

themselves to the acceptance of mankind at large. In another, and a very important, sense they are not universal, because they are not purely moral. Islam is distinctly military: it is Arabian conquest extending itself, first in the void created by the decline of the Roman Empire, afterwards over neighbouring communities inferior in warlike prowess. It still spreads to a certain extent, by proselytism, in countries adjacent to the seats of its power, and specially subject to its influence. But it has not, like Christianity, sent forth missionaries to bear its gospel to distant regions and nations entirely alien to its sway. When its vigour as a conquering power declines, general decay sets in; and it is now on the point of abandoning Europe from a sense of political weakness which there is nothing in its religious faith to countervail. Moreover, recent inquiries have disclosed the fact, that in parts of the East where Mahometanism is professed, its ascendancy is merely superficial, and covers the retention by the mass of the people of their ancient superstitions. Buddhism is not like Mahometanism military or political, yet it is confined to a territorial group of populations, beyond which its missionary enterprise has not extended. Nor can its connection with climate be denied: evidently congenial to the languid resignation of the Hindoo, it is as evidently uncongenial to men of a hardier and more energetic race. It has not been found compatible with progress or supplied the animating spirit of a great civilization. Christianity alone is really universal: and if there is any Power, akin to our moral nature, which manifests itself in human history, it must have been specially manifested in the birth of Christendom.

The volume which gave occasion for these remarks suggests that a collection of the Words of Jesus might be welcome and useful at the present juncture. Without going again into the question of the Evidence for Miracles, it is enough to say that there are many religious minds to which it has ceased to seem sufficient; while even orthodox divines, such as Canon Farrar, are manifestly anxious to throw the Miraculous into the background and to separate belief in it from belief in the great doctrines of Christianity. To disentangle the Gospel history from the Miracles and present it in the form of ordinary biography, seems, as has been