that they should preach no more. We should revolutionize the churches, should buckle on the armor and fight for the overthrow of the people's faith, should withhold sympathy from our theological seminaries, should insist that the trustees and faculties shall dethrone the Christ of the churches and put this other Christ in his place. Not another student should be permitted to depart bearing on his spirit

the likeness of any other than an anti-supernatural, error-teaching, non-atoning, unrisen Christ. Nor should we cease till our religious periodicals shall have begun to bring the likeness of such a Christ weekly before the eyes of our children ; not till every man in the country shall refuse to sing,

“ Oh, could we speak the matchless worth,
Oh, could we sound the glories forth,
Which in our Saviour shine.”

not till our hills and valleys shall re-echo concerning the Christ of the present :

“ Ashamed of Jesus ! yes, I may,
For I've no guilt to wash away ;
No tear to wipe, no good to crave,
No fears to quell, no soul to save ! ”

If Judson's Christ is the Christ of the New Testament, it is a serious account that ministers will be called to give if they shall preach any other. They may shrink from putting to the lips of their people the poisoned chalice of Parker or Renan, but unconsciously infected by the death-bearing miasma of rationalism, may deceive themselves with the hope that salvation by Christ can be so explained as to be readily accepted by the culture of the world. Let them beware, however, of attempting to make a vicarious sacrifice acceptable to the unrenewed heart. The attempt will prove them to have taken up the line of march on which, at the front, though perhaps far in advance, are the boldest deniers of the truth. It is the first shrinking of the spirit from the duty of meeting the natural heart with the unwelcome truth that we can be saved only through the substituted sufferings of Christ, that must be watched and resisted. Are there not members of evangelical churches in England and our own country who are teaching sentiments concerning the death of Christ, which, if those men shall not blink their own logic, will lead them to deny Christ and the Bible as supernatural ? In his review of Dr. Channing's works, Renan rallies the prince of American Unitarians for inconsistency : “ A singular rationalist to reason away the deity of Christ, and yet

receive the miracles." Channing is floored. Renan is the more logical of the two. So the new school Unitarians are more consistent than the old school. "The whole or nothing" is the inexorable demand of logic. We should beware, then, of the first step in the rationalistic method of interpreting the scriptures. Ministers may preach Christ, but not salvation by Christ. They may preach salvation by Christ, but not salvation by the death of Christ. They may preach salvation by the death of Christ, but not salvation by a vicarious sacrifice, propitiation. They may preach a vicarious sacrifice, justification by faith, imputed righteousness, but not preach the way of life as revealed in the gospel.

The amplest justification of these assertions will be found in one of the recent books of Dr. Horace Bushnell. Dr. Bushnell believes in salvation by Christ, but not in substitution. He believes in salvation by the death of Christ, but not in substitution. He believes in propitiation, imputed righteousness, justification by faith, but not in substitution. He believes in a vicarious sacrifice, but not in substitution. How can he accept those while he rejects this? Only by rationalizing away the commonly received meaning of these old theological terms; but substitution seems to have some—we know not what—peculiar property which has hitherto saved it from the touch of the destructive criticism. It is a hard word for them. Rationalism may yet give us a volume on "substitution," in which, after the word shall have been emptied of its long-cherished meaning, the doctrine shall seem to be held; but for the present the term is left us, and is nearly the only term pertaining to the way of salvation which the book on vicarious sacrifice has not attempted to misappropriate. With consummate skill in marshalling arguments, with beauty of style scarcely paralleled, so far as we know, in the whole range of English theological literature, the book cannot but captivate some imaginative and inaccurate minds; but analyze it, sublimate the analysis, and the residuum is merely this: "Vicarious sacrifice is something which Christ did by the moral power of his char-

acter, to invest us with personal righteousness." We have seen what Theodore Parker and Adoniram Judson taught concerning the character of man and concerning Jesus Christ.

With what spirit did they teach? In the first place it should be remarked that, notwithstanding his general cheerfulness and the frequent outbursts of wit and fun, Mr. Parker's Life and Correspondence discloses a deep under-current of sadness. "I know not why," he writes in the earlier part of his life,

"I know not why, but heavy is my heart;
The sun all day may shine, the birds may sing,
And men and women blithely play their part;
Yet still my heart is sad, I cannot smile
As I could smile all day in long past youth;
There is no art my sorrows to beguile.
Daily from utmost heaven descendeth truth;
I look upon her with an unmoved face,
And feel no leaping heart when fixed in her embrace."

"It is plain," says Mr. Weiss, his rationalistic biographer, "that these accesses of sadness may be credited to a jaded spirit." "I feel," he writes at the age of eighteen, "like a broken-hearted and ruined man, and think sometimes it was a mercy if Providence would take me back; not less a mercy to others than to me." At twenty-six he writes: "Indeed I have felt blue, terribly blue, all the week. I never speculate on the causes of such chilling damps that come over the soul." Two years later he exclaims: "I have lost many things; the greatest was hope. Days there have been when I saw naught else to freshen my eye, weary with looking over the dull waste of my early life." "Never knew till now," he says in 1842, "the sadness of that perpetual disappointment of hoping, hoping, and finding nothing come of that hope. . . . Oh, how our life is streaked with sadness! I shall begin to believe, with some weeper, that all the birds sing in the key of grief, for the stars look melancholy now to me." He declares that he cannot account for his sadness; he is well in body and temperate in meats and

drinks. The missionary's heart sometimes overflowed with sorrow on account of sin, accompanied, however, with joy under the forgiving love of God; but he was a stranger to such ground-swells of unaccountable sadness. Mr. Weiss gives us no reason to suppose that this trait of Mr. Parker's was constitutional. Nature seems to have dealt not less kindly with him in this respect than with Judson. We have reason to believe that his sadness would have burst out oftener and rushed on with destructive violence, had he not held it in check by plunging with terrible energy into work. Which, in this respect, is the better model, it is not difficult to decide.

Mr. Parker was a man of unbounded self-confidence. He has studied this matter "of the divine origin of the Bible and the divine nature of Jesus of Nazareth" all his life; and if he understands anything he understands this. All the men in the world cannot make him believe that he does not know a good deal more concerning the other world than Jesus Christ. He contends against the Universalists, that Christ taught the doctrine of endless punishment, and contends against Christ, that the doctrine has no foundation in fact. It must be affirmed also that Mr. Parker was a very ambitious man. Even his sympathizing biographer, with fatal blindness to the incongruity of the representation, says that he was filled with piety and pure feelings, yet was very self-reliant and ambitious. Judson was not a whit less ambitious by nature than Parker, but nothing can exceed the thoroughness with which the vice seems to have been extirpated long before he died. Parker's egotism — vanity — is in marked contrast with Judson's humility. Scholarship, in his judgment, is narrow, if not employed in such destructive habits of criticism as he delights to revel in, and in such acquisitions as can be found only in the countless tomes of German infidelity. Dr. Channing is no scholar; there is a most woful neglect of sound study of all kinds among Unitarian clergymen; he knows of only four scholars in the entire Unitarian sect. This is an utterance sufficiently

sweeping for a man of whom it has been justly said¹ that the amount of his accurate and reliable knowledge was by no means remarkable. "We do not," says the writer, "recall a single important topic which he has treated in a manner indicative of thorough scholarship. Haste, incorrectness, confusion, misconception, and misrepresentation, are well-nigh omnipresent. . . . The only important translation from his hand, made from the language with which among all foreign tongues he may fairly be presumed to have been most familiar, was so faulty, that its author was pronounced by a prominent British quarterly to be 'grossly ignorant of German,' and was held up to ridicule as 'a conceited and ignorant translator.'"

One of the most painful features of Mr. Parker's character remains to be told; and it is one concerning which people are strangely ignorant. Men have been taught that Mr. Parker's heart was the home of all manner of excellence; that it was distinguished for kindness, amiability, charity. Now his own biographer — and let us depend on him alone in attempting to make good what is affirmed — presents his character, without any apparent intention to do so, in quite another light. On the basis of the *Life and Correspondence*, we affirm that the subject of the biography was either a grossly self-ignorant man, or was guilty of intentional misrepresentation of himself.

One of his own friends had addressed him upon the duty of refraining from sarcasm and abuse in his allusions to those whose religious opinions differed from his own. Instead of acknowledging the error, instead of confessing that he might possibly be chargeable with the fault, and thanking his friend for the hint, he returns an answer as follows: "I am by no means conscious of giving utterance to 'an unchristian-like sneer or an unkind accusation' in any of my writings, preachings, or prayings. I do not admit the justice of your remarks about sneering tones. I never spoke of such as have faith in the gospel record in terms of sarcasm

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. xviii. p. 48

and abuse, say Mr. — what he will. . . . I never mocked at anything. I am not aware of uttering contumely and reproach." Again he writes: "I have not sat in the seat of the scornful." Such are his assertions; what are the facts?

Even his biographer speaks of "the blunt and distasteful way in which he sometimes uttered his criticisms." Thus speaks Mr. Parker of the Lord's supper: "On what terms shall persons be admitted to the communion; i.e. on what terms shall a person be allowed once a month in a meeting-house, on Sunday, to eat a crumb of baker's bread and drink a sip of grocer's wine which the deacon has bought at a shop the day before? The Lord's supper I don't like, as it is now administered. It is a heathenish rite and means very little, I think." He recommends coming together in a parlor and eating, if one likes, curds and cream and baked apples. When Mr. Parker was a divinity student in Cambridge, Dr. Ware suggested that it was not quite courteous to say "old Paul." The "gentleman from Tarsus" was the style in which the apostle was thenceforth referred to. Whatever may be the shock to the reader's sensibilities, it seems necessary to put the last touch upon this terrible portrait by the following quotation: "To me the name of Christianity is most exceeding dear." Can self-ignorance or misrepresentation go further? How many parallels with such a mental phenomenon can be found in the history of the world? No doubt Mr. Parker's sympathies were warm except toward great multitudes of his fellow-men; his love of justice intense, except in many very important directions; his spirit genial and amiable, save toward all from whom he differed, which, unfortunately for himself, were the greater part of mankind. Not the least of the many blots upon his character is his fierce impeachment of men's motives; as those of Horace Mann: "I like not his having prayers three times a day at his table. It was an official, not a personal act, and savors of hypocrisy. It was done for example, but it was an instance of falseness to his convictions."

Against no people did Mr. Parker hurl such bolts as against

the Unitarians. Of Judson and Moses Stuart he spoke with much kindness. With few exceptions he spoke of Unitarian clergymen as Unitarian clergymen then were, with great bitterness. It is but just to remark that on the whole the Unitarians kept their temper as well as could be expected; and the remarkably catholic spirit which they are now showing toward him is certainly a beautiful illustration of the spirit of forgiveness. That no undeserved credit is given them will appear from the words of one of the most distinguished Unitarian clergymen in our country, Rev. Dr. Bellows. "There is no place of safety," says Dr. Bellows, "in the Unitarian body, for any Christian who is afraid of fellowship with such men as Theodore Parker. We have a hundred men, I presume, in our pulpits, who look up to him as one of the best Christians, and one of the greatest spiritual forces that Divine Providence has vouchsafed to our denomination or our generation."¹

Should we make a formal attempt to prove that such traits as we have just seen inhering in Mr. Parker were no part of the character of Judson, it would seem like admitting that the world's verdict had fallen into doubt. The chief fault of the missionary was born of his intense self-condemnation, so that it partook scarcely less of a virtue than of a fault. It was the error of one, who, though he had already attained uncommon lustre, was striving to get rid of the last speck of sin. Such blotches as we have been compelled to see in another, were it possible to transfer them to him, would be as incongruous to his character as the quills of a porcupine to a bird of paradise. Near the close of his life, however, Mr. Parker requested his friends to erase from his letters everything personal which would be likely to wound the feelings of those concerning whom it had been written: "In the flush and fun of letter writing I may have said what would one day give needless pain, should some prying eye see it and some busy tongue prattle thereof." Oh that Mr. Parker had embraced in the request all that he had written

¹ *Christian Examiner*, November, 1866.

in derogation of Jesus Christ! But it gives us sincere pleasure to mention even this. The request is honorable to his memory, and the non-compliance with it is disreputable to his friend, follower, and biographer, John Weiss. Such was the general spirit of Mr. Parker and Mr. Judson as they prosecuted their life-work. Which is the better model?

Mr. Parker made no effort to extend his opinions concerning religion to that vast multitude of his fellow-men that most needed them, if true. Why should not the sentiments which he taught with such fiery zeal at home have been sent to the heathen? Is there anything in their nature which palsies effort for the universal good? If Christianity is not a universal religion what can justify the non-organization of effort to send the true religion to men? Is that the benevolence of the universal religion? Let that religion answer for itself. Says M. Renan in his religions history and criticism: "As to the savage races, those sad survivors of an infant world, before making Christians of them, we should have to make them men; and it is doubtful if we should succeed in doing that. The poor Otaheitan is trained to attend mass or sermon, but the incurable softness of his brain is not remedied, he is only made to die of melancholy or ennui. Oh, leave these lost children of nature to fade away on their mother's bosom; let us not with our stern dogmas, disturb their childish play, their dances by moonlight, their hour of sweet intoxication. The great mistake of the Jesuits, the idea that man gets his education from without, by means of artificial processes and pious machinery, is at the bottom of all missions."

In the zeal with which he winged his sentiments through his own country, concerning both Christianity and slavery, Mr. Parker is a model for evangelical ministers. His determination, deliberately adopted, to destroy the Christianity of the people, was followed with consuming energy: "No man shall shut my lips; if I cannot get an audience in one place I will find one in another; the attention of men I will have; so help me God." This was his purpose; he did as

he purposed. "I took great pains," he says "with the composition of my sermons; they were never out of my mind; I had an intense delight in writing and preaching." The clearness, vivacity, fire, of his style, though his style has faults, are in mortifying contrast with the soporific style of many preachers of the truth. What he said was said with the force of a thunderbolt, and that because his soul was a magazine of thunderbolts. Thunder cannot be made outside to order. The capacious Music Hall was not enough for him. Working in his study like a Cyclops, he bursts from the bounds of the city and travels from Maine to Missouri, ostensibly to lecture upon literature and politics, but really to inoculate the public with his sentiments upon religion. The long night-ride, with no supper before his lecture and none after, the cold room and cold bed, the tough steak and sour biscuit, the coldness of former friends, the bitterness of political foes, the necessity of contending with inherited disease, baffles him not. He seldom murmurs, never parades his trials as some ministers of the true faith parade theirs, never stops to tell the world through the papers what presents his people have made him, but thanks his people privately; never talks discouragingly of "the cause," but marches on with a lion's heart to battle the popular religion, and sow down the battle-field with seed which he had imported from granaries in Germany. Such was his zeal at home; but his religion had no wings to bear itself to pagan lands.

See Judson cutting himself adrift from the higher forms of civilization, abjuring the pleasures of literature, taking up his abode in the centre of the earth's population, not daunted by exposure to brutal imprisonment, with almost no one near to speak a word of cheer, working one, two three, four, five years, without seeming to have drawn one human spirit to his Master, yet saying, "I would not leave my present situation to be made a king," working almost through the sixth year before he can say, I have won a soul; see him giving away all his earthly possessions to help secure

the object of his heart; declining three successive invitations to suspend his labors, and seek temporary rest in the land of his birth; and when at length compelled to do so, hastening back to his work with an eagerness that seems almost allied to impatience; see him through all his career, casting away every impediment from without and from within, that he may the more certainly attain the object of his life—the renewal of an empire of souls—which he regards as but one scene in the great drama, the ultimate regeneration of the race. See Judson thus at work as a preacher, as a pastor, as a translator, with this world-wide comprehensiveness, without permitting himself to be diverted from his purpose for thirty-seven years, and it will appear that he, rather than Theodore Parker, is a representative of the ministry which the world needs.

It is time to sum up the characteristics of the two men. We may say, then, that according to his published life, Mr. Parker was a man of uncommon ability and learning, of vast industry, of illogical cast of mind, great sensibility, obstinacy of will, sadness kept down by hard work, and extreme severity. We are under the necessity of saying that he was irreverent, illiberal, sarcastic, and sometimes positively slanderous; that he was guilty of impugning the motives of men and charging them with hypocrisy, without the least foundation for it; that his views of sin were radically false; that he regarded Jesus as having made mistakes in his moral and religious processes; that he had no belief in the necessity of salvation by Christ; that in some things he was very conscientious, in others not at all so; in some things had a sharp sense of justice, in others had none at all; toward certain classes had, as he ought to be ever honored for having, great benevolence, but was wanting in active sympathy with hundreds of millions of the race; that, while he was among the foremost in self-denying labors for the good of the colored population, he was more active in effort to subvert the authority of the Bible, and to make men believe that reason is authority enough. In a word, we must say in

estimating his intellect, that Mr. Parker was a man of little originality, except in the use of words, having borrowed from others what theology and philosophy he had; and in estimating his heart we must say that according to the common law of England and the United States he was often well-nigh indictable for the crime of blasphemy.

Of Mr. Judson it may be said that, though a man of learning, he was not equal in this respect to Mr. Parker; that he was endowed, however, with a better balanced, more discriminating, more logical, more accurate mind; that, though he was naturally very ambitious, his ambition early gave way to an impulse infinitely safer and purer; that he had great strength of will without obstinacy, and perfect singleness of aim directed toward the loftiest possible object; that he was a man "of singularly happy temperament"; that illiberality, sarcasm, impeachment of men's motives, are spots that never defiled his character, but that on the contrary he was eminently kind and charitable; that he was profoundly conscious of sin, yet a firm believer in the certainty of forgiveness through the substituted sufferings of the Son of God; that he was intensely interested in the welfare of all his fellow-men, and consecrated his eminent abilities with unsurpassed self-denial and energy to its promotion, giving to one entire nation a translation of that book, the authority of which Mr. Parker did all in his power to destroy.

The two men are before us in their teachings and spirit. They are before us as the representatives of opposite types of ministers. The comparison that has been made may seem to some to have been a waste of words; but if making Theodore Parker our model in training men for the ministry seems improbable, it should be considered that it is not impossible. Impossible it can be made by guarding against the possibility. Not gloomily should we look upon the present state of Christianity; for not one sign of decrepitude can be seen. God is vindicating his truth. His spirit is seeking the lost; revivals abound; evangelical Christians, though still retaining distinct denominational outlines, are

learning to hold them in love, and to feel that in effort to obey the great commission they are one. Never before have the treasures of wealth been so freely opened to aid the Christian cause. Pagans are believing; northern and central Europe are convalescent; victory blazes on the banners. We are, therefore, no alarmists in respect to the world as a whole; yet how can we shut our eyes to the fact that the old enemy has marshalled his forces for a new conflict? Was it not affirmed a few years ago that the seeds of rationalism which some were sowing would bring forth a fearful harvest? But mark how deceitful the process. There is one thing in the old-fashioned Voltaire infidelity that one cannot but like; it was honest; it never stole the livery of heaven to serve the devil in; it was not ashamed to flaunt its own name; it preferred to be known as a downright hater of all that bore even the name of Christian. That was fair. We cannot help respecting it for that one good quality. If we go back many hundred years before Voltaire till we get to Hierocles in the fourth century, Porphyry in the third, Celsus in the second, then, too, we shall find an infidelity that never was ashamed of the name. It stood up manfully to its chosen work, not trying to shelter itself under the name of Christianity. That was fair. The current, most popular form of infidelity, in addition to the ancient characteristics, has also this: a pretty thorough shame of its own signature. It rejects the Old Testament, yet it is Christian; it rejects the Epistles, yet it is Christian; it rejects the Gospels, yet it is Christian; it denies that Jesus was miraculously conceived, yet it is Christian; it denies that he raised Lazarus from the dead, yet it is Christian; it denies him as a mediator between God and man, yet it is Christian; it denies him the title of Lord, yet it is Christian; it affirms that the Bible contains errors in doctrine and fact, still it is Christian. That is not fair; it is undertaking to act Hamlet not only without Hamlet, but without the king, and without Horatio and without Polonius and without the queen, without the ghost, and without Ophelia. It must be admitted

that the old style of infidelity was low, coarse, vulgar; but as already said, we knew where to find it. The current rationalism must therefore be put a little below the infidelity of Voltaire himself, as Satan must be put considerably lower by all good judges of character for coming to Eve as serpent instead of devil. That way of coming was mean as well as wicked.

Let us hope, however, that the mask will yet be thrown off. On the thirty-first of May, 1867, a convention was held in the city of Boston to consider "the condition, wants, and prospects of free religion in America." Youth and middle life and old age, all degrees of culture and both sexes, were represented. It must be admitted that the most active spirits of the meeting seemed to have at last attained such a degree of virtue as to manifest no desire to be considered as fighting under the banner of Christianity. "Religion," said one of the speakers, "is one thing, and Christianity is another." "Whether the Bible teaches future punishment or not," said another, "our own spirits, the light that shines within us, teaches us there is none. The men of science, God's prophets, say that we must bow down not to Jesus Christ, but to the Infinite Spirit." "The great Messiah, as he is called," said a well-known Quakeress, "and there have been some great ones since." A letter was read by the president of the convention, which was written, we were told, by a liberal Jew who was unable to be present. "Truth," said the writer, "is the only redeemer I acknowledge"; and this brought applause from the convention. "We profess," said a clergyman from New Hampshire, "no discipleship to Jesus." "Religion," said another, a writer for the *Atlantic Monthly*, "is the affirmation of spirit made in the soul of man, the report which the spirit makes of itself. So we can say, I know." He denied that logic has anything to do with the matter. He wanted no premises, for spirit is self-affirmation. Said another gentleman, also a well-known writer for the *Atlantic Monthly*: "The moment we call ourselves by the name of Christ we lose the real expression of truth.

We take Christ as a leader so far as we take any man as a leader." It is enough to add that whenever the name of Theodore Parker was mentioned, and whenever anything was said against Jesus Christ, the convention greeted it with rapturous applause. We may presume, then, that by-and-by rationalism will everywhere have the honesty to discard the name of Christian, and be known, as it seemed almost willing to be known in this convention, by its appropriate name. There is no safe position between that taken by Theodore Parker and that held by Adoniram Judson. He who begins to rationalize away the word of God, even at a single point, is in danger of dashing through the entire course till he is precipitated upon the rocks of infidelity. We have no hesitation, therefore, in concluding that the type of ministers which the world still needs is substantially that which is represented in Adoniram Judson.

ARTICLE V.

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD'S PROVIDENCE.

BY DR. BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT, CLINTON, N. Y.

PART II.¹—ITS SUBJECTIVE ASPECTS; OR, THE DEVELOPING POWER UPON THE HEART AND LIFE OF TRUE VIEWS OF ITS NATURE AND WORKINGS.

EVERY truth has its value in its uses. It becomes in itself, as such, as soon as it is discovered, a law of action in higher or lower relations, in the physical, intellectual, or moral direction in which it manifests its existence. He who is continually discovering new truths is in the same measure discovering new responsibilities.

We shall the more easily comprehend the true practical bearings of the doctrine of God's providence if we gather about our minds, more closely, ere we proceed to their consid-

¹ For Part I. see Vol. xxi p. 584.