

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

and on what it expends itself. The spiritual worth of man, which is that of a moral being, gives to him the law of action, the only applicable estimate of utility. That line of action, and that only, is useful to him which is right. The absolute, perfect utility of holiness grows out of the nature of virtue, and all the mechanism of man and society is attached to and revolved by this shaft.

ARTICLE V.

LIFE OF THE PATRIARCH CYRIL.

BY DR. A. G. PASPATI, CONSTANTINOPLE.

[NOTE. — This Essay was forwarded for publication in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* by Dr. Hamlin, of Constantinople. It is interesting as the production of a foreigner, writing in a language foreign to him, and containing various intimations in regard to the history of the Greek church; its relations to the Catholic and Protestant churches; the advantages which it has enjoyed, as well as the disadvantages which it has suffered, for attaining a correct faith, etc. The Essay was originally read, in March 1864, before the Literary Society of Bebek; and, contrary to our usual practice, we have retained its original form of direct address. We have chosen to publish it precisely as it was delivered, with the exception of a slight verbal change made here and there, in order to remove some obscurity resulting from the author's foreign idiom.]

It was with a feeling of reluctance that I accepted the invitation to address an English and American audience. As the proposition, however, came from Dr. Hamlin, a friend endeared to me by an intercourse of many years, I felt it a duty to accede to his wishes. Knowing that I was to address you in a language foreign to me, it seemed very natural that I should choose a subject familiar to me, so as to compensate for the uncouthness of my style and diction.

I intend this evening to invite your attention to an episode in the history of the Greek church of Constantinople at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when a battle was fought in this city between Catholics, Greeks, and Protes-

tants, and sustained for many years, until the disappearance of the hero of the battle. It was a mighty struggle, which would have been full of eventful consequences for the Greek church had the champion been permitted to live.

Why have I chosen a subject of this nature? Why talk on ecclesiastical matters, and ecclesiastical strifes, that have marred the beauty and embittered the sweetness of the Christian faith! It is because Constantinople has been, from the earliest ages, one of the great nursery-places of Christianity. Even in a political point of view it has been acting a prominent part in the history of the world for the space of sixteen hundred years. First, an insignificant city, it became the capital of a Christian and Turkish empire. Rome and Athens are revered for what they were; but Constantinople is still full of life. No traveller passes its solitary streets to look at decayed monuments or vestiges of past glory. It still lives a life of bloom, a life of its former days. Can the same be said of its sister cities, Rome and Athens?

Those of you who have visited the heights of Chánlitza, over Scutari, know that above the fountains and the ordinary lounging-places of visitors is a cluster of trees, under which find shelter from the scorching sun the flocks that graze upon those treeless hills. What a magnificent view! How lavishly beautiful is the scene before you. How solemn for a Christian! On your left are the hills of Bithynia, at the foot of which stand the poor and neglected hamlets of Nice, where, in 325, was drawn up by Christian fathers the Nicene Creed, dear to all Christians. Under your feet stands Cadykiv, where, in 451, was assembled the fourth Ecumenical synod. Look now over to the city, that portentous city, so quiet, so still, so beautiful, that you would willingly blot from the book of history the numberless crimes that have contaminated it. There before you, as though cringing before the majestic dome of St. Sophia, stands the church of St. Ireni, now the armory of the Turkish government. In these halls, now filled with spears, battle-axes, guns, and rusty armor, was settled, in 482, the sacred dogma of the

Trinity, left incomplete by the fathers of the Nicene Synod. An immense cross still stands over the place where the fathers officiated on that day. Look now at St. Sophia, and gaze upon the square in front of it, where have walked nearly all the Fathers of the Christian church. Look not at the majesty of the massive structure, and the inestimable riches of its antique columns, that once served to support and embellish heathen temples. In that church Chrysostom has preached; there he thundered against the vices and profligacy of the Byzantine court and the cold indifference of the Christian public. In that church, three hundred years afterwards, officiated the patriarch Photius, under whose patriarchate began the schism which has divided for ever the two sister churches, Roman and Greek; schism, that originated from interested, worldly motives, and finished in a series of anathemas between the pope and patriarch.

The crusaders, in 1204, ejected the Greeks and their patriarch from this church, till, fifty years afterwards, the Greeks, on repossessing it, purified it anew from the pollution of a foreign and hated religion. This was its third consecration. There would not be place enough to write upon those marble walls the iniquitous deeds that have been perpetrated under that unparalleled dome. Allow me now to tell the Christian spectator the last heart-rending scene, which no one should forget on entering this magnificent temple.

Fourteen years before the fall of Constantinople, the Greek emperor, with his nobles and clergy, went to Rome, to effect the union of the two churches, which time had sadly alienated from each other. The object of the Greeks was not so much the union of the church, as the promised help against the hordes of Turks that were closing in upon the doomed city and empire. The pope and his clergy thought that by offering them protection and armed assistance they would overcome the stubbornness of the Greeks, and easily induce them to enter into union with the Catholic church. Their patriarch would then become a suffragan bishop of the pope. The truth is, that no human aid could have saved Constan-

tinople in those times, when the Greeks, instead of betaking themselves to arms, and fighting their own battles, preferred monasteries and nunneries, where unworthiness and indolence revel to their utter satisfaction.

They went to Italy as humble supplicants. Their souls were bent down by the danger from the Turks, and the antipathy of their nation to a union with the Latin church; for most of the Greeks were ignorant of the true motives of this extraordinary mission to foreign lands. Much they accepted, much they discussed; but they could not bend their necks in abject servitude to the pope of Rome. They left, despised and scorned, hooted as heretics and schismatics, fit to be an easy prey to their Turkish enemies.

On the twenty-eighth of May, 1453, the Greeks, perfectly conscious of their inability to prolong their resistance against the hordes that were preparing for a final and desperate assault on the next day, assembled for the last time in the church of St. Sophia. There the emperor, with his nobles, generals, and all the distinguished inhabitants of the city, came together for the last time, to partake of the communion, and to prepare for death. The patriarch officiated. Only a small number of those who were seeking protection in the precincts of St. Sophia (according to a popular belief that an angel from heaven would there protect them) could enter the church. The scene was of solemn interest. All over the church resounded prayers, such as the human soul offers only in times of danger. Sobs and tears, wailings and heart-rending cries, filled the vast church, from its outer portico to its inner temple. Before partaking of the communion for the last time they pardoned each other, and were reconciled man to man. It was the most solemn day in the history of this far-famed church. That night an empire was to fall. The emperor, his warriors, and ministers were to die upon those walls. That church was to become a mosque. Those women were to become widows, and many a maiden, wife to her dreaded enemy. Before the morrow's sun set upon that lost city Mohammed II. was to pray upon that Christian

altar. More than this, — with him was to come the grim angel of destruction, and, sitting upon that Christian altar, would be defying the whole of Christendom for ages to come, mocking her armies, and insulting her kings.

The next day, at three in the afternoon, the Turkish emperor prayed in the inner sanctuary, and the voice of the muezzin was heard from the pulpit where Chrysostom and Photius preached.

Such was the last and fourth consecration of this magnificent church. Did the Catholics, in their imprecations against the stubbornness of the Greeks, and in their refusal to afford them protection against the Turks, ever dream of the horrors which Constantinople, in passing into Ottoman hands, would bring upon their own heads? That small point of land which we call the Seraglio, and which incloses the imperial Ottoman residence, has been for more than three centuries the most unmerciful scourge of the Christian name. Hungary, Transylvania, and Bohemia for many years trembled at the name of a Turk.¹ Such was the alarm in Christendom occasioned by the incursions of the Turks, that Rodolph II., in 1592, instituted, in the Roman and Hungarian empire, the bell of the Turks, which morning, noon, and evening summoned the faithful to the church, to ask God's aid against such a terrible enemy as the Turk. Their cities were ruined; their inhabitants butchered, flayed, and quartered; their women and maidens led into ignominious slavery; their churches turned into mosques and stables; their ambassadors imprisoned and slaughtered. Austria itself was for many years obliged to pay a large tribute, in order to save its frontiers from the continual deprivations of its Ottoman neighbors. Every time that the treaty of peace was renewed, it concluded with this phrase: "Graciously accorded by the sultan, always victorious, to the infidel king of Vienna, always conquered."²

Venice itself, the powerful republic of the Middle Ages,

¹ Von Hammer (French translation), Vol. VII. p. 264.

² Von Hammer, Vol. VIII. p. 73.

trembled at the thoughts of a Turkish war. Her maritime cities were devastated by the Turkish navies and the daring corsairs of the African coast. A Turkish fleet arrived at the very door of Rome, and, after ravaging the coast of Italy and Sicily, came triumphant into Constantinople, richly laden with spoils and comely maidens from Christian lands.

Am not I justified in saying that Constantinople has acted a prominent part in the history of the Christian world? Was it not in this city that originated that division which has kept asunder the two great families of the Christian world? What a fiendish spirit animates, to this day, the two churches against each other? In the time of the crusades the spirit of opposition to the Latins knew no bounds; for those who have studied their history know that the object of these daring and fanatical men was not only to retrieve from the hands of the Moslems the sacred cities of our religion, but to subject, if possible, the Christians of the East to the dominion of the pope. The ill-success of the Synod of Florence still more embittered the Greeks against the Latins, till the former publicly declared that it were better to wear the Turkish turban than the Frank cap. Besides all this, the Venetians, long before the Turkish dominion, and for years afterwards, occupied many of the islands of the Archipelago, and were so impolitic as to appropriate to themselves the best churches of the Greeks; promoting to public offices every Catholic, and entirely neglecting those of the inhabitants who preferred remaining faithful to the religion of their fathers. Why, then, did the Venetians complain that their Greek subjects always favored the Turks against them, and often betrayed them, to their utter surprise? The Greeks as a body were not so harassed by the Turks as they were by the Venetians. The Turks rarely molested their religion. In times of trouble, they might easily quiet the avarice of their rulers by presents and money. It was natural for a Turk to despise their religion; but that a Christian nation should profane their churches, and exert itself to the utmost to deride what to them, in their slavery, was

the greatest boon of heaven, was an insupportable offence. To this day the Catholic of this country calls the Greek a schismatic, which the Greek readily repays, calling him a dog.

I have been thus prolix in my observations on this division of the two churches, in order to show whence has originated the feeling of animosity which is still very violent between these two churches. You will, I think, better understand the spirit which actuated the patriarch Cyril in his connections with the Latin church.

Cyril Lucar, or as the Greeks call him *Κύριλλος Λούκαρις*, was born in the island of Candia in 1572. The island was then in the hands of the Venetians, and enjoyed, under the rule of that despotic government, more liberty than was to be found in other parts of Greece subject to Turkey, and more security from the lawless incursions of the Turkish corsairs.

All the Greeks of those times who were desirous of obtaining a liberal education repaired to the universities of Venice and Padova, where they studied general literature, mathematics, or medicine. Cyril, in pursuing his studies, became extremely interested in the reformation of Germany, as it appears from his subsequent letters to many distinguished Protestants. Knowing that there was little truth in what he heard or read of them in Italy, he determined to travel to Germany in order to study their opinions, and thence return to his native country. He had studied the Italian and Latin, with both of which he appears by his correspondence to have been very familiar. After completing his course of study in Italy, he repaired to Geneva, where he became acquainted with many of the leading Protestants. Here he had ample opportunities of familiarizing himself with the opinions of the Reformers. From Geneva he travelled to Holland, Germany, and England, where the Protestant religion was highly favored by Queen Elizabeth. We know little more than the simple itinerary of Cyril through these countries, where his sole object was to study the sayings and doings of the Protes-

tant Reformers, and to peruse their various polemical works, that absorbed the minds of Europeans at that age. What we know of these travels is collected from his letters to different individuals in the latter part of his life. On his return from Europe, he sailed directly to Alexandria, where a near relative of his, Meletius Pigàs,¹ was occupying the patriarchal throne of Alexandria. Meletius, though born in Candia, and under Catholic rule, was all his life warring against the Latin church. He also was educated in Padova, for the medical profession, but, at the close of his studies, left the university without his medical degree, because it was required of him to take an oath of allegiance to the Latin church. I mention this fact because the character of Meletius may have influenced the subsequent life of Cyril.

Soon after his arrival at Alexandria, Cyril was ordained priest. On the death of the patriarch of Constantinople, Meletius was called to occupy the vacant throne till the election of a new patriarch. Cyril accompanied him to Constantinople. Here he became acquainted with the principal men of his nation, who had occasion to admire the talents of Cyril as a pulpit orator at the patriarchal church of Phanar.

While he resided in Constantinople Meletius sent Cyril to Poland, to prevent, if possible, the union of the Greek churches with the Latins. Sigismond, king of Poland, after many ineffectual efforts, found it impossible to persuade Cyril to accede to his wishes. The king was afraid of Cyril's influence with the neighboring Cossacks, who were not only ready to take up arms in defence of their tenets, but to unite with the Protestants against the fanatical Sigismond. The king, however, baffled all their efforts, for he routed the assembled Cossacks, pursued Cyril and his colleague, the latter of whom he arrested, and immediately quartered. Cyril barely escaped with his life. He arrived in Constantinople with the firm conviction that the Greek church cannot cope with the Roman, unless a union be effected with the Protestant powers. Such seems to have been the result

¹ Μελέτιος Πηγὰς.

of this mission to the Polish churches upon the mind of Cyril.

Cyril succeeded Meletius to the patriarchal throne of Alexandria in 1602, being then thirty years old. From this date to 1621, when he was first called to the see of Constantinople, there is very little to be said of the tranquil life of Cyril. In 1612 he was called to Constantinople by the unanimous voice of his nation, to occupy the throne till the election of a new patriarch. After his vicarage, he travelled to Wallachia, and thence to mount Athos, examining the monasteries and their libraries. Thence he sailed directly to his see in Egypt. Leaving now Cyril in Alexandria, allow me to say a few words on the busy stage of Eastern affairs.

It was in the year 1602, when Cyril was elected patriarch of Alexandria, that the Jesuits for the first time established a school in Galata, under the protection of the French ambassador. Up to this time all the permanent resident ambassadors in Constantinople were Catholics, representing Catholic powers. No ambassadors were so well treated or so highly favored as the French, for Turkey and France were always political friends, both interested in subduing Charles V. and his successors on the throne of Austria. Some years before, the Christian world, according to the expression of Von Hammer, saw with amazement a French and Turkish fleet, under Barbarossa, ravaging the coast of Italy. With the exception of France, every other Catholic power was at enmity with the Turks, paying at times a tribute to keep off marauding parties from its territories. On this account all foreign subjects frequently demanded French protection, and the Latin church wisely from the beginning sheltered itself under the banner of France. This explains the preponderance of France in all litigious religious questions in the East.

Queen Elizabeth for the first time in 1579, sent three English merchants to the sultan, demanding protection for their vessels and their traders in the Levant. Following the usages of all European ambassadors to the Porte, she fur-

nished the first regular ambassador in 1583, William Harebone, with sundry presents to the sultan and his officers, among which stand conspicuous nine bull-dogs. Edward Burton, the successor of Harebone, was extremely well treated by the sultan and his officers.

Soon after the arrival of the English ambassador, envoys came to Constantinople from the States-General of Holland and from Sweden, who, together with the English ambassador, stood aloof from their colleagues of the Catholic emperors.

It appears from what we know of the instructions of these ambassadors, that they were recommended to promote, by all the means in their power, the Catholic faith among the Christians of the East. In fact, as the Catholic faith had been sadly weakened and exposed in Europe, so much the more did it exert itself to compensate its loss in the East. In India, China, and among the Mongols, the Jesuits were strenuous in their efforts, converting and baptizing in such a loose manner, that their converts, after their reception in the Christian church, were neither heathen nor Christians. This untiring activity of the Jesuits soon showed itself in Constantinople, where their influence was frequently counteracted by the interposition of the Protestant ambassadors. In their newly established school of Galata they received children of all classes, but particularly of the Greeks. Some of the Greek clergy repaired to hear their instruction, as no other school in Constantinople was open for instruction in European learning and science. The Jesuits hoped that in this school they might educate some of the Greek clergy, and by their means bring about the much-desired union of the two churches, or rather the subjection of the Greeks to the pope. Cyril seems to have been studying all these movements of the Catholics; not only in Constantinople, but in Syria and Palestine.

It is extremely fortunate for the history of the Greek church in those days that Cyril's correspondence with many Protestants has been preserved and published at different times. A very important letter is the one written to John Nytterbogaert, from Wallachia, in 1613, when Cyril was

returning to Alexandria from Constantinople. It appears from the text of this letter, published in Amsterdam, 1718, that Nytterbogaert had demanded Cyril's opinion on the state of the Greek churches. The following is the title of the letter, written in Latin. "Cyril, pope and patriarch of Alexandria, to the most learned and revered John Nytterbogaert, minister of the divine word in the Christian church of Hague. Beloved brother in Jesus Christ: Salutation and peace from the Lord Jesus Christ." A few extracts will answer our purpose. Says Cyril: "In these days of calamity we cannot openly speak or declare the truth. In communicating, however, with you, and your church, I can speak with confidence; I can unite with you, because you act in a Christian manner, you love the peace of Christ, and desire a true union in the Lord. Should I err in whatever I write, you will not on this account burn me in a cauldron, or stretch me upon burning embers, or terrify me by the sight of the executioner. The church of Christ cannot be supported by such torments; on the contrary, they weaken it. Admonish me in brotherly love. Whatever man declares to be true and infallible, let us examine by the scriptures and the gospel. I am fully persuaded that I ought not to neglect those duties of friendship and Christian charity which have so happily commenced between us, and by the means of which, we may increase in the knowledge of truth and piety. We should pray to the all-merciful God to assist our designs by his grace, and that his Holy Spirit may never depart from our hearts. You ask that I should write to you what is our confession of faith. Please favor me by your first letter with *your* confession of faith, for which you have so much suffered."

Cyril, in giving to the Dutch minister the confession of his church, says: "Substantially, there is no difference between us. Our sentiments are the same." There is a remark of Cyril on the minor ceremonies of the Church which I consider extremely important. It is this: "Though the members of the church of Rome profess that human institutions are

so necessary that those who trespass against them cannot be saved; we, however, believe that only the divine institutions are certain and infallible, and the human, indifferent, subject to fallacy. On this account we subject them to the word of the scriptures, the gospel, and the Holy Spirit. Should they be found good and useful, we accept them; if not, we certainly reject them."

Hear now what Cyril says of the patriarchate of Constantinople, which he occupied ten years afterwards: "The patriarch of Constantinople is the most powerful, and at the same time the most unhappy, of the four patriarchs; for the Turks, not regarding the fitness of the candidate, confirm the one who gives them the largest sum of money."

Cyril, after describing the manner in which the patriarchs are elected, and the sects with whom the Greek church has no communion, says, that he often talks on religious matters with the members of his flock, and his bishops, whose ignorance he everywhere bitterly deploras. On account of this ignorance, says Cyril, the Jesuits have been allowed to establish themselves in Constantinople for the instruction of the youth. Their gain is the gain of the fox among the poultry.

After describing the persecutions of the Greek church in Muscovy and Poland, of which he was an eye-witness, and the wicked machinations of the Romish church against the unprotected Greek churches established in Turkey, he says: "We hope to be always united with you; we depend upon your spiritual admonitions, as we also give you our spiritual benediction in your opposition to the Roman church. So that united, and embracing in our spirit the orthodox faith of Christ, we may be able to accomplish the duties of our high vocation, combating in faith, and always defending the truth, for the increase of the Catholic church, for the everlasting glory of God the Father, and his only Son and Holy Spirit, whose blessing and grace may always be with you, so that it may bless your exertions in the accomplishment of your pious duties, and for the spiritual benefit of those who hear your mellifluous discourses."

In finishing his letter, he thanks the States-General for the books which they sent to him. He demanded as a special favor from Nytterbogaert, to have a collection of Protestant works, and a short history of their authors, sent to him in Cairo. There is a spirit of love and Christian affection in this long epistle. Cyril is violent only when he talks of the Catholics, and their emissaries the Jesuits. Now, had this letter been translated and published at that time among his countrymen, he would certainly have been deposed, and probably excommunicated. A Greek patriarch giving the right hand of fellowship to a Protestant minister, telling him that there is no great difference between us, and fraternizing so heartily with the Protestants against the Catholics, would have wounded the Greeks and the Turks. From the earliest times to this very day, it has been the custom among the Greeks in upbraiding each other to use the term "Pilate" and "Arius." At this time, however, the greatest miscreant was termed "Lutheran," or, as the Greeks generally pronounced it, "Luterano"; evidently derived from the Catholics of these countries, who cannot pronounce the *S* of the Greeks. Think now of a distinguished Greek patriarch, of a highly educated man, uniting himself with Protestant Lutheran communities!

In another letter to the same minister, written in Constantinople the year before, he tells him that it is difficult to introduce in these countries anything new in the church. "We," says Cyril, "will never consent to it, for it would scandalize all Christianity."

Cyril, a few years afterwards, became acquainted with a distinguished traveller of those times, David de Wilhelm, member of the council of the Prince of Orange. He was born in Hamburg, of a distinguished family. After studying in various universities of Germany, he travelled in the East, and visited Egypt and Jerusalem in 1617-18-19. Cyril became intimately acquainted with him. Maurice de Wilhelm, his brother, has published numerous letters of Cyril to the traveller, written in 1618 and 1619. It appears from these

letters that Cyril had frequent conversations with the accomplished traveller, who furnished him with the latest works on the Reformation. In these letters religion is the principal topic. In one of them, Cyril says: "If I could reform my church, I would do it with all my heart; but God knows that it is impossible." Before entering upon the eventful history of Cyril's patriarchate, I must not omit to mention a letter which Cyril wrote to George Abbot, in 1616, then archbishop of Canterbury. Abbot advised the patriarch to send to England some of his clergy, to study theology at the expense of the English government. Cyril selected a certain Metrophanes, who afterwards occupied the patriarchal see of Alexandria. He travelled through Germany, and became acquainted with many distinguished individuals of that country. While in Europe, Metrophanes wrote, at the request of the Protestants, a confession of faith, which is highly esteemed by the Greeks themselves. It appears by the letter of Cyril to the archbishop, that James I. was graciously pleased to invite Cyril to send a young priest to study in the English universities, in order to be able on his return to confound the Jesuits, who were disputing with the Greeks. It was on the recommendation of the archbishop of Canterbury that the ambassador of England exerted himself in favor of Cyril in after years. In a letter of the archbishop to Cyril, he thus expresses himself about James (I quote his words): "He not only is a diligent hearer of holy discourses, and a guest at the tremendous table of the Lord, but also, which is more than example, and the greatest thing in this great monarch, he discusses learnedly the most abstruse mysteries of the school with the bishops best practised in the arena of divinity."

In 1621 the patriarchal throne of Constantinople became vacant by the death of Timothy. By the exertions of the English and Dutch ambassadors, and the efforts of the Greeks, among whom Cyril enjoyed a high reputation, as a pious and learned prelate, he was unanimously elected to the vacant throne, of which he took possession on the fifth of November.

Rome and the Jesuits were extremely disappointed at the election of Cyril. He was a declared and open-faced enemy to them, and in public he openly advised his nation to keep aloof from the society of the Jesuits and the instructions of the Roman Catholics, which were perverting the Greek nation. But the Jesuits raised enemies against him from his own clergy, and, by bribing the government officials, and promising aid to a new candidate favorable to their views, they obtained his deposition, and exile to the island of Tenedos, after a patriarchate of sixteen months.

Two patriarchs occupied the throne of Constantinople after Cyril. Gregory IV., after a patriarchate of seventy-three days, was exiled to Rhodes, and there put to death. His successor, Anthimus II., gave his resignation, and retired to a monastic life on mount Athos. Cyril was recalled for the second time in the beginning of 1624, and, occupying the throne for a number of years, had time and opportunity to counteract the pernicious influence of his mortal enemies, the Jesuits. It appears that the ambassadors of England and of Venice were divided as to the successor of Cyril. Of the French ambassador, Count de Cesi, the English envoy, Sir Thomas Roe, says, in the memoirs which he has left of his residence in Constantinople: "The French ambassador was as much too precipitate in complaining of me as he is in all his actions."¹ On this subject, the Venetian archives say: "The patriarch has made known to the baylo that he has discovered a plot of the Jesuits in order to depose him, and elect, with the assistance of the French ambassador, a certain Caloyer, or monk, their dependant"; and again, "the Greek patriarch was deposed by the machinations of the Jesuits, aided by France." Von Hammer says: "The ambassadors of England and Holland were actively engaged at the Porte for the re-election of the Greek patriarch Cyril, who had been deposed by the intrigues of the Jesuits."² Their united efforts destroyed their credit. It was a great subject of dis-

¹ Von Hammer, Vol. VIII. p. 344.

² Von Hammer, Vol. IX. p. 30.

cord between the Dutch and French ambassadors, the latter of whom protected the Jesuits, out of hatred to the Venetians. France not only pretended to exclude the republic from the protection of Jerusalem and Bethlehem, from the churches of Pera and Galata, but she exerted herself to put the Jesuits in the place of the Franciscans, and establish a school of that order in Pera. It appears that the republic in all these troublesome times was represented by men of high political character. It was continually opposing the influence of the French ambassador. The Venetian archives in speaking of the baylo, Simone Contareni, say: "The baylo prevents the erection of a school in Pera by the Jesuits for the instruction of the children of the Perotes. On account of its proximity, and for other reasons, I considered it pernicious, and have prevented it." The English ambassador then in Constantinople was Sir Thomas Roe, who has left us, in an antiquated style, many particulars of the petty strifes of the ambassadors. He had instructions from his government to protect Cyril to the utmost, and to thwart the influence of the Jesuits in the East. Of Cyril he says: "As for the patriarch himself, I do not doubt but that in opinion of religion he is, as we term him, a pure Calvinist, and so the Jesuits in these parts do brand him."

The Dutch ambassador, Cornelius Haga, is principally known by the writings and correspondence of Cyril, who speaks of him as a man of learning and piety. He was untiring in his efforts to promote the welfare of Cyril, and to propagate Protestant principles in the Greek community. This ambassador established for the first time a Protestant church in Galata. Cyril had been for a long time acquainted with Haga, whom he first met, years ago, at the island of Patmos, on a visit to the famous monastery of that island. A French ambassador resided permanently in Constantinople, and his residence seems to have been the general rendezvous of the Catholics, in their endeavors to separate the Protestants from the Greeks, and bring them over to their own faith.

Besides these ambassadors, there generally resided in this

city an ambassador from the state of Ragusa, and the Austrian, called in those days the Caesarean, orator. In speaking of these ambassadors, I quote a part of the instructions given to the baylo of Venice: "He was enjoined to oppose the designs of the Jesuits who had established a seminary, and to protect the Greek church." Though the Jesuits had been established in Constantinople ever since 1601, when they first opened a school in Galata, in the church called St. Benoit, there had already settled before them the Franciscan and Dominican orders, who were growing jealous of the influence of the Jesuits, who pretended to have, besides their other privileges, the sole guardianship of the sacred church of Jerusalem. They had already, in 1616, suffered dire persecution, were cast into prison, and by the incessant intercessions of the French ambassador, and a present of thirty thousand ducats, were finally set at liberty.¹ Such, in a few words, were the combatants who strove for a supremacy in Constantinople; often, however, being thwarted in their designs by the independent and ferocious character of the reigning sultan, Murad, the most sanguinary ruler that ever sat on the throne of Turkey.

It appears from a curious document written by the Greek chancellor of those days, and happily preserved in the papers of David de Wilhelm, that in the school of the Jesuits, there were very few Latin scholars. As the instruction was gratuitous, and the difficulties of obtaining instruction elsewhere extremely difficult, it was soon filled with Greek scholars, and by their means the Jesuits ingratiated themselves in the favor of the Greek people.

Cyril and his bishops prudently advised the parents of the children to avoid the Jesuits and their school, as it could not but be a cause of serious disturbance to the peace of the church. There were no public anathemas, no scandalous libels, to wound the feelings of the Jesuits and their protectors.

The Roman Catholic party who had previously deposed:

¹ Von Hammer, Vol. VIII. p. 219.

Cyril, saw with no favor his installation at the cost of sixty thousand rix-dollars to the Greek community. Never before was such a sum paid to the Turkish government; and it is true to say that, even to this day, immense sums are expended on such occasions. It was about this time that the court of Rome sent to Constantinople a Greek priest, Archimandrite, an apostate from his faith, who came to lodge at the residence of the French ambassador. This emissary of the Propaganda declared to the Jesuits that they need not despond or lose courage; that twenty thousand dollars would soon be transmitted to them from Rome, in order to depose Cyril, and elect some one in his place, whose filial obedience would be indubitable; that for this object, they were authorized by the pope to make use of the ten thousand rix-dollars that had been bequeathed by a French widow for charities.

In the month of February 1624 a certain Berille was sent to Constantinople to accuse Cyril of a treacherous connection with the Cossacks, who were then infesting and plundering the coast of the Black Sea with their armed war-boats. Soon after arrived in Constantinople a certain Cannachio Rossi, of Levantine extraction, and of the Catholic faith, with a mandate signed and sealed by Cardinal Brandini in favor of Cyril. Sir Thomas Roe, speaking of this man, says: "Instructions given to Cannachio Rossi, a Greek undertaking to reconcile the Greek church with the pope." This mandate, written in Italian, and in seven articles, is without address. I will not weary your patience by the recital of the whole. Some paragraphs are curious and worthy of note. For example, in the second article: "The church of Rome has always desired union and fellowship with all the churches, particularly with the Eastern, which has received so many marks of favor from the Catholic church. For this end it has established and maintains a college for young Greeks at her own expense, so that this nation, so noble and ingenious, may again flourish in piety and literature, as in former days. Our lord the pope, protector and father of the Greek

nation, as you yourselves particularly know, and have remarked with your own eyes, would spend immense sums of money to reconcile such a noble member to the church, and assist that patriarchal see on which depends the rest of the East. We hear that he sends young men to study new doctrines in the university of England, and disseminate them afterwards in the Levant. Should these reports be calumnious, and should he be able to exonerate himself before his holiness the pope, then let him prove this before the ambassadors of France and Austria. Through these let him send to his holiness his confession of faith, in which he accepts the Council of Florence, and condemns the errors of the Calvinists and Lutherans. His holiness demands no other condition but the simple acceptance of the Council of Florence, provided that the Greek church condemns and anathematizes, as it has done to this day, the blasphemies of the northern heretics, — Lutherans, Calvinists, and the like.”

I am writing history, such as has been transmitted to us by Greek and Catholic historians. Von Hammer, the profound historian, plainly relates the facts. Think of a mandate of this nature sent to the descendants of those very men whose ancestors preferred death to a union with the Latin church. Think of a man like Cyril, whose whole life was spent in endeavors to check the influence of the Catholic faith among his people, called in such haughty terms to announce publicly the rejection of his faith, and anathematize the whole body of Protestants! Well, indeed, he acted in not taking the least notice of this mandate.

But the Jesuits insisted on having his answer; and not being able to persuade the patriarch himself, betook themselves to a faction of the Greek bishops, some of whom are always ready to enter into plots for the deposition of the patriarch, as they do to this very day. Twenty thousand rix-dollars were offered to them, should they succeed in deposing Cyril.

Soon after the arrival of Rossi the court of Rome sent an

antipatriarch to Constantinople, who, conjointly with the Jesuits, took all ecclesiastical matters into his hands. It was then that the Franciscans and Dominicans, always jealous of the Jesuits, in unison with the baylo of Venice, and assisted by the influence of the patriarch and his friends, pushed the Turkish government to imprison all the emissaries of the pope. Thus fell for a time the machinations of the Jesuits against Cyril and his church. Cyril, who had often lamented the ignorance of his people, and observed how inferior in ecclesiastical knowledge were his bishops, determined to introduce a Greek printing-press into Constantinople, as the means of instructing his people and disseminating books among them. This was the first printing-press established in Constantinople. In June 1627, a monk of Cephalonia, Nicodemus Metaxá, arrived in Constantinople, in an English merchant vessel, with the Greek types, cast in Holland and England under his personal superintendence. On his arrival Metaxá sent immediately to the patriarch, to obtain his assistance in the establishment of the printing-press. Cyril warmly recommended him to Sir Thomas Roe, the English ambassador, by whose interest, the press and all his books passed the custom-house without noise and loss of time.

The ambassador thought that the enterprise, though honest in itself and highly conducive to the welfare of the Greek nation, could not prosper unless it enjoyed the special protection of the patriarch. Cornelius Haga also aided powerfully the establishment of the press. Sir Thomas Roe, after obtaining the public permission of the grand vizier, received at his residence the books and types, and took under his special protection Metaxá and the whole establishment. Cyril demanded as a particular favor that the press might be set up in the English embassy. The ambassador having refused from private motives, rented a house, which he paid, and protected as his own.

The house was soon prepared, not far from the English embassy, but nearer the residence of the French ambassador. Scarcely had Metaxá arranged his establishment, when the

Jesuit party invited him to their convent, declaring that should he unite with them, he might be able in this manner to confound the reports current in the city, of his having studied in England and become tainted with Lutheran heresies. Metaxá however, intent, on following up his plan, was not in the least discouraged by the reports of his being a heretic and a Lutheran, and of his types having been cast with the arms of the king of England. Finally Metaxá was warned to take care of himself, as emissaries were paid to stab him at night, in bed, or in the street, on leaving the English embassy. These reports induced the ambassador to take Metaxá into his own house; from thence in the morning he repaired to his establishment, and returned late in the afternoon, accompanied by guards of the embassy.

Thus far the enemies of Metaxá had not been able to obtain any palpable proofs of his guilty machinations. At this time Cyril printed in Metaxá's press a small treatise on the faith of the Greek churches. The treatise abstained from controversy, or criticism of others' opinions. In fact, it was an apology to his people, among whom it was rumored that the patriarch was introducing new doctrines, to the great scandal of his flock. He intended to dedicate the work to the king of Great Britain, and was writing the letter of dedication while the work was going through the press. In the meanwhile, the Jesuits could not brook the idea of a Greek patriarch dedicating a religious book to the heretical king of England. As the work was not in their hands, they brought forward another work, written by Cyril against the Jews, printed in England, and imported to Constantinople by Metaxá. According to this book, his enemies declared that the patriarch, in speaking against the Jews, blasphemes the religion of the Koran; that Metaxá is a personage versed in the science of arms and war; that, under the semblance of instructing his nation, he is undermining the Moslem religion; that many of the books composed by the patriarch were sent to the Cossacks, to ferment an insurrection as soon as the sultan should undertake his expedition

into Asia ; that all these infamous proceedings against religion and the peace of the empire, were silently concocted under the auspices of Sir Thomas Roe, the English ambassador. The man who was the means of communicating these accusations to the grand vizier, was a Turk, formerly vayvode of Galata, and highly esteemed by the vizier for the amenity of his conversation.

The grand vizier, highly exasperated by these reports, determined to surprise Metaxá in his iniquitous proceedings. He therefore ordered a band of Janissaries to proceed to Metaxá's house and press, and seize all his papers and proof-sheets, in order that they may be examined at the Porte. It was agreed to effect all this in great secrecy, on Friday, the 4th of January, 1628. In the meanwhile, the French ambassador, having learned that Sir Thomas Roe was to have a party at his hotel on Sunday, the 6th of January, day of Epiphany, and that among his guests, were the patriarch Cyril, and the baylo of Venice, postponed the attack to that day.

About noon on that Sunday, one hundred and fifty Janissaries surrounded the house of Metaxá, putting at the same time sentries at all the gates of the English embassy. At that very hour, Metaxá, in company with the secretary of the English ambassador, was returning to Pera from the church in Galata. The Janissaries fell upon them, and mistaking Metaxá for a secretary of the ambassador (for he seems to have worn a similar dress), he was suffered to escape in safety to the English embassy, whose gates had been abandoned by the guards. Frustrated in their attempts to seize Metaxá, the Janissaries repaired to his establishment, broke up all his chests, carried off his furniture, tables, presses, papers, books, silver cups, and money, to the value of four thousand rix-dollars. This foraging party was met in the street by a French dragoman, who told the Janissaries that Metaxá was in the English palace. The captain of the Janissaries wisely answered : " my orders do not go so far."

Sir Thomas Roe, who knew whence all these scandalous

proceedings had originated, entertained his company through the day, as though nothing had happened. The next day Metaxá's books were examined by two renegade Greeks. Cyril's treatise, which had been particularly complained of by the Jesuits, was the object of a most severe examination. The contents of the books were explained to the grand vizier and the moolahs, and all the obnoxious passages translated to them. Nothing was detected that, according to Musulman law, could subject the author or the printer to capital punishment. There was no proof to the accusations brought against the patriarch. The final decision of the mufti is remarkable. "Dogmas against the precepts of Mohammed cannot be accounted blasphemies or crimes. As the sultan has graciously permitted the Christians to profess their doctrines, they cannot be accounted guilty in printing or preaching publicly whatever they believe. It is not the difference of opinion, but the scandal, which is punishable by the laws."

Three days after the attack on Metaxá's house, the ambassador of England paid a visit to the grand vizier, accompanied by the customary retinue of state representations. He seems to have spoken with a freedom which injured innocence only employs. He told the vizier that his highness had given permission to the establishment of the printing-press, that he knew Metaxá, and the business which he conducted so honorably; that the insult was as though perpetrated against the embassy itself; that up to that day nothing had been printed in the press without previous consultation with him. He hoped, finally, that his highness would be satisfied, after the examination of the books, of the innocence of their contents. Finally, Sir Thomas, in a firm manner, told the vizier that it was his duty to exonerate himself from the accusations which would be brought against him, should he believe the reports of the true enemies of the state, the Jesuits.

These observations of the ambassador seemed to have stung to the quick the irascible vizier. He promised to punish the instigators of these foul proceedings. The ambassador left, assured of the grand vizier's affection for him and his friends.

The mufti seem from this day to have become particularly friendly to Cyril, who on all occasions was highly extolled by the English. The day after the attack on Metaxá's printing-press, Cannachio Rossi called on the patriarch, to ascertain his opinion on the seven articles of the mandate. At the same time there arrived from Rome new emissaries, accusing the patriarch of seditious attempts to overthrow the Ottoman empire, and of a secret correspondence with the Protestant ambassadors. A league seems to have been formed about this time by the Catholic ambassadors against the influence of Cyril. The relations of the Catholic ambassadors fully confess it. Cyril at this time was very intimate with the English ambassador; they were often to be seen in the streets together, to the great annoyance of their enemies, the Jesuits.

The English ambassador could not resent the affront of the Jesuits. He could not but perceive their bitter animosity, and the assistance afforded to them by the Catholic ambassadors, and by Rome itself, through its continual emissaries. Sir Thomas, uniting his efforts with the venerable baylo of Venice, determined to show the Jesuits that if their assault upon Metaxá and Cyril had remained unpunished, it was not on account of weakness, but from an unwillingness on their part to do harm.

After the examination of Metaxá's books and the sentence of the mufti, the Jesuits retired to the French embassy, where they remained hidden for two weeks. A few days after, they were seized by Janissaries, their convent of St. Benoit ransacked, and they themselves put in irons, and imprisoned for a whole month. Cannachio Rossi was also arrested and put in chains. Finally, Sir Thomas Roe and his friends, fearing lest the Jesuits should be put to death, interceded for them. After many deliberations, the Turkish government expelled them from all the dominions of the sultan. It demanded, moreover, that all Metaxá's books and furniture confiscated at their request should be returned to him. The Turkish government sent commissioners to

Scio, Smyrna, Aleppo, and Cyprus, in order to banish all the members of this order who were to be found in these and other provinces of the empire. All the influence of the French ambassador could not prevent the execution of this measure. He even demanded his passports. The grand vizier, according to Sir Thomas, told the French envoy, "That the grand signor did esteeme the French kyng an ancient and a good friend, and could not believe that his amitye depended upon the necessity of protecting traitors by force, against the rule of buon governo."¹ Of the Jesuits, in this part of his memoirs, Sir Thomas says: "I hope they shall little trouble the poor Greek church, hereafter who hath spent, and is indebted by their practices, twelve thousand dollars, besides this last insurrection against the stamp, the life of the patriarch, and my honor."² In these infamous proceedings against the printing-press, established for the instruction of the Greeks, it is painful to observe the efforts of European ambassadors pushed to such Vandalic acts by religious fanaticism. I will give you the text of the Austrian and Catholic historian, Von Hammer; he says: "Austria sent as her representative, Jean Louis, baron de Kuefstein. The instructions of the new ambassador contained many points relating to the Franciscans and Jesuits. He demanded for the Franciscans the body of the Saint, John Capistran, fallen into the hands of the Greeks at Vilak, and for the Jesuits their admission to the empire, in virtue of the seventh article of the Treaty of Vienna. He failed in both, as well as in his efforts to unite the two churches, and to prevent the establishment of a Greek printing-press. Austria was not more fortunate in its efforts to obtain the election of a Catholic patriarch, a demand inserted in the instructions of the ambassador at the instigation of Lamormain, confessor of the emperor."

Such is a short account of the first introduction of the printing-press into Constantinople. Only a single copy of its few publications has been saved, and is to be seen in the

¹ Von Hammer, Vol. IX. p. 113.

² Ibid.

public library at Athens. The attack of the Janissaries, and the subsequent expulsion of the Jesuits, produced an immense sensation in Constantinople. The Greeks, in their exultation at the defeat of the Jesuits, were unanimous in their praise of Cyril, whose influence had done much to defeat this order.

It is well to remark, that in reading Turkish history of those days, you should bear in mind that Turkey was then a powerful despotic power, ruled by a capricious and cruel sultan, and that the European ambassadors then residing in Constantinople enjoyed very little consideration. In corroboration of this sentiment, I may mention here, that in 1581 the Porte determined to transform into mosques three Latin churches of Galata. No arguments or political threats had any effect. The execution of this order was delayed by a timely present of some thousand ducats to Turkish officials. In no other empire in the world, having relations with the European powers, has money acted such a political role as in Turkey.

Two years before these events took place James I. of England died, and was succeeded by Charles I. On the accession of the new king, Cyril sent a letter of congratulation to Charles, accompanied, soon after, by a precious Greek manuscript of the Bible, which, according to tradition, was written at the time of the Nicene Synod. It is to this day the most precious jewel of the British Museum, called the Alexandrine Codex. This letter of Cyril to Charles ends thus: "May the Lord grant you a prosperous and long reign in the flourishing kingdom of Great Britain; and on my knees I pray to God, the Father of our Saviour Jesus Christ, to preserve your royal majesty for many long years, and guide you by his Holy Spirit, and pour upon you every blessing." Such was the letter of Cyril to Charles. Both suffered a violent death by the hands of their enemies. It was the misfortune of Cyril, in 1628, to lose his greatest patron, Sir Thomas Roe. George Abbot, the archbishop of Canterbury, was exiled, and his place given to Laud, who leaned to the Catholics, and who was sometime after condemned and executed. Cyril and

his party were neglected in the eventful reign of Charles. In this emergency, the States-General of Holland sent to Constantinople, as pastor to the Protestant church in Galata, Anthony Leger, from Piemont. He became very intimate with Cyril, and seems to have had an extraordinary influence upon the mind of the patriarch.

The Dutch ambassador, together with Leger and Cyril, thought of extending their influence to the patriarchal see of Alexandria. They wrote to the patriarch Gerasimus, that they would undertake to establish schools in Alexandria, and a printing-press, at the expense of the Dutch government, in case the church of Egypt would receive the Calvinists in its communion. The sad fate of Metaxá's printing-press probably induced Cyril to attempt the same in Egypt, far from the influence of the Jesuits. To this proposal Gerasimus answered: "That the union of different churches from political motives was conducive to the fall of both. It was better to live divided in harmony, than united on mere earthly principles."

Cyril, thus frustrated in his exertions to establish a printing-press, engaged a certain Maximus of Gallipoli, to translate the New Testament in Modern Greek, which translation was published, with a preface by Cyril, at the famous Elzencis press, in 1688, at the expense of the Dutch government. I am sorry to say that the British Bible Society was badly advised to republish this translation at the beginning of the Greek revolution. It is very faulty, and exhibits signs of the grossest ignorance.

We come now to an important event in the history of this patriarch. So much was said about Cyril, his religious opinions, and violent opposition to the Catholics, that the Protestants of Geneva were naturally anxious to know his opinions on religious matters, and to have a confession of faith from his hand. Whether Cyril wrote this on his own accord, or whether it was drawn up at the request of his Protestant friends in Constantinople or elsewhere, is not known. Leger forwarded the manuscript to his friends in

Geneva, which was there published in Latin, with this title : "Confession of Faith of the Most Reverend Lord Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, 1629." Four years afterwards the Greek text was published in the same city. This extraordinary document, coming from a man so highly placed in the Greek church, produced immense sensation among the Protestant churches of Europe. Though the Protestants had formerly demanded from the Greeks some exposition of their opinions, up to this day nothing of this form had appeared. The Greeks not well acquainted with the tenets of the Protestants, and fearing the jealousy of the Turks, and the animosity of their countrymen against all foreign sects, had given evasive and dubious answers to many distinguished Protestants, who often demanded their confession of faith. But here was a document written and signed by a patriarch of note, fully explaining all the dogmas and opinions of his people. It was thought that he must know what the Greeks believed. It was a powerful organ in the hands of the Protestants, who saw what an insignificant difference existed between them and the Greek church. The partizans of the Roman church were confounded, for they saw, to their utter surprise, the inefficacy of their efforts to gain over to the pale of the Roman church a nation so closely united with the Reformers in matters of faith.

Cyril himself declares that he wrote his confession of faith in Latin, and then translated it into Greek. He thus finishes it : "We bear witness that this short confession of faith will be opposed by those who take pleasure in unjustly calumniating and persecuting us. But, strengthened by the Lord, we are sure that he will not neglect or desert his own ; that he will not permit the rod of the wicked to fall upon the inheritance of the just." This confession was a bold act of Cyril. Up to his time the Greeks had never put their belief in such a form. So that Cyril, influenced probably by the advice of his Protestant friends, has published to the Christian world dogmas which stand in opposition to many points of belief common among the Greeks.

Rome attempted to refute this confession of faith, by a certain Caryophyllus. It was said that the work was due to the pen of the Dutch ambassador Haga, as Cyril was not able to write in Latin. The new French ambassador, the Marquis of Marcheville, was requested by the pope to have a personal interview with Cyril on the subject. Cyril, in a letter to Professor Diodati, at Geneva, dated April 15, 1682, relates his interview with the ambassador. He says: "When on a visit to the illustrious Marquis of Marcheville, now ambassador of France, his excellency, after the usual complements, showed me my confession of faith, and asked me whether I really were the author of it. I answered that it was my confession and profession. His excellency then showed me a letter written by the French ambassador at Rome, in which it was said that his holiness the pope sent the confession to the ambassador in Constantinople, in order to know whether it was mine, and whether I intended to persevere in the opinions therein exposed. I boldly replied, that it was mine; that I was the writer of it, because it is what I believe and profess; that should any one detect any errors, and would prove them to me, I would answer in a Christian manner, and with a good conscience."

Cyril in this same letter thus writes about the Catholics: "We hope, with the aid of God, to be able to convince the whole world that we desire no kind of fellowship with the Roman church, as it is the mother of errors, falsifying the word of God, the nest of superstition. As to my own self, let the world know, that I am old. My desire is to die, according to my appointed time, with the truth of Jesus Christ in my mouth, and with his seal upon my conscience." Such was Cyril's confession of faith, which was scattered in Constantinople in manuscripts, many copies of which, at the particular request of the writers, were undersigned by him. This confession of faith became now a powerful instrument in the hands of the Catholics. The French ambassador, with the ambassadors of Austria, were too powerful for Cyril and his faithful protector, Haga. The venerable baylo of

Venice seems to have entirely retired from Cyril's party as soon as his great object was obtained, — the expulsion of the Jesuits.

About this time arrived in Constantinople Paul Strasburg, the envoy of Gustavus Adolphus. Cyril had frequent relations with this ambassador, who brought him letters from Gustavus. Strasburg, in the relation which he has left of this embassy, speaks of Cyril as a man of profound learning (*vir profunde doctus*), bent on the propagation of the Christian religion.

A new actor now comes forward in this troublesome period of Cyril's history. The Jesuits had educated a young Greek, called Contarí, in their school in Galata, who evinced from the very first years of his career, a strong leaning to their church. He seems to have acted the part of a spy upon Cyril, and ingratiating himself in his favor, was sent for a time to fill the vacant bishopric of Salonica. Contrary, however, to his expectations, the place was subsequently given to a countryman of Cyril, Athanasius. Contarí returned to Constantinople, and Cyril was induced to send him to Russia, to collect the contributions that were annually sent to the church of this city. On his return, Contarí, aided by the French ambassador and the Catholic party, but most effectually by the use of the money collected in Russia, and freely offered to the Ottoman officials, deposed Cyril, and was elected in his place. He did not long enjoy his victory; for Cyril, by the aid of his numerous friends, was recalled, and Contarí in his turn exiled. One of the first acts of Cyril was to pardon Contarí, and recall him from exile. About this time there was a violent dispute in this city; both parties claiming the sole possession of the sacred places of our Saviour's life. Cyril, assisted by the Protestant ambassadors, attained a firman, according to which the guardianship of these places was given over exclusively to the Greeks. The Greeks in this manner took from the Franciscans the Temple of the Resurrection, the Stable of Bethlehem, the Monastery of Nazareth, and the Garden of Gethsemane. The Marquis of Marcheville,

in this long question, became extremely unpopular, and was frequently insulted by the Turks.

By money and intrigue, so rank in this great and wicked city, Cyril was again deposed, and in his place was elected his friend Athanasius, who, after occupying the patriarchal see for a few weeks, was again deposed, to make place for Cyril. Again Cyril was deposed, Athanasius elected. Athanasius soon falls, and Contarí, Cyril's enemy, elected. But Contarí was too unpopular, and too despicable as a favorite of the Catholics, to be long on the throne, and Cyril's friends soon after re-elected him, in 1637; the fifth and last time that he occupied the patriarchal throne of Constantinople.

In the relation of Cyril's fourth exile to the island of Scio, it appears that a plot was organized by his enemies to seize him, and carry him to some distant port. By the good offices of his friend, the vice-admiral Bekir Pasha, he was allowed to lodge in the strong castle of Rhodes, until his recall to Constantinople. Von Hammer relates a similar fact. The Armenian patriarch Avedik, who strenuously opposed the encroachments of the Catholics among his people, was carried away from Scio by the efforts of Ferriol, ambassador of Louis XIV. Nothing has ever transpired of the ultimate fate of this patriarch. Cyril was now in his sixty-sixth year. For many long years he had been battling against the Jesuits and the whole Catholic party. To the Catholics it was discouraging to see an enemy rising higher after every defeat, and haughtily rejecting every proposition on their part. Cyril was accused of a secret connivance with the Cossacks, who captured the city of Azof. It was feared that they would fall on Constantinople with their destructive war-boats, as they had done some years before. This idea of the Catholic party was successful. The governor of Constantinople hinted to the sultan, then absent in Asia, the suspicion of Cyril's connivance. An order was immediately forwarded by the sanguinary sultan to execute the patriarch. On the twenty-seventh of June, 1638, the Porte sent a band of Janissaries, who seized the patriarch, and embarking in a large boat,

sailed for the Bosphorus. At Roumeli-hissar the Janissaries announced to the patriarch the fatal sentence. Knowing his hour had arrived, he kneeled and prayed, and, rising, surrendered himself into the hands of the Janissaries. His body was thrown into the Bosphorus, and, floating towards the Asiatic shore, was found the next day by fishermen, and buried in great secrecy on the shores of the Gulf of Nicomedia. No stone ever marked the place where this distinguished patriarch reposes.

Think, now, of the fate of this great patriarch, whose body, like that of a criminal, floated on those same waters, where, two hundred years afterwards, floated the body of another patriarch, executed after celebrating the great day of our Lord's resurrection.

A strange coincidence marks the death of both these patriarchs, whom the Greeks consider as martyrs in their nation's history. Both are justly revered by their people; for both died in a noble cause. In Cyril's death were hushed for ever Rome's bland propositions to the Greek church. Gregory's death, on the day of resurrection, was a breath from heaven to light up a conflagration that burned intensely for years. Thus considered they stand in history as the champions that have sealed with their death their nations liberation from religious and political thralldom.

Were I to address a Greek audience on Cyril's eventful life, it would have been my duty to explain to them the opinions and conflicts of the Reformers in Central Europe. But in addressing an audience to whom this portion of history is familiar, I will merely state what the Greeks themselves say of Cyril.

His successor to the patriarchal throne, Contarf, the despicable man by whose influence Cyril, his benefactor, was ignominiously strangled, was deposed and executed the next year. Rycant the historian says: "At the expense of fifty thousand crowns, one moiety whereof was paid from Rome, the whole design against Cyrillus being managed by the Jesuits, and other religious living at Galata, who accused

him before the Turks of keeping a secret correspondence with the Muscovites and the Cossacks." The Venetian archives say "for the deposition of whom Rome paid forty thousand scudi."

Much has been written by the Greeks on Cyril, the Calvin-minded (*Καλβινόφρον*). A synod collected by his enemies accused him of heresies and leaning to Protestantism. Time has done justice to this distinguished patriarch. His confession of faith is of the purest Christianity. It is a simple and faithful exposition of the fundamental truths of Christianity, common to all Christians. His confession is faulty, if fault it be, in leaving out what he often in his letters calls human institutions. Though allowed by his countrymen to have shown a leaning to the opinions of the Protestant divines in Geneva; though known as a friend and correspondent of their ministers here, and their pastors in Geneva and Germany, still they love him, because he was always with them; fighting their battles against the most hated enemy of their church.

Enter into the feelings of an oppressed people, who in the time of Cyril had lost all, oppressed by all, whose condition was sorely embittered by the recollection of what they once were, upbraided by travellers, ignorant and unlettered, now subject to the Turks, now to the Venetians, looked upon as a pitiful race, whose only inheritance was the bare name of their ancestors. Could they but revere a man like Cyril, universally esteemed, who for many years fought their greatest enemy, the pope? Even to-day, this very year, Cyril is considered as a distinguished prelate, in a Greek Ecclesiastical history published by the learned secretary of the Greek synod.

Could Cyril have become a Luther to his church? I answer, No. He was too earthly in his aspirations. He clung to his Protestant friends to defend his church from the influence of the Catholics. His friends one by one left him. He never imitated the spirit of the German Reformers, who began their work in the heart and conscience of their Christian

fellows. Cyril's work failed, as every similar work must fail. No religious impression was ever made on the minds of his people after his death. He knew how jealous his people were of foreign influence; how the Protestants had been sadly calumniated by the Catholics, and branded as the vilest of heretics.

Though to this day Cyril may be regarded as a partisan of Protestant doctrines by European writers, this short notice of his life, I presume, will convince you that his whole bent of mind was to counteract the influence of the Catholic church assisted by his Protestant friends.

ARTICLE VI.

THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF TRUTH IN REGENERATION.¹

BY REV. AUSTIN PHELPS, PROFESSOR AT ANDOVER.

It is the misfortune of some of the doctrines of our religion that theological inquiry has often confounded their speculative with their practical elements. Questions respecting them, which never can be answered in this world, have stood side by side, as if of equal moment, with those which must be answered, if an earnest mind would find peace. The views of truth which are commended to the faith of an inquirer often exhibit, therefore, a singular medley of knowledge and conjecture. Volumes have been compiled of the Curiosities of Literature. A good service would be rendered to practical religion if the curiosities of theology could be detached from its essential facts; yet without abridgment of legitimate theological inquiry.

The necessity of such a distinction becomes the more obvious the nearer we approach to any one of those centres of theological thought which represent an intermingling of

¹ A Discourse preached in the Chapel of Andover Theological Seminary.

agencies in human destiny. Such a centre of truth is the doctrine of The New Birth. In the spirit of these remarks, it is my desire to consider in this discourse :

THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF TRUTH IN REGENERATION.

I. We shall reach the objects of this discussion most directly, by first observing the Biblical modes of representing Truth as an instrument of God. The scriptural representations on this subject are not recondite; yet they cover all those points of inquiry on which we need instruction, that we may form a consistent theory of the working of Divine Grace. They may be cited, not so much for their force as proof-texts, as for their pertinence in giving us the inspired doctrine in inspired expression. Fortunately, the most salient of the passages declarative of this doctrine need no comment. To utter them is to explain them. It is difficult to mistake the import of the text¹: "Of his own will begat He us with the word of truth." To the same effect is the Psalmist's declaration: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." The entire burden of the one hundred and nineteenth Psalm is a tribute of adoration to Truth, as an instrument of Divine purposes. Why was Paul "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ?" Because "it is the power of God unto salvation."

Dogmatic statements of doctrine, however, are not the favorite forms of inspiration. The most emphatic representations of doctrine in the scriptures are pictures. Their forces of expression depend on the significance of figurative language. Scriptural style is thus hieroglyphic. "I have heard of Thee," one might say, in comparing the biblical revelation of God with uninspired theology, "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine *eye* seeth Thee." We must, therefore, often interpret calm and literal declarations by the light of other texts, in which the same truths are more intensely expressed or implied in metaphor.

¹ James i. 18.

We must gain vividness of impression, at the expense of literal accuracy of formula.

Thus Truth, as an instrument of God's will, is at one time a lamp to the feet of a wanderer; it is a light shining in a dark place. Then, it is a voice from heaven; it crieth at the gates of cities; it is more, it is the rod of God's mouth; yet, it is songs in a pilgrimage. Again, it is an incorruptible seed; seed sown in good ground; it is an engrafted word: Martial images and mechanic powers and the elements of nature are laid under tribute to express it. It is a sword, the sword of the Spirit, sharper than any two-edged sword; it is a bow made naked; the wicked are slain by it. It is a helmet, a shield, a buckler; it is exceeding broad; it cannot be broken. Goads, nails, fire, a hammer are its symbols, It breaketh the flinty rock; it is mighty to the pulling down of strong holds. Opposite and contrasted emblems are tasked to portray its many-sided excellence. It is a fountain; it runneth very swiftly: yet it standeth forever; it is settled in heaven; it cannot be moved till heaven and earth pass away. It is of ancient birth; before the mountains were settled, it was brought forth; when there were no fountains, it was there. The choicest and most fascinating objects of man's desire are the imagery of its magnificence. It is a revenue, better than choice silver; men shall buy and sell not again; happy is the man that findeth it. It is a pearl of great price; better than rubies; like apples of gold: yet to him that thirsteth, it is wine and milk, which, in the affluence of the supply, shall be given away without money and without price. The senses of the body and its most necessary functions are made to set forth the efficacy of truth. Men taste it as a luscious food; it is sweet to the taste; sweeter than the honeycomb. Their hands have handled it, as a work of rarest art. They have walked in it, as in a path at noonday. Yet they have hidden it in their hearts; and there it quickeneth, it strengtheneth; it hath made men free; it giveth life; men are born again by the Word. Even the most daring mysteries of speech are resorted to, to inten-

sify truth as a power in the universe. It dwelt with God. Before the hills, and when there were no depths, there was it by him, as one brought up with him; it rejoiced always before him. And more, it *is* God: "I am the Truth;" again, it *is* God: "the Spirit is Truth."

By such versatility and boldness of imagery do the sacred writers pour out in profusion their conceptions of truth as an instrument in the execution of God's will. And it is by the aid of these picturesque scriptures that we must vivify our interpretation of those declarative passages which, like the text of this discourse, express logically the instrumentality of truth in regeneration.

It is very obvious that the inspired writers have not thought it essential to the objects of their mission to measure and weigh their words, to meet exigencies suggested by metaphysical inquiry. They have spoken as freely, as boldly, with as spontaneous and unguarded speech, on this subject, as on that of the holiness or the love of God. Theirs is the dialect of song, rather than of diplomacy. They have spoken as if they were not thinking of any philosophy to be defended or destroyed, or of any polemic strategy to be executed or evaded, by the doctrine they should teach. They have spoken like plain men talking to plain men. They have uttered truth vividly rather than warily. They evidently trusted much for the correct interpretation of their language to the common sense of their readers. They have assumed many things, they have omitted to guard against many misconstructions, because of their confidence in common sense. The necessary beliefs of the race, of which common sense is the exponent, lie back of inspired language, as of all language.

We must bear this in mind in any attempt to reduce the scriptural declarations to the formulary of a creed. With this precaution, we may safely infer from them all that we need to know respecting both the fact and the mode of the action of truth in regeneration.

1. Inspiration has established beyond reasonable question the *fact* of the instrumentality of Truth in changing the

human heart. It is scarcely possible to reverent inquiry to err on this point. This is an elemental fact in scriptural theology, which no necessities of philosophy should tempt us to fritter away. Specifications of it may be concisely stated in the following form :

First, that God employs in regeneration Truth as distinct from instruments of physical power. God is wisely studious of congruities. He adapts the instrument to the effect. He selects that which in its nature is fitted to act upon mind, not upon matter. He chooses that which is pre-adjusted to the regeneration of mind, not to its creation. He calls to his service that which intelligence can perceive, heart can feel, will can choose ; that which, therefore, the whole man can accept, trust, love, obey.

Again, God employs in regeneration Truth as distinct from falsehood. Not a shadow of evidence appears in the scriptures that a human heart was ever changed from sin to holiness by the force of error. No man was ever moved aright by wrong. No soul ever thrived upon lies. Profound and honest belief of the false can never, in its own proper drift, save a man. If it seems to save, there is a way that seemeth right, but the end thereof are the ways of death. If the man is saved in his error, he is not saved by it, but by truth lodged somewhere in it. Pure error tends to destruction as inevitably as fire. An echo comes down the ages of inspiration : " that they all might be damned who believe not the truth."

Furthermore, God employs in regeneration religious Truth as distinct from all other truth. Not the axioms of mathematics, which appeal only to man's sense of the true ; not truths which address only man's sense of the beautiful ; not truths which move only man's sense of grandeur ; not truths which gratify only man's love of mystery ; not truths which quicken only man's sense of honour ; not truths which take possession only of man's social affections ; not these are the causal instrument of the new birth. Right, holiness, law, love, God, — such are the rudimental ideas of truth in this divine renewal. Primarily and ultimately they appeal

to conscience. Through this regal faculty they command the whole soul.

Moreover, in the regeneration of those to whom the Christian revelation is given, God employs as his chosen and final instrument Truth as it radiates from the person and the work of Christ: "I am the Truth; I am the Life"; "The Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation"; "Nothing, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."

Yet once more, so far as we can know, God never dispenses with the instrumentality of Truth in renewing the hearts of men. If a question be raised here, it should concern, not the power of God, but the facts of his working. So far as any essential doctrine of theology is concerned, it may or may not be true that infinite power *can* regenerate a soul by other instrumentalities, or without the intervention of instrument. For the purposes of a practical faith, it may or may not be true that, in the nature of things, regeneration is an act which apart from the instrumentality of truth sustains no relation even to omnipotence. Be it so, or be it not, that to the divine mind truth and regeneration — the instrument and the effect — stand in relations of necessity immutable and eternal, like the laws of numbers or of diagrams. We need not affirm or deny. The theological question, if any exists, is a simple question of fact. Does God in the renewal of a human soul ever dispense with truth as the instrument of the change?

The answer to this question is not wholly unimportant to consistency of faith. It can be given in few words. It is comprised in two positions which a moment's reflection will establish.

One is, that if God does in any instance dispense with truth as his moral instrument in the new birth, the evidence of this fact must be a subject of pure revelation. Experience, from the nature of the case, cannot prove it. No man can intelligently affirm himself to be conscious of a divine fiat thrilling his nature, making a new man of him, with no instrumental agency, or with other instrumentality than that

of truth. The only evidence any man can have from experience that his heart is changed is the evidence of actual exercises of heart in view of truth. Divine power in the change is, to all consciousness, so blended with the force of truth,—in other words, the efficient cause so interpenetrates the instrumental cause — that no mind can intelligently separate them. Indeed, consciousness gives us no hint of the Divine Cause, except through the success of the instrument. I cannot go back of my own conscious exercises in view of truth, and affirm that God has changed my heart by sheer will, independently of truth. It is plainly impossible; as absolutely so, as that my eye should detect the undulations of sound, or my ear those of light. Regeneration, the divine act, is evidenced to consciousness only by conversion, the human change; and this, again, discloses itself only in responses of the soul to truth. Experience can go no further back than this; and if experience cannot, observation cannot. If, then, God has ever wrought the renewal of a soul in such anomalous manner as that implied in the inquiry before us, the evidence of the fact must be a subject of direct and supernatural revelation; we can *know* it only from the scriptures.

The second position, then, in answer to this inquiry is, that the scriptures are silent as to the occurrence of any such instance in the history of redemption. They do not explicitly deny, but neither do they affirm. They inform us of many instances of regeneration by means of truth; and of not one without the truth. They proclaim indubitably the *law* of divine working in this phenomenon of human experience; and they neither by assertion nor hint point us to a solitary exception. They record none in the world's history; they predict none in its future. Here, therefore, argument on this topic may legitimately end. In all our positive reasonings upon it we must assume that no such exception exists. In our practical uses of the doctrine we must assume that none will exist to the end of time. We cannot logically found any article of our faith on the hypothetical possibility that the fact is otherwise.

But if conjecture, wiser than truth, must still press inquiry and ask: "How are infants regenerated who die before moral responsibility commences?" we respond by inquiries which are at least as wise; though for ourselves we do not revere them, nor are our dreams troubled if we cannot answer them. We respond by asking: How do you know that they are regenerated? How do you know that irresponsible beings are proper subjects of "regeneration" in the sense in which the scriptures apply the word to adult sinners? Who has told you that the new birth has any relation to irresponsible infancy, more than to irresponsible idiocy? Is a change of heart conceivable in a being who has no heart? What is regeneration in an irresponsible soul? What authority have we for believing anything of such a nondescript? Shall the whole drift of the scriptures be held in check by conjectural philosophy?

But again, how do you know that there are any such infants? Where is it revealed that a soul has ever left this world, or ever will, with moral nature absolutely undeveloped? Who can assure you that moral birth and physical birth are not simultaneous? Who can prove that because a being cannot discern between its right *hand* and its left, therefore it cannot in any respect or in any degree distinguish right *thought* from wrong? How much do we know of the possibilities of infantile intuitions? Besides, who knows what the process of dying is, as a means of moral development? Have we never seen an *aged* infant in its coffin? Moreover, is not the death of an infant, itself an abnormal event? May it not then be one of a group of anomalies which involve an anomalous probation and an anomalous qualification for heaven?

Yet once more, if infants *are* proper subjects of the same change which adults undergo in regeneration, then are they not sinners? If sinners, have they not sinned? If they have sinned, can they not repent? If they can either sin or repent, can they not know right and wrong; therefore may not they too, in a future world, declare gratefully: "Of his own will,

begat he us with the word of *truth*?" Have ye not read: Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast *perfected* praise? Who shall dare to limit God's power of converse with the tiniest image of his own being? Are not the whole heavens mirrored in the retina of a single eyeball? How much greater is the distance—and what matters it to his resources—between God and a speechless babe than between God and you or me? How do we know that in the world of infantile seclusion, before speech has broken the eternal silence from which that world has sprung, God has not ordained a system of moral correspondences with heaven, on which he administers a government of freedom, of law, and of grace as perfect in its kind as that of Eden; a system which he guards as lovingly as ours; and a system, before the mysteries of which angelic wisdom bends reverently, as we stand in awe around the marvels of the microscope? Is such a system any more incomprehensible or incredible than the laws of communication by instinct in humming-birds? Is it any more marvellous than the autocracy of a beehive?

We confess to an aesthetic sympathy with Wordsworth's fancy in the lines,

"Thou who didst wrap the cloud
Of infancy around us, that thyself
Therein with our simplicity awhile
Mightest hold on earth communion undisturbed."

Theologically, we see no absurdity in the hope that this may be more than poetry. Yet we cannot fortify the hope by revelation or by reason. The proof-texts—where are they? The logic of the facts—to whom has infantile experience disclosed it? Our memory is very reticent; our observation is very ignorant. To our reason, "the cloud of infancy" is very dense. To our faith, the Bible is very still. What moral mysteries are latent in infantile mind we therefore do not affirm or deny. We do not know. If revelation had been addressed to infants it might have made us more knowing than we are; but, alas, we cannot be wise above

that which is written for *our* admonition. Yet, if the scriptures had answered the "obstinate questionings" of wise men on this theme, could the world have contained the books which should be written ?

2. Assuming, then, the fact of the invariable instrumentality of Truth in regeneration so far as we know, we are prepared to observe further such intimations as the scriptures give us respecting the *mode* in which Truth operates in the change.

Here, again, the Bible can scarcely be said to affirm anything except by implied assumption. One vital principle is thus affirmed. It is that of the coincidence of the operation of truth with the laws of the human mind. Truth is everywhere *used* in the Bible precisely as men are wont to use it in persuasive speech. There is a freedom in its use ; there is a skill in its use ; there is a mingling of boldness and adroitness in its use ; there is a studious care to adjust it to its use ; there is a wise control of it, now by utterance, now by reserve, in its use by inspired minds ; and there is a confidence, yes, a triumph, in their assertions of its power, which appear to assume that truth has intrinsic fitness to move a human mind ; and if to move it, to move it aright ; and if to move it aright, to move it in genial consistency with its own laws.

Where do we find in the scriptures disparagement of truth as a power over unregenerate mind ? Where is the proof that the divine choice of it as an instrument was arbitrary ? Where is a hint given of its being a fictitious or a factitious means to the end it is used for ? Why should we search for it as for hidden treasure, if intrinsically it has no worth, or if any other instrument divinely chosen could be as worthy ? That is not a salutary faith which depreciates the inherent potency of truth. Divine sovereignty gains no honor, and needs none, from the reproach of its instrument. Are God and Truth rivals in our esteem ? That is not a rational fear, then, which shrinks from " means " of regeneration, and especially from " natural means." Not so do we read the Word of

God. The change from sin to holiness as portrayed in biblical speech strikes us as a restorative, not a destructive process. It may be tumultuous, but it is not therefore discordant with the laws of mind. Truth energized by the Holy Spirit may take possession of a man impetuously, so that whether he is in the body or out of the body he cannot tell; but his experience is not therefore unnatural, or even extra-natural.

The usages of scriptural appeal are conclusive in their implications on this topic. How do inspired men preach? They reason with men; they invite men; they instruct men; they urge men; they entreat men; they warn men; they rebuke men; they accumulate and reiterate all the legitimate arts of persuasion in addressing men; as if *men*, regenerate or unregenerate, elect or non-elect, were proper subjects of persuasion; as if they were complete *men* in their endowments; and therefore as if it were the normal action of their being to obey the truth. The Bible assumes that man everywhere, under all conditions of probation, has intellect which can receive truth, sensibilities which can respond to truth, a will which can act in view of truth, and act aright. So far as the philosophy of the operation of truth is concerned, we cannot see that the scriptures make any distinction between fallen and unfallen mind. We cannot discover that the methods of speech chosen by Isaiah, Paul, John, are not precisely the same in addressing men before regeneration as after. What is the difference? Where is the proof of it?

Nothing but the necessities of a philosophical theory can extract from the scriptures the dogma that truth is an instrument, arbitrarily chosen by divine wisdom, or chosen for unknown reasons, or chosen for no perceptible fitness to move, and move aright, the most guilty and hopeless specimen of depraved mind. True, inspiration preserves a wise silence, in direct instruction, on the whole subject of the philosophy of regeneration; but its assumptions of the correspondence between truth and mind are as unqualified as the boldest

assertions could be. So versatile is its use of truth, so many-sided does truth appear in inspired forms, so affluent in its resources, so intricate in its evolutions, yet so direct in its aim, and so exultant in its consciousness of power, that we cannot but infer the existence of versatile and profound susceptibilities to that power in the soul to which it is addressed. So exquisite is the mutual adjustment of mind and truth as represented in the biblical forms of speech that the entire science of persuasion might be illustrated by those forms; even by such as are addressed to fallen, depraved, unregenerate, non-elect souls. The theory of all that the world has felt to be eloquent is realized in them.

From the scriptural uses of truth, therefore, we cannot but infer that in regeneration its action is perfectly normal to the soul. Truth and mind, in this divine change, come together not as metals held in a vice and riveted; they come as light and the optic nerve. Like seeks its like. Truth acts thus not by contravention, not even by suspension, of the laws of fallen mind. It acts in harmony with those laws, in obedience to those laws, by means of those laws. They are laws which no fall can dislocate. No degree of guilt can suspend them. Truth is thus God's instrument in effecting a change which it never could of itself effect; but the soul on which it operates is never in more healthy concord with its own being than when it yields itself to truth, and becomes a child of God. God thus wisely honors the laws which his wisdom ordained.

II. In the views thus far presented certain collateral principles are involved, which are of practical importance to the preaching and the hearing of the gospel.

1. Of these may be named, first, the simplicity of the work of God in the change of a human heart. We see in this mysterious act the same unostentatious blending of divine efficiency with instrumental agency that we see, the world over, in other departments of God's working. For the purposes essential to faith in the doctrine of the new birth, the change is as intelligible as vegetation. It is as comprehen-

sible as the phenomenon of sleep. The change from sleep to waking is no less mysterious. The beating of your heart is no less incredible. The laws of mind are as benevolently guarded in the one case as those of vegetable and animal life in the others.

This view should specially commend itself as a corrective of certain prejudices which may be fatal to religious life. Is there not a class of solidly built minds which are constitutionally incredulous of a supernatural regeneration, because they have no conception of it as anything else than the effect of a shock inflicted upon the spiritual nature? They imagine it as involving a suspense of conscious personality. They have heard believers affirm that it may be imparted to a man in sleep. The creation of Eve seems to them not an inapt symbol of it. Hence, they rank faith in it with other eccentricities of dreams. Their good sense revolts from the whole thing. Have we not known certain timid minds which have believed, indeed, but only to shrink from their faith as a practical experience, because their faith also is steeped in materialism. Regenerating grace as they conceive of it is spiritualized electricity. They recoil from a religious life, for a reason analagous to that which leads them to draw back from a voltaic battery. Contortions, spiritual or muscular, are alike repulsive. Some, too, believe only to despair of salvation; others, only to live in sullen impenitence, because they are not conscious of the infusion of new vitality into their moral being. Do not pastors often encounter sad inquirers, whose minds are saturated with conceptions of the new birth scarcely more spiritual than those of Nicodemus? Are not these conceptions in part the result of accepting literally the symbolic language of the pulpit in the enforcement of this doctrine? I have known a man to watch and pray for palpable concussion with the regenerating Power, as he would spread his sails to catch the winds if he were becalmed at sea. Such unfortunate experiences are the legitimate fruit of any theory of regeneration which reduces a change of heart to an infraction of nature.

But viewed as the normal effect of truth energized by the will of God, this divine renewal falls into the same plane with other phenomena in which cause and instrument work blended to one end. The greatness of the change is not violence of change. Supernaturalness of cause is not unnaturalness in effect. Deity in the power is not miracle in the result. In material nature are not the most profound phenomena the most simple? The very mystery of their causation enhances by contrast their lucidness as facts. What is the most sublime change the physical world ever undergoes? Is it an earthquake? Is it not rather the noiseless change from night to day? The mightiest forces in the universe are silent forces. Who ever heard the budding of an oak? Who was ever deafened by the falling of the dew? Who was ever stunned by a solar eclipse? So is it with the august phenomenon of a change of heart. So far as we know, it is the most radical change a human spirit can experience. It is a revolutionary change. Disembodiment by death, morally estimated, is not so profound. Still, a change of heart is not an unnatural change. It is never miraculous. It is not necessarily convulsive. It is not necessarily even destructive of self-possession. God employs in it an instrument exquisitely adjusted to the mind of man as an intelligent and free being. Truth may act in it with an equipoise of forces as tranquil as that of gravitation in the orbits of the stars.

No, it is not of necessity a tumultuous experience to which God calls us when he invites us to be saved. By what emblem have the scriptures expressed the person of the Holy Ghost? Is it an eagle? "And John bare record, saying, 'I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a *dove*.'" "Come," is the select language of inspiration; "come, and I will give you" — what? a shock, the rack, a swoon? No; "I will give you — rest. "Come, and ye shall find" — what? struggle, terror, torture? No; "ye shall find — peace. Come ye," — come who? — Come, ye strong, ye men of valor, ye mighty men armed, ye heroes? No; "come, ye that labor and are heavy laden; come, ye bruised reeds; come, ye bro-

ken-hearted ; come, ye whose whole heart is faint ; come, ye poor in spirit ; come, ye blessed ones who hunger, who thirst, who mourn, who weep ; come, ye old men whose strength faileth ; come, ye youths who are as when a standard-bearer fainteth ; come, ye daughters of my people who are girded with sackcloth ; forbid not little children to come."

2. A second principle involved in the doctrine of the Instrumentality of Truth in regeneration, is that of the rational nature of all trustworthy evidences of religious character. A change of heart, from the nature of the case, must manifest itself. Regenerate character, like all other character, will act itself out. Like all other character, its evidences will be intelligible and forceful to the common sense of men.

Christianity, in this respect, vindicates its superiority to other systems of religion. In its tests of character, as in its doctrines, it makes less demand on the credulity of men than is made by any other religion which this world has known — less even than is made by atheism. Monstrosities of life, as of belief, have been the invariable characteristic of infidelity whenever it has existed on a large scale. It appears to be growing more inane and senile as the world grows older. The early paganism had scarcely so wild a development of lunacy in religion as that which our age witnesses in Mormonism, in Spiritualism, and in philosophic Pantheism. Beside everything that man has originated in religion, christianity is alone in the fidelity with which it stands by the convictions of the human conscience, and in the severity with which it applies the laws of good sense to the judgment of character.

The vital test of what a man *is*, in the divine judgment of him, is truth acting by the common laws of mind, and therefore working out effects intelligible to common sense. Pre-sentiments, irrational impressions, apocryphal revelations, ridiculous prodigies, and outrages upon the moral sense of mankind, find no place in the Christian groundwork of experience. Marvellous excitements, as such, have no significance in the Christian philosophy of conversion. Incontrollable

or unreasonable excitements in religious life are no more commendable than any other form of frenzy. The pathological phenomena sometimes witnessed in revivals are a misfortune, perhaps a satanic infliction. The divine ideal of regeneration provides no place for them, except as it tolerates compassionately the infirmities of our nature. He remembereth that we are but flesh.

So, Christianity is silent when an adulterous generation seeketh after signs from heaven. When men hear voices in the air, and stare at visions in the night, and read hand-writings on the walls, and "seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and mutter," and frame creeds out of the antics of "household gods"; the spirit of Christian faith looks down calmly, and says: "The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream"; and then goes on its way. If a Christian believer lingers, trusting in prophets of lies, who say: "I have dreamed, I have dreamed"; it turns and looks upon him as our Lord looked on Peter. The tests by which it would try the spirit of a man all assume that God works with natural means, by natural laws, and for results signalized by their purity and their dignity. Intelligent faith in God; an honest discovery of sin; spiritual craving of holiness; the trust of penitence in the blood of Christ; the dependence of guilt upon the Holy Ghost; and a giving of the whole soul in eternal consecration to God's service, and acceptance of God's love, and joy in God's being — these are pre-eminent among the responses which a regenerate heart makes to truth as the instrument of the divine change within. They are intelligible responses. They are reasonable, natural, honorable responses. They constitute a new life in the soul, which honest men cannot help trusting, and wise men cannot help revering. "And God saw that it was good."

3. A third principle inferable from the doctrine before us, is that of the importance of truthfulness in theological opinion. The new birth as represented in the scriptures gives no support to the theory so natural to superficial thought,

that belief, as such, is of little moment in religion ; that God will judge characters, and not creeds ; that we shall not be held responsible for obeying another man's faith in preference to our own. On the contrary, in regeneration character and creed are indissolubly united. God's instrument in effecting the change is truth. Falsehood finds no place there. Truth in caricature finds none. The less a man believes of truth, the more distant is he from the probable range of regenerating grace. The more distorted a man's opinions are, the more fearful are his perils. The more negative his convictions become, the more faint becomes all reasonable hope that he will be saved. In terrific consistency with this principle is the scriptural representation of the most hopeless depth of sin, as that of those to whom God sends delusion, that they may believe a lie. God acts in regeneration where truth can act ; not elsewhere. The mind that witholds itself from truth is witholding itself from God.

There is reason to believe respecting many constant listeners to the preaching of the gospel, that here is the exact point at which lies the chief obstacle in their way to heaven. They will not assent to certain truths, the force of which is essential to draw them within the range of God's regenerating decree. They are repelled by one truth ; they are heedlessly confused by another ; they are uninterested in a third ; perhaps in part persuaded of many, they are advancing in consolidation of character with hearty opinions upon none. The Holy Spirit passes them by, because they will not credit his truth. They thrust the instrument of his grace from them, and he leaves them in their sins. He does not there his mighty works, because of their unbelief. That is in reality a delicate and perilous work which a man performs when he adopts his religious opinions. In that process often occurs the very crisis of his destiny. At that point in his experience may the contending forces for good and evil meet in fearful equipoise.

In this view also, the varieties of opinion in evangelical theology are not unimportant. That theology which is most

truthful, other things being equal, will be most successful in the salvation of souls. Every distortion of theological faith is perilous, we may be assured, somewhere in the progress of its history. False combinations of doctrines which isolated are true, or false isolations of doctrines which in combination are true, are obstructions to the work of God at some point in the development of their sequences. A disproportioned shading of a single doctrine will surely attract some mind, whose way to heaven it will darken. The foreshortening of a single group in the representation of scriptural theology may so impair its truthfulness of perspective, that to some soul, somewhere, at some time, in some juncture of probationary discipline, that shall seem to be a distorted theology, a caricature of theology, a hideous theology, and therefore a false theology — a theology which no amount of evidence can prove to a sane mind, and no authority can enforce upon a sound heart. That soul, such a theology — no matter what extreme of opinion it represents — may consign to perdition; yet it may be a gospel which angels have seemed to preach.

4. A fourth principle collateral to the doctrine we have considered is, that the life of Christian institutions is in great degree independent of the auxiliaries of Fine Art. Two theories respecting the relations of Christianity to Art are affecting the taste and the practice of the Protestant Christian world. The one theory assumes that Religion and Art go hand in hand, and are equally interdependent. Certain imaginative minds even conceive of them as substantially identical. They are at least so far interchangeable that enthusiasm in the one slides naturally into enthusiasm in the other. Taste and conscience are indistinguishable. Beauty and God are one. Accordingly, it is believed that to secure to Christianity any high development in the life of a people, pre-eminence must be given to music, architecture, painting, and statuary. These, again, must be seconded by scenic forms of service and by priestly attire. A preacher must become as a lovely song and one that playeth well upon an instru-

ment. The simple meeting-house of the fathers "should be turned end for end"; the organ should be the cynosure of attraction, and "the pulpit nothing but an organ." This theory, with variations, lies at the foundation of the popular taste of our own day for the revival of certain forms of mediæval architecture in the construction of churches.

The other theory, without condemning one variety of Art or another, as such, and as in some sense a handmaid of Religion, still assumes that in the very nature of Christianity there lies a certain independence of all forms of Art. The *vital* resources of religious power are not in them. Christian truth is sovereign over them. It uses them in their grand and spiritual dignity, but refuses to subject itself to their scenic and sensuous frivolities. This view is obviously sustained by the doctrine of divine instrumentality in regeneration. The gospel presents itself to men by that noble title: "The Truth as it is in Jesus." Its power lies in the clear, calm conceptions which mind forms of truth. Through truth thus received by a human spirit, God breathes regenerating efficacy, and man becomes a living soul.

We need not, therefore, throw back the support of Christianity upon the appendages of Fine Art. We care not to clothe our clergy in classic or sacerdotal robes. We must not burden our worship with responsive liturgies. We will not employ, or vie with, operatic troupes in our service of song. We dare not crowd our sanctuaries with the masterpieces of the studio. We cannot enjoy a dim religious light. We tire of the gorgeousness of mediæval ornament and the cumbrousness of gothic columns in the structure of our churches. The kaleidoscope of memorial windows does not quicken in us a devout spirit. Why should we struggle to reproduce, in place of our plain meeting-houses, the temples of Greece, or the basilicas of Rome, or the cathedrals of Central Europe? We will not abjure these resuscitations of Art, except so far as they become substitutes of Truth. But as such they minister to an imaginative, and therefore an effeminate, and at length a corrupt, religionism. We must say

of them, "Let the dead bury their dead." We prefer, indeed, that Art should await the bidding of Christian Truth to originate new forms more becoming than these to Christian maturity. Has Christian Art no resources in reserve for a millennial future? Even in this work, let it be but a modest handmaid of the Christian conscience. Let it follow in the train of instrumentalities auxiliary to the gospel, as Miriam followed the ark of bulrushes in the flags by the riverside—afar off, to see what would be done unto the child; and, like the Hebrew maiden, let it be content to do humble and *incidental* service. Then that service shall work in with laws of invisible and eternal Providence.

We must not, we cannot, make the gospel dependent on any of these subordinate aids. Its great strength lies in God's independence of them. It leans to severity of tastes, and to simplicity of usages, and to forms of worship uncomplicated and unimposing to the senses. This it does through its awe-struck sympathy with the spirituality of God. The glory of its work on earth is, that, as the Truth of God, it can go *anywhere* in the strength of God. In Grecian temples, in Indian pagodas, in barbarian amphitheatres, in Turkish mosques, in mediaeval cathedrals; in puritan conventicles, in quaker meeting-houses, in floating bethels, in barns, in lumber-rooms, in log-huts; in the forests, at the seaside, on the prairie; everywhere, it can be itself the power of God and the wisdom of God. Its preachers need not be learned in the millinery of churchly costume; nor careful to know whether vaulted roofs, or painted panels, or plain ceiling, or unhewn rafters, or green leaves, or the stars of heaven are over their heads. If they can but speak God's truth as God bids them, it will do God's work.

5. In sympathy with this view, the Instrumentality of Truth in regeneration suggests the scriptural theory of preaching. In the light of this doctrine, preaching is a perfectly natural work, successful through supernatural power. Its object is to instruct men in the knowledge of truth, to impress truth on the conscience and the heart, and to win to

obedience of truth the estranged human will. To these ends it is a perfectly philosophical means. Its action is normal to the constitution of the soul. Its aims and its methods commend themselves to the good sense of all candid minds. They are not philosophically different from those of honest speech in other forms. But unlike those, preaching is overshadowed, in the very conception of it, by the Divine Presence. There lies the sole hope of its success. Finite instrument in the hand of Infinite Power; Nature used by Him who made it: such is the true ideal of the pulpit.

Preaching, then, is no idle play for the amusement of idle minds. Its design is not to fascinate men by euphony of speech, to startle by oddity of conceit, or quaintness of imagery, or boisterous declamation. It is not to work upon the magnetic organism which unites body and mind, so as to excite sensibility not sustained by thought. Still less is it to soothe the religious instinct of men, while evading or stupefying those cravings which forecast eternity. A genuine preacher will engage in his work with intense intelligence of purpose. He will preach truth to the calm, sober judgment of men. He will lead men to a right life by implanting within them right convictions of truth. He will kindle their sensibilities by so presenting truth as to set their minds to thinking. Vividness of belief, depth of feeling, holiness of will, all borne up and ruled by truth,—these will be the object of a wise preacher's aim. These he will strive to weave into the homeliness of real life. He will preach to men's wants rather than their wishes. The *wholeness* of his soul in its co-working with God will revolt from making the pulpit anything less than a regenerating power.

He may, indeed he must, employ varied and skilful methods of address. Things new and old he will bring from his treasure. Acceptable words even, he will seek out diligently. No art of orator or poet or moral painter is unworthy of him. But the crowning feature of his work is, that it breathes with the singleness and the intensity of his desire to make truth reach and sway the whole being of his hearers,

through time and in eternity; and with the courage of his faith that, in God's strength, and in that only, it will do this. This ardor of devotion to Truth, and to God in Truth, palpitates all through the structure of a Christian sermon. This makes preaching seem intensely alive and concrete. This sanctifies all art in the work of the pulpit. It subordinates art, and conceals it from obtrusion. The hearer sees no art; the preacher is conscious of none. Only God in Truth is felt in living presence. Such is the theory of preaching as implied in the divine instrumentality of the new birth.

This theory is specially opposed to a certain construction of discourses, some varieties of which, we have reason to fear, are craved by the popular taste of our own day, and are sometimes given from the pulpit.

Here let us distinguish precisely the evil; for I must believe that undeserved censure has been broadcast upon both the pulpit and the popular taste, by indiscriminate rebuke. That is not a healthful caution, for it is neither reasonable nor scriptural, nor true to the teachings of history, which decries the careful, the studied, the elaborate, the anxious use of what are ambiguously called "natural means" in preaching. God recognizes no other than natural means. Supernatural power acting through natural means, is the divine ideal of successful preaching. So far as we have anything to do with it, the means are as essential as the power. Philosophically speaking, indeed, we have nothing to *do* with anything but the means. Prayer is but a means auxiliary to truth. That is a perfectly legitimate taste, therefore, which demands *thought* in the pulpit, as everywhere else where mind attempts to influence mind. That would be a criminal weakness in the pulpit which should fail to meet such demand. We must commend the alertness of the popular mind which requires penetrative and suggestive preaching. Men always require this when they are in earnest. They have a right to it. We should not be fearful of "great sermons." We are in no peril of greatness above measure.

It would be more becoming to our modesty to stir up each other's minds in remembrance of the evil wrought by small sermons. But the truth is that, in this work of preaching Christ, "great" and "small" are impertinent adjuncts. In such a work nothing is great but God; nothing small in his service. That is not only a hopeless, it is a positively false, policy which, in its fear of an excess of stimulus in the pulpit, would put down the popular craving for thought, by inundating the pulpit with commonplaces whose only claim to attention is that they are true. Even that which is so severely and justly censured as "sensational preaching" is not so unworthy of respect as that preaching which popular impatience describes by the use of an old word in our English vocabulary, and calls it "humdrum."

The policy of frowning upon the raciness of the pulpit as an unholy thing is not the policy commended in the scriptures; nor is it the policy which historically God has blessed. Apostles charge us: Be strong; quit you like men. The Bible itself is the most thrillingly living volume in all literature. Why do philosophers turn to it when all other wisdom is exhausted? Yet savages have wept, entranced by it when they would play with their plumes under the reading of *Pilgrim's Progress* or *Robinson Crusoe*. The testimony of history is that in every period of religious awakening in the world the pulpit has been intellectually awake. Preaching has been thoughtful, weighty, pungent, startling, and timely; so broad awake as to impress the world as a novelty. At such times there is very little of conservative tranquility in it. It seems rather to be turning the world upside down. It has always been thus; it always will be. Cannot the depth of revivals of religion be generally measured by the weight of the discussions in which the pulpit has made down truth into the popular heart? . . . as God's

The principle, in brief, which should decide in satisfying respecting the intellectuality of preaching is of sight in the popular mind will always demand, and our prettinesses, or receive, so much of weighty, racy, penetic form.

preaching as defec-

thought as the popular conscience is sufficiently educated to appropriate; and it should receive no more.

But there is a style of preaching which is regardless of this principle, and of all others that concern the necessities of souls. I refer to that structure of discourse in which the sacredness of truth as the divine instrument of salvation is buried beneath the display of artistic skill. There is a mode of preaching in which a sermon becomes purely a work of art, and nothing more. This error exists in a variety of forms. Sometimes it is the art of constructing authoritative formulæ of theology. Doctrines are defined and defended with reference to nothing but their orthodoxy of statement, and their place in a catechism or a creed. Again, it is the art of scholastic reasoning. Argument is constructed with care for nothing but its logical rigidity — and, we may blandly add, its aridity. In other cases it is the art of transmutation of truth from the dialect of experience to the dialect of philosophy. Sermons are framed in morbid fear of cant and commonplace. Without one new thought, or new shading of an old thought, the preacher would fain lift up his weary and bewildered hearer from the language of life, that is, the language he has *lived* and therefore knows, to the language of the “higher thinking,” whatever that may be. He preaches as if the chief end of man in the pulpit were to evade the peculiarities of Christian speech. In its best interpretation, his discourse is only an exchange of the cant of the church for the cant of the school.

In a still different form this clerical affectation becomes the art of elegant literature. The graces of composition are elaborated with solicitude for nothing but its literary finish. They are drawn, like the lines of an engraving on a plate of steel, with fastidious and mincing art, studious only of their effect in a scene which is to be set in a gilded frame, and exhibited to connoisseurs. Application of truth is made, if it be made, to an imaginary audience or to an abstract man. It is clothed in archaic speech, which no man, woman, or child of a living audience will take to heart. An exhortation

to repentance even, may be so framed and uttered as to be nothing but the closing scene of a drama.

Perhaps the most vapid variety of these affectations of the pulpit is that which, for the want of a more significant name, may be termed the art of churchly etiquette. This is an inheritance from a dead age. Its chief aim is to chain the pulpit fast to its traditional dignity, to protect it from plebeian excitements, and specially to seclude it from the vulgarity of participation in the conflict of living opinions. With this ambition, the clergy assume the style of reverend fathers in God, and *talk down* to their hearers. Their dialect is that of affectionate patronage. They preach as an order of superior beings. At a sublime altitude above living humanity, they speak benignly to the condition of buried centuries. They discuss extinct species of thought. They exhort to untimely forms of virtue. They prop up decaying usages and obsolescent rites of worship. They are absorbed in the romance of priesthood. It may happen as an incident to their ministry that they tread delicately through the thoroughfare of a bloody revolution, affecting to ignore the forces which are embattled in the popular heart, and counting their mission successful if they keep the pulpit intact from the great agonies which are seething around it.

In a word, under such theories of preaching a sermon becomes a catechism, or a disquisition, or an essay, or an allegory, or a poem, or a painting, or a reverie, or an "encyclical letter," or a nondescript beneath all these, and nothing more. Preaching is literally reduced to an art, and religion is degraded to a science—reduced and degraded, not because of science and art, but because they are made nothing else than a science and an art, or are even made caricatures of both. The intense sacredness of truth as God's instrument in the quickening of dead souls, and in satisfying the cravings of their awakening, is lost out of sight in the preacher's solicitude for certain accuracies, or prettinesses, or dignities, or oddities, or distortions of artistic form.

We are accustomed to condemn such preaching as defec-

tive in religious spirit. It is so. We say in that most expressive dialect of Christian experience, that it wants "unction." It does so. We whisper that it betrays a moral delinquency in the preacher. We are right in this. But are we not often guilty of a fallacy in the commendations bestowed upon the very thing against which our religious instinct has hurled the heaviest anathema that can be uttered in criticism of the pulpit? Such preaching is often approved for its orthodoxy, for its science, for its literature, for its churchly dignity. You hear it commended as good doctrine, good philosophy, good logic, good rhetoric, good poetry, good painting, good acting, good manners, good art in all its forms, and yet you cannot feel it to be good preaching. It is fancied to be good for every purpose except that of doing good. The intellect, it is affirmed, approves it, imagination delights in it, sensibility revels in it, taste courts it, culture craves it, everything in man that is worthy of respect, makes obeisance to one form or another of it, except his conscience; and this stands by as a disconsolate monarch, lamenting his impotence to put down as a sin that which by the consent of all allied powers is exalted as an accomplishment. Confusion follows, therefore, in clerical practice. False art comes to be recognized as the legitimate fruit of a sound faith, or a scholarly training, or a churchly taste in the pulpit. Yet the obstinate conviction is underlying all the while, that this does not meet the responsibilities of the pulpit, nor do its work. Thus a divorce at length comes about, in the very theory of what the pulpit should be, between the moral usefulness of preaching and all its other excellences.

To illustrate the truth of this in but a single phase of it: have we not learned to speak of a certain class of ministers, in tones of compassionate criticism, in which our culture and our conscience give the lie to each other? We say of one of these brethren in Christ: "He is a useful preacher, but he is not eloquent. He is a good man; he is an earnest man; he is a devout man; but — he is not eloquent. He is a faithful pastor; he is a laborious pastor; he is a successful pas-

tor; but — he is not eloquent. He is a truthful preacher; he is a sound preacher; he is a solemn preacher: flippant men are awed by the earnestness of his discourse; thinking men are strengthened by his faithful words; proud men sit as children at his feet; scoffers rage at his plain speech; men who rail at him are held, year after year, beneath his pulpit, as by an invisible hand; but — he is not eloquent. Souls are converted under his timely ministrations; somehow — you cannot tell how, the wind bloweth where it listeth, but somehow — he hath the tongue of the learned; he knoweth how to speak a word in season to him that is weary; the common people hear him gladly; woman discerns of what spirit he is, and follows him, as she went early to the sepulchre; and little children come running unto him and praying that he will take them in his arms and bless them; but, this man, so honored of God; this man, so revered by ministering angels; this man, so much like Christ; this man, we cannot, Oh no, we dare not, pronounce — an eloquent preacher!"

Never was a more egregious error committed, than in this whole style of criticism, in judgment of the pulpit. If nothing is beautiful but truth, neither is anything respectable which is not true to God's thought. A sermon which is only a model of orthodoxy, or of science, or of literature, or of churchly conservatism, and which shoots by or vaults over the plain, living applications of truth as God's instrument in meeting the actual condition of souls, has no qualities which should win for it the respect of an earnest man. For the great uses of the pulpit it is an abortion. The falseness of it to the mission of a preacher vitiates its very virtues. Good taste condemns it as violently as conscience. All noble culture cries out against it as sternly as the word of God. No tribunal is more fatal to its claims than that of Christian scholarship. No voice is more indignant in the rebuke of it than that of the most accomplished manhood. Such preaching is not only not good preaching, but it is not anything else which a symmetrical and earnest soul can approve.

Demosthenes, Chatham, John Adams, had they been preachers of the gospel, would never have preached thus, any more than Paul. They would not have listened to such preaching any more complacently than John Knox.

Let us bring our ministry, my brethren, to its true test, though our work be burned, and we be saved as by fire. Lay it open to the light, as it appears by the side of the simplicity, the directness, the timeliness, the sacredness, and the intensity of truth as used by the Holy Spirit in the salvation of souls. There lies the proof of a living pulpit. Confronted with such an ideal, the affectations I have described shrivel into nothingness. Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all is vanity! They are false to the very titles in which their praise is so often vaunted. They are not "sound"; they are not "scholarly"; they are not "eloquent"; they are not "churchly"; they are not "beautiful"; they are not "finished"; they are not "in good taste"; for — they are not good sense. And they are not good sense because they are not subdued by awe of truth, as God's instrument, put into the preacher's hand for ends which it is impiety to neglect. No matter how much truth may be wrapped up in these false arts, souls never feel it; the preacher does not feel it. Neither can be quickened by it, any more than corpses in arctic seas can feel the latent caloric of the ice-fields which have congealed their life-blood.

When one of those useful pastors, who are "not eloquent," encounters ungenial criticism, it is his right to rest calmly upon his calling of God to the preaching of truth. No secret distrust should impair the joy of such a preacher in his work. There is a certain trust in God's word that truth shall do its work in the hearts of men which every preacher needs to make him a man of power. It is an equable and joyous trust. It is a spirit of repose in the *destiny* of the instrument which God has chosen. Once possessed of it, and possessed *by* it, a preacher feels that he can afford to preach truth truthfully. He need not exaggerate truth. He need not distort it. He need not deck it with meretricious ornament. He need not surround it with eccentric illustration.

He need not swathe it in transcendental speech. He need not belabor it with theatrical declamation. He need not mince it, nor trim it, nor inflate it, nor paint it. He has only to preach it, thoughtfully, vividly, variously, and with the singleness of an intense soul living in communion with God, and then let it do its own work. It will do its work. He may have faith in it. In the midst of exhausting toils, when wearied with that stern suppression of fitful hopes and apprehensions which must enter largely into every intense life, he may find this spirit of repose in truth falling upon him like the mantle of a prophet. He may *know* then that his words are the wisdom of God and the power of God. He will often speak with the consciousness of that which is a pledge of his success. He will speak with a daring neglect of false expedients and conventionalities, which will astonish men who do not know where is the hiding of his power.

We are told that Napoleon in battle used to be restless, anxious, irritable, and taciturn till a certain critical point was reached in the execution of his orders; but that after that crisis was past,—a crisis invisible to all eyes but his,—and long before any prospect of victory appeared to his subordinates, he suddenly became calm, bland in his manners, apparently careless in his manoeuvres, even jovial in his conversation; and at the battle of Eylau, at the risk of defeat, as others judged, he lay down to sleep on a hillock, which the enemy's grape-shot grazed without wakening him. In explanation of his hardihood, he said that there was a turning-point in all his plans of battle beyond which, if it were safely reached, he deemed victory secure. He knew then that he could not lose the day. His work was done.

The repose of genius in the assurance of results which are invisible to inferior minds, can bear no comparison with that rest in the power of truth which a preacher may feel, and which if he does feel it reasonably, will go far towards realizing his expectations of success. The secret of his power will be simply that he is proclaiming God's truth, at God's bidding, and in God's methods. He gives to men that which

God has given to him. The cloud of the Divine Presence envelops him. Within that august protection he performs his life's work. He cannot but achieve results which God will own. He may labor trustfully, for he must succeed. No man ever failed who preached thus. The world may never know his power; but he shall know it; and God shall one day proclaim it, at that tribunal at which shall be fulfilled those words so pregnant with the decisions of eternity upon the history of the pulpit: "There are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last."