

THE
LIBERAL CHRISTIAN.

VOL. II.

JULY, 1855.

No. 7.

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

BY REV. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

THERE is no doctrine which deserves better to be studied by the light of history than that of the Atonement. The idea of Reconciliation is the central point of Christian doctrine, and it may almost be said of all religion, since its contains the thought on which the necessity of religion is based,—that of man's separation from God, and union with God.

Unitarians have not sufficiently understood the meaning of this doctrine. They have justly rejected the Orthodox form of it, and have exposed, by irresistible arguments, the fallacies on which it rests, and the inconsistencies in which it is involved. But they have not as yet adequately replaced this form of doctrine by any other. Here, as elsewhere, they have done more in the polemical than in the dogmatical department of theology. Their criticism has been excellent, their positive teaching not so good. Their views, as hitherto presented, do not, we believe, sufficiently explain two important phenomena; first, the great stress laid in the New Testament upon the

work of Christ, in its relation to the forgiveness of sin ; and second, the importance assigned to this doctrine by the Christian Church and by Christian experience in all ages. These two facts must be adequately accounted for by any theory of the Atonement which is expected to maintain its place as a permanent solution of this question. That Unitarian theology has not yet done justice to this doctrine is not brought as a reproach against it. It has had its own work to do, and this has hitherto been one rather of destruction than of construction. But now, this work is well nigh done, and everywhere men are beginning to build. We may now hope to have a more positive system of theology, and with the rest, more justice will be done to the positive side of the doctrine of Atonement. Meantime, we may help to prepare for this, by taking a brief survey of the past history of the doctrine. Our survey must be very cursory, for our limits compel us, however reluctantly, to abstain from touching any but the most prominent points.

In surveying the course of this doctrine we are struck by three periods distinctly marked, which present themselves immediately to our observation. The first, which may be called the Mythic period, extends from an early point of Christian antiquity to the eleventh century, during a period of nearly a thousand years. During the whole of this time, the prevailing idea was of a *controversy* between Christ and the devil for the souls of men, and the work of Christ was mainly to redeem men from the power of the devil, by paying the ransom due to him on account of their sins. The second is the Scholastic period, extending from the eleventh century to the Reformation, and during this period the leading notion was *legal*, and

the work of Christ was to satisfy the justice of God by paying the debt legally incurred by the sinner. The third is the period from the Reformation to the present time, and the leading thought has relation to the *government* of God, the work of Christ being mainly to produce an impression on the human mind, by manifesting God's hatred of sin, his respect for his law, or his forgiving love.

Throughout the whole of this time we see that the doctrine is in progress. It passes from the most theoretical to the most practical form. The work of Christ is at first something wholly outward, out of men, out of the world; it is at last wholly inward, a work taking place in the interior soul. It is at first objective, it is finally subjective. Atonement is at first a transaction between God and Satan, in the supernatural world; then it becomes a transaction between God and man, in which God is to be satisfied; and then an influence exercised upon the human mind by which man is to be redeemed. But after reaching this extreme point of subjectivity, a reaction takes place, and in the systems which have followed from the philosophy of Kant, Schelling and Hegel, there has been an attempt to combine the objective and subjective forms; in other words, to represent the Atonement as a transaction in which God is reconciled to man, as well as man reconciled to God.

Returning therefore to the first period, which we have called the *mythic* period of the doctrine, we shall see that the writers of the early church, taking a partial view of the New Testament statements concerning the work of Christ, and seizing on a particular class of Scripture expressions, constructed a theory in accordance with the habits of thought peculiar to their age.

The New Testament ascribes a great variety of influences to the death of Christ, and uses a multitude of expressions in relation to it. Many of these are highly figurative, as where Christians are said to "wash their robes white in the blood of the Lamb," and many are naturally borrowed from the Jewish ritual and sacrifices. But there are two principal influences, relating to the twofold consequences of sin, as separating us from God and as depraving our nature. The work of Christ, in relation to the first, is called in the New Testament *reconciliation*, in relation to the second, *redemption*. The first removes the guilt of sin, the second its power. By the first we are forgiven, by the second we are cleansed from all unrighteousness. Now the first of these effects was of too inward, subjective and spiritual a character, to suit the tone of thought in the early church. They passed by, therefore, the fact of Reconciliation: and took hold of the fact of Redemption, as comprising the chief part of the work of Christ. And seizing a single expression of Scripture in relation to this, they built their whole theory on its literal application. The word thus taken as the foundation of their system was the word "*Ransom*," a word used by Christ* of himself, and applied also to his work by the Apostles. "A *ransom*," they argued, "is paid to deliver captives from the hands of their enemies. But if Christ gave his life as a ransom for us, to whom did he give it? It must have been to an enemy who held us captive. And who could this be except the devil?" Thus argued, for example, Irenæus, contending against the Gnostics,† who endeavored to take a more

*Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. Titus ii. 14. 1 Peter i. 18, etc.

† The Gnostic views of the death of Christ were quite different from each other. Thus Basilides admitted a real death of Jesus, but only of

spiritual view of the death of Christ. Irenæus was the first* who attempted anything like a doctrinal development of the notion of Redemption. His theory was this. Men, through sin, become the prisoners of the devil. Christ, being perfectly just, the devil has no just power over him. By causing him to be put to death, the devil therefore made himself liable in turn to a penalty, and Christ accepts the freedom of his prisoners as his due. He, by his death, pays their ransom, and sets them free. This theory was supported by those texts which speak of a victory over the devil.†

Origen supplied the defects in the system of Irenæus, and developed the doctrine further. He is more mythic in his view than Irenæus, for he explains the motives which led the devil to cause the crucifixion of Jesus, a point which Irenæus had left in obscurity. Origen regarded good and evil as in constant conflict, and considered every good action of a good man as a victory gained over evil and the demoniac world. Every martyr-death is a victory. The demons are well aware of this, but blinded by their hatred forget it, and cause the death of the good. But in doing so they destroy their own power.‡ Thus

the *man* Jesus, and denied the power of his death to redeem others. Marcion taught that the sufferings of Jesus were to be regarded as those of the Divine Being, but were not to be considered as real, but only symbolic, representing the truth that man must die to this world and to all material things. Valentine said that the Psychic Christ, not the Pneumatic, (the soul, not the spirit, the humanity, not the divinity,) suffered on the cross. This, according to him, typified the truth that in the Absolute becoming one with itself, all finite existence is reconciled with it.—*Baur Christ. Gnosis*, p. 140.

*The early Fathers were occupied almost entirely in opposing the Gnostic Docetic tendencies, and in proving the *reality* of the death of Jesus. Ignatius, Tertullian, etc. says a great deal of the reconciling power of the death of Jesus, but not definitely enough to give any distinct doctrinal idea.—*Baur, von der Versöhnung*, p. 26.

†Coloss. ii. 15. Heb. ii. 14. 1 John iii. 8.

‡Origen taught that good works magically, by a secret wonderful power, upon evil. He refers those who doubt to the Heathens, who

was the devil deceived when through hatred to the goodness of Jesus, he caused him to be murdered. He was then obliged to accept his soul as a ransom for sinners. The death of Christ differs from that of other martyrs only in this, that his death brought good to *all* men.

The theory, thus developed by Irenæus and Origen, held its place for many centuries with little alteration. The *right* of the devil over men was fully admitted. Augustine regarded it as the right of property. According to him, Adam was conquered by the devil in fair fight, and made his slave by the laws of war, and according to the same laws all his descendants were slaves also.* Leo the Great considered the devil to have only a tyrannical right. Others thought man to be only in the power of the devil. Some as Theodoret and Hilary of Poitiers, spoke of redemption as a battle, in which Christ has conquered the devil, and set free his prisoners. The notion of a *contract*, however, was more usual, and it was accurately explained how the devil was deceived into accepting the life of Christ as a ransom. Gregory of Nyssa tells us that he was attracted by the sublimity of Christ's works, and did not perceive the divinity under the veil of the flesh. "Under the bait of the flesh," he says, "the hook of the divinity was concealed." This figure

believed that cities and nations had been saved by the voluntary devotion of some heroic characters. Origen also regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice offered to God, and contends that sin can never be forgiven without a sacrifice. Yet this necessity is not deduced from the notion of divine justice, consequently it contains no idea of *substituted suffering*. The purity of the sacrifice takes away the sin, and in its beauty the evils of men vanish away. The beauty of the sacrifice would lead God to forgive, but the devil's claim remains, and that is satisfied by the soul of Jesus as a ransom. We must not look for perfect consistency in these early fathers.

* Augustine wavers in his view, and in some places seems to take an opposite one.

of the hook and bait runs through many of the Fathers, down to Peter Lombard.

Objections were made to this view, from time to time by one and another, and even those who held it seem often inconsistent with themselves in their statements. It was opposed by Gregory Nazianzen, John Damascene and others. But it had taken such strong hold of the mind of the age, that it continued the prevailing view. And even after it had been rejected by Anselm and Abelard, and its inconsistencies fully pointed out, the famous Orthodox teacher, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, defended it with extreme bitterness against its opposers. Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, A. D. 1164, whose "Four Books of Sentences" was the text book of every great theologian, holds to a certain right in the devil over the souls of men. In fact, so long as they clung to the literal idea of redemption, they were compelled to return to the view of an atonement offered to the devil.

The second period is that of *Scholasticism*. But what was scholasticism? Baumgarten Crusius says, "The school separating itself from the Church, and endeavoring to gain an independent existence." Hegel, going deeper, says, "First come the Church Fathers, then the Church Doctors." First come those who give life to the Church, then, life needing light, there arise those who shall teach it.

In the first period of the Church, the direction of its activity was to produce the contents or substance of doctrine: in the second, or scholastic, to give arrangement and form. To systematize and reconcile the various doctrines which had come to be regarded as Orthodox; to harmonize the whole into a complete system of theology;

by innumerable distinctions, and the most subtle definitions, to unfold and penetrate every theological question with the sharpest thought; such was the work of the dialectic scholasticism of the middle ages. But at the very beginning of this period appears a book, which was destined, by the power of its author's genius, to make an epoch in theology, and especially in the history of this doctrine.

Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, born 1034; scholar and successor of Lanfranc, the opponent of Berengarius; in his celebrated book, "Cur Deus homo?" lays the foundation of the Church doctrine of substituted punishment. A realist in philosophy, proving the existence of God by assuming the reality of general ideas, in an argument which has been commended by Leibnitz and Hegel; he carries into theology the same strong confidence in necessary truths, and endeavors to found the doctrine of the Atonement on a basis of absolute necessity. He sweeps away, with the boldness of an independent thinker, the whole doctrine of the rights of the devil, declaring that the devil has a right to nothing but to be punished.

Anselm begins his treatise by asking, Why was it necessary that God should become man in order to redeem mankind? His answer is, Because only so could the guilt of sin be atoned for. He defines sin to be, *not giving to God his due*. But man owes God all that comes within the sphere of his free will. Whenever he omits to pay this debt, he dishonors God, and commits sin. How can satisfaction be made to God for his dishonor? It cannot be made by us, since at any moment we already owe God all that we can do. All that we can do, therefore, only fulfils our present duty, and prevents us from falling into new sin, but cannot satisfy for past sin.

Since the gift of a universe ought not to tempt us to omit a single duty, it is evident that each duty outweighs the universe, and for each omission of duty we owe to God more than a universe. Evidently, therefore, we cannot ourselves satisfy God for our past sin. But satisfaction must be made, or punishment inflicted; for only by punishing sin, or receiving satisfaction for sin, can God's honor be maintained. That it ought to be maintained is evident; since as there is nothing in the universe greater or better than God, to maintain God's honor is most just, and the best thing for the whole universe. If God were to forgive sin without satisfaction being made for it, it would be a disorder in his kingdom. Sin, in that case, being subject to no law, would enjoy greater freedom than goodness. Now, as God's honor can be preserved in two ways, either by punishing sin, or receiving satisfaction for it, why does God choose satisfaction instead of punishment? Anselm gives two reasons, first, because so sublime a work as man's rational nature should not be created in vain, or suffered to perish: second, because the number of the redeemed being absolutely fixed, and some of the angels having fallen, their number must be supplied from among men. Man must, therefore, be enabled to satisfy God for his sin, in order that he may be saved. But to satisfy God, we have seen that he must give God more than the universe, that is, more than all that is not God. But only God himself is this — therefore God himself must make the satisfaction. But it is man who owes the debt, therefore God must be man to make satisfaction. Hence the necessity of the Incarnation of the Son of God, or of the God-man. To make satisfaction this God-man must pay something which he does not him-

self owe on his own account. As a man he owes perfect obedience for himself; this then cannot be the satisfaction. But being a sinless man, he is not bound to die; his death, therefore, as the death of a God-man, is the adequate and proper¹ satisfaction. In return for so great a gift, the Father bestows what the Son desires, namely human redemption. These are the essential steps of the famous argument of Anselm.*

Many serious objections may be urged against this theory, and the same scholastic acuteness which Anselm showed in building it up was manifested by other scholastic Doctors in criticising it. Their minds were too penetrating not to discover its main defect; namely, that the idea on which it is based, of the absolute preponderance of the Divine Justice over the Divine Love, is a mere supposition. Peter Abelard, born 1079, the great Rationalist of the middle ages, criticises and opposes it in his Commentary on Romans. He places the reconciling power of the death of Jesus in its awakening in us an answering love, which conquers our sinfulness. Those who foresaw this revelation of the goodness of God were influenced by it also.† Robert Pullen, teacher at Oxford, 1130, agrees with Abelard. So also, on the whole, do Peter Lombard and Hugo St. Victor.

To be Continued.

*It will be seen that, according to Anselm, Christ's death was not *vicarious punishment*. He did not endure punishment in the place of sinners. On the contrary, the idea of *satisfaction* excludes that of *punishment*. God is satisfied *either* by satisfaction *or* punishment. "Necesse est ut omne peccatum satisfactio *aut* pœna sequatur." The death of Christ satisfies God's holiness, because it was a free act of goodness which was equal to all the good acts which men had omitted to perform. The notion of vicarious *punishment* was introduced afterward by the Luthern Reformers, when they distinguished between the active and passive obedience of Christ.

† In proof of which he quotes the text, "The multitudes which *went before*, and followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David."

UNITARIANISM IN INDIA.

REMARKS OF REV. C. T. BROOKS, AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION, IN MAY LAST.

MR. PRESIDENT — I feel as if the word which I have to say to-night about Unitarianism in India, came both too early and too late. Too late for me, because a year ago was the time when I wanted to say it, only while you were then gathering here, I was fifteen thousand miles off, and if I had been here I should not have had strength enough to utter. Too late for you, because the imperfect expression which I gave of it on paper last autumn has already done its work, and far more than I dared to expect, in deciding you to send to India not only money, but a man, and yet, at the same time I feel as if my present speaking, though in these respects “a day after the fair,” were almost permature and presumptuous, when I consider how soon the report of an invalid who spent only three languid weeks in each of the two great eastern capitals of India will be revised, favorably or unfavorably, (and in either case, superseded,) by the statements of the quick-eyed and strong-hearted laborer who by this time is fast approaching that distant and interesting field.

As, however, it has been thought that a few words from an eye and ear-witness might add to the interest of this occasion, and as the printed paper already referred to left some things unsaid that I wished to say, I will occupy the attention of the Association a few moments.

I confess, sir, to have been hitherto one of those who have been in the habit of regarding the Unitarian body

as not specially called, just yet, to engage in foreign missions, not because "charity begins at home," for ours has been beginning at home a great while, and my religion tells me that

"My neighbor is the suffering man,
Though at the farthest pole;"

and my philosophy, that there are deeper wounds and wants than those of the body; but I have simply felt that in the work of communicating Christianity to humanity, there was as much to be done in the way of *deepening* as of extending its influence, and that home labors and home missions constituted the department to which Liberal Christianity was at present particularly called and peculiarly adapted.

But, within a year or two, I have felt that, in fulfilling the call (I will not say of Christ, but of the Christian conscience) to "preach the Gospel to every creature," there were several strong reasons for making India our first *foreign* field, at least.

1. There is much ground to think that India is the region in which the simple and sublime doctrine of Unitarianism was first communicated from Heaven to man. If (as some hold,) there was the cradle of the human family, then this was certainly so, for there is no evidence in reason or revelation that Adam knew any doctrine contrary to the unity of God. The doctrine of the Divine unity and a pure rational worship is still extant, not yet dethroned, if not throughout decidedly dominant, in the oldest sacred books of the country. In sending Unitarianism to India, then, we aim to restore an old faith to an old homestead.

2. In this work there are many things to give us hope

and help. The general progress of education and civilization has opened the eyes of great numbers of Hindoos to the absurdity and abominations of the existing religion, and placed them in that inquiring state which our simple views of Christianity are best fitted to meet. "Are there Unitarians among the Christians?" said a native gentleman to me with an expression of great interest. Another young native with whom I became acquainted had become converted to Unitarian Christianity by reading the Gospels and Channing, and had in consequence been disinherited by his father; but he had secured the birth-day presents which his father had laid by for him from year to year, and they had enabled him to buy a farm, which he now conducts in a Christian spirit. He expressed great eagerness for our Unitarian books. Many others I saw who have lost all faith in the Brahmins, and whom none of the distracting creeds of the Christianity presented to them can satisfy. Among these are some who owe their yearning for a better faith to the influence of Rammohun Roy, and at present seek in the Unitarianism of the old Hindoo Scriptures the satisfaction of their spiritual wants.

3. I cannot believe that the race and region which produced the noble advocate of Unitarianism just named, are to be for ever given over to a false, distracting, and degrading theology. I feel that there must be an influence surviving his earthly labors which will cooperate with us when we enter the field he opened, and that the memory and example of Rammohun Roy are a call to us from the Father to *go over and help* his countrymen.

4. There are other helpers. The mosques and mausoleums that rise everywhere among the pagodas of India remind us that the followers of one who was not wholly

a *false prophet* are numerous in the country ; that the Koran is there, launching its indignant, scornful, and often sublime satire against the Polytheism of the heathen idolater on the one hand, and of a corrupted Christianity on the other. Even the little Mussulman children may be our allies against not only heathen, but Christian error, as I was forcibly reminded one day when, visiting in Madras the vast mission-school of the Free Church of Scotland, and witnessing the quiet dissent which one of the Mohammedan boys manifested to the teacher's exposition of the Gospel, I said : " You find the Mohammedans tough subjects ?" " Yes," was his quick and earnest reply—and it had more point than he thought of—" because they have *so much* of the truth !"

5. I felt deeply, in visiting the schools of the missionaries, the need of our doctrine and protest for the sake of keeping the truth before them, our Christian brethern, and defending the simplicity of the native mind against the burden of a false creed, and encouraging all parties to *stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and not become entangled in the yoke of bondage*. It was painful to see how the teacher would watch every symptom of a tendency in the young and unsophisticated heart to break through the snarl of a self-contradictory dogma, how he would meet them at every opening, and drive them back into the maze ; painful to see the benighted and bewildered mind that asked for the bread of revelation answered with such a hard stone as the Trinity. I am not wanting in admiration for those heroic men who labor in the fields where Judson and Scudder wore out their lives ; but I must say it is not by means, but in despite of great and grievous misrepresentations of

the Gospel that they have done what they have. And when, in addition to the mighty obstacles to the conversion of the natives of India presented by their own superstition, sensuality, skepticism, by the power of the Brahmin and the dread of losing caste, we consider the stumbling-block thrown in their way by the inconsistencies, immoralities, or indifference of people from (so called) Christian nations who resort thither merely in the scramble for riches and honors, caring little for the natives, except as instruments of their own advancement, and then, finally, by the irrationalities and inconsistencies, so obvious to all thinking heathen, in the very creed offered them as Christian, the wonder should be, not that so few converts have rewarded the missionary efforts, but so many.

6. Wherever the language and mind of England (Old-England or New-England) go, wherever English common sense goes, there our common-sense Unitarian idea ought to keep them company. Surely it seems high time that in that great English Empire of the East, the liberal principals of theology which *we* feel to be so extensively identified with the best of our inheritance of freedom, should have "a local habitation and a name." Indeed, the preacher who "being dead yet speaketh," had been there before us. The most popular clergyman of the English church in Calcutta told me that Channing was his constant companion, and that he held him as the first of the religious writers of the age. And I saw in his preaching the influence of Channing's thought. And then I would suggest here that our sons go to the far East as well as to the far West; and amidst the moral dangers of the East as well as of the West they need all the Christian influence we can supply.

7. But, finally, what has more than all else excited my Unitarian sympathy for India, is the fact that I have seen with my own eyes, and heard from their own lips, the trials and the necessities, the desolateness and devotedness of a little handful of worshippers on that distant and darkened shore, who have for half a century sustained an altar inscribed with the name of the God of Abraham, and Moses, and Jesus—an “unknown God” to the multitudes around them and ignorantly worshipped (it may too truly be said) even in the several denominations of churches and converts who there name the name of Christ.

I refer, of course, to the native Unitarian Society in Madras. I feel that if that little church were the forlorn hope of our cause in India, they would deserve that we should stretch forth our hand and keep it stretched forth in their behalf; that it would be a good and great thing, for our own sakes, to keep up a constant communication of heart and help with that noble little household of the faith.

I will mention one anecdote related to me by William Roberts, the young, ingenuous, and intelligent native pastor of that Society, as showing what influence those poor Unitarians have to struggle under, and to what meanness bigotry will bow men down. Mr. Roberts was some years since the servant of a Bishop; but when his master discovered he had Unitarian notions he silently dismissed him, and when a gentleman to whom he afterward applied for employment agreed to take him if he would get a statement from the Bishop of the reason for his dismissal, that dignitary declined giving it! What an example for a master in Israel to set to the heathen of the spirit of the Christian religion!

But under all the discouragement and depression of the cause, with a church composed mostly of poor servants, for whose worldly interest it would greatly be to yield to the constant influence exerted to draw them from their faith, this young man works on, nor *abates one jot of heart or hope*; he preaches, he catechizes, he keeps three schools in operation, he writes letters to the missionaries protesting against their misrepresentation or their mis-translations of the Scripture to the heathen, as when, in one instance, they worded the title of the New Testament, "the Gospel of our God Jesus Christ;" he is instant in season and out of season, and has long asked, and I think he might well ask, that we of America and our brethren of England should give him a steady expression of our Unitarian, our Christian, our human sympathy. We have put forth our hand, may we have no occasion to draw it back!

THE INFLUENCE OF CHANNING.

REMARKS OF REV. C. H. BRIGHAM, AT THE UNITARIAN
COLLATION, IN BOSTON.

MR. PRESIDENT.—In my wanderings and observations in Europe and the East, I did not forget that I was a *Unitarian*, or neglect to exercise a Unitarian as well as a New England curiosity. I tried to find Unitarians everywhere, and found them. I inquired what Unitarians were doing, and learned that they were doing more than we at home imagine. I looked everywhere for their communities, their books and their work, and nowhere was I wholly disappointed. I met them in the city and in the

country, in Protestant and Catholic regions, in lands infidel as well as Christian. On the side of Mount Zion in Jerusalem, in full sight of that proud mosque which stands where the tribes of Israel once went up to worship, I heard one who has had experience in missionary work among the Jews of that city, declare that none but a *Unitarian* could largely persuade the Jews to embrace the Christian faith; that the *Trinity* was the great hindrance to conversions from that race. He prophesied, if a Unitarian should teach on Mount Zion, that he would find better success than any which had thus far awarded his own efforts. I heard, too, an intelligent and honest Mohammedan, known widely in this country as the companion of the most famous of American travellers, confess that he could see in the Christian faith as I explained it—the Unitarian faith as we hold it—nothing revolting to human feeling or contradictory to reason; that he could willingly accept such a faith; and that, if this were generally understood to be the doctrine of Christians, all enlightened followers of the prophet would forget their ancient religious enmity, and wish well to the evangelists of Christ. He was surprised to meet a Christian who did not believe in the horrid dogma that *God died upon the cross*, and assured me that that dogma would be an effectual bar to every attempt to make Moslem proselytes—effectual, even without any legal prohibition of change of faith. The good opinion of a man like this was worth having, for one meets few Christians whose spirit is more generous, whose lives are more pure and consistent than the spirit and life of this unbeliever.

But the incident most interesting to me was one connected with a name which we all delight to honor. I

made several valuable acquaintances where the name of Channing was the medium of introduction. But for wearying your patience, I should gladly tell of an interview which I had in an Irish car, on the road from Belfast to the Giant's Causeway, riding beneath the bold headlands of that rocky and picturesque coast, where a gentleman who had been careful to point out all the peculiarities of scenery along the way, became at once indifferent to them in his joy at meeting one who had seen and known the man whom he regarded as a prophet, and for miles could talk of nothing else than Channing. Or I would relate a walk which I took in Edinburgh, from Scott's monument to Holyrood Palace, down the Canon-gate, where the curiosity of my English Unitarian companion to know about Channing, had nearly hindered me from seeing the quaint and marvellous sights of that strange thoroughfare. These interviews, however, though agreeable surprises, were much less striking than one which chanced in a district of Europe, where such an interview would be the last thing to be expected.

The Cantons of the Grisons are the wildest and least frequented part of Switzerland. They are somewhat removed from the common ways of travel, yet, in my opinion, better repay a traveller than those regions of the land where the people have been sophisticated by their intercourse with foreigners, and the simplicity of the old Swiss character has been nearly lost. The language of these Cantons is a singular, unintelligible compound, in which the patois of French, English, and Italian has been grafted on to an old dialect of the Dark Ages, and it separates the mountain tribes of the Grisons from all the counties around them, cuts them off from literature,

newspapers, almost from all foreign society. You would as soon think of meeting Unitarians in the hollow of Mount Lebanon, as in such a secluded district. Yet you find here some who have a much better right to the name than the Druses of Mount Lebanon. As I was descending the valley of the Upper Rhine, in one of the most magnificent breaks of the mountain chain, the diligence stopped for a few moments at the small village of Splugen, where a gentleman entered and took his seat by me, whom I saw at once to be a man of more refinement than the rough companions who filled the other seats. I found that, though the Romanick was his native tongue, he could speak the German as perfectly. Discovering from some casual observation that I was an American, he took an occasion to speak of his great interest in that land, especially as the country which had produced Washington, the "most perfect character," as he believed, "of modern times." And for some minutes he went on to express his admiration for him who was equally great in war and peace, as a general and as a ruler, and great, too, in his dignified retirement. I listened with delight, of course—with greater delight to hear in such a place, such hearty words of praise for him whom all Americans revere.

After a while, with some embarrassment, he added, "There is another American whom I have learned to admire, though perhaps you will not sympathize with me here. I think that next to Washington, he is the greatest man that your country has produced. I mean Rev. Dr. Channing. Have you ever read his writings?" I answered that I had not only read his writings, but that I had heard him preach, was present at his funeral, knew

him personally, had visited at his house, and spent hours in listening to his conversations, and that his only son was my friend and college class-mate, and that I shared the opinions of Dr. Channing, not only upon the general questions of human right, but in his special doctrines of theology. Seizing my hand, he exclaimed, "Sir, Dr. Channing is my saviour. Without him I had no faith—did not know where I stood—and could find no satisfaction in all my inquiries. I will tell you my early history. Some five and thirty years ago, when a young man, I studied in the university of Basle, intending to be a Protestant minister. In the the course of our exercises the Professor laid before us the objections of the early heretics, Arius, Sabellius, and Pelagius, and the rest, to the doctrines of the creed, with his own answers thereto. The objections seemed to me weighty, but the force of the answers I could not preceive, and I expressed myself accordingly. Soon my residence at that University became uncomfortable, and I went to the universities of northern Germany, hoping to find sympathy in my heretical opinions. But the rationalism here was not more satisfactory. I happened, however, one day to see in a German journal a fragment of a discourse delivered by Rev. Dr. Channing at the ordination of a Mr. Sparks, in America. I was so much interested in it that I tried to find more of the writings of the same gentleman. And not content with this, *I learned to read the English language mainly for the purpose of reading Dr. Channing's writings.* I have read them all. I have made them my study. I agree with them throughout. They are nearer what I believe to be truth than any writings of this age. And, sir, you may rely upon it, that even in

Germany, where there is so much written about every topic of religion, the works of Dr. Channing have now, and will continue to have a most wholesome and purifying influence upon the tone of thought. I regard Dr. Channing, next to Washington, as the great man of America. It is an honor to any country to have produced in a single century two such men."

Our conversation was continued for nearly two hours, mostly on topics connected with the history of liberal opinions, and the probable spread of Unitarian faith. About sunset he left the vehicle at a little town in the valley, repeating, as we parted, his joy at having seen a man who had known Dr. Channing. The other travelers had seen with amazement his enthusiasm, not understanding a word of what he had been saying. But the wonderful scenery of that valley of the Upper Rhine will ever be associated in my mind with this strange and exciting interview.

HOUSEHOLD NOBLENESS.

BY MARGARET FULLER OSSOLI.

" Mistress of herself, though china fall."

WOMEN, in general, are indignant that the satirist should have made this the climax to his praise of a woman. And yet, we fear, he saw only too truly. What unexpected failures have we seen, literally, in this respect! How often did the Martha blur the Mary out of the face of a lovely woman at the sound of a crash amid glass and porcelain! What sad littleness in all the department thus represented! Obtrusion of the mop

and duster on the tranquil meditation of a husband and brother. Impatience if the carpet be defaced by feet even of cherished friends.

There is a beautiful side, and a good reason here ; but why must the beauty degenerate, and give place to meanness ?

To Woman the care of home is confided. It is the sanctuary, of which she should be the guardian angel. To all elements that are introduced there she should be the "ordering mind." She represents the spirit of beauty, and her influence should be spring-like, clothing all objects within her sphere with lively, fresh and tender hues.

She presents purity, and all that appertains to her should be kept delicately pure. She is modesty, and draperies should soften all rude lineaments, and exclude glare and dust. She is harmony, and all objects should be in their places ready for, and matched to, their uses.

We all know that there is substantial reason for the offence we feel at defect in any of these ways. A woman who wants purity, modesty and harmony in her dress and manners, is insufferable ; one who wants them in the arrangements of her house, disagreeable to everybody. She neglects the most obvious ways of expressing what we desire to see in her, and the inference is ready, that the inward sense is wanting.

It is with no merely gross and selfish feeling that all men commend the good housekeeper, the good nurse. Neither is it slight praise to say of a woman that she does well the honors of her house in the way of hospitality. The wisdom that can maintain serenity, cheerfulness and order, in a little world of ten or twelve persons,

and keep ready the resources that are needed for their sustenance and recovery in sickness and sorrow, is the same that holds the stars in their places, and patiently prepares the precious metals in the most secret chambers of the earth. The art of exercising a refined hospitality is a fine art, and the music thus produced only differs from that of the orchestra in this, that in the former case the overture or sonata cannot be played twice in the same manner. It requires that the hostess shall combine true self-respect and repose,

“The simple art of not *too much*,”

with refined perception of individual traits and moods in character, with variety and vivacity, an ease, grace and gentleness, that diffuse their sweetness insensibly through every nook of an assembly, and call out reciprocal sweetness wherever there is any to be found.

The only danger in all this is the same that besets us in every walk of life; to wit, that of preferring the outward sign to the inward spirit whenever there is cause to hesitate between the two.

“I admire,” says Goethe, “the Chinese novels; they express so happily ease, peace and a finish unknown to other nations in the interior arrangements of their homes.

“In one of them I came upon the line, ‘I heard the lovely maidens laughing, and found my way to the garden, where they were seated in their light cane-chairs. To me this brings an immediate animation, by the images it suggests of lightness, brightness and elegance.’”

This is most true, but it is also most true that the garden house would not seem thus charming unless its light cane-chairs had lovely, laughing maidens seated in them. And the lady who values her porcelain, that most ex-

quisite product of the peace and thorough-breeding of China, so highly, should take the hint, and remember that unless the fragrant herb of wit, sweetened by kindness, and softened by the cream of affability, also crown her board, the prettiest tea-cups in the world might as well lie in fragments in the gutter, as adorn her social show. The show loses its beauty when it ceases to represent a substance.

Here as elsewhere, it is only vanity, narrowness and self-seeking, that spoil a good thing. Women would never be too good housekeepers for their own peace and that of others, if they considered housekeeping only as a means to an end. If their object were really the peace and joy of all concerned, they could bear to have their cups and saucers broken more easily than their tempers, and to have curtains and carpets soiled, rather than their hearts by mean and small feelings. But they are brought up to think it is a disgrace to be a bad housekeeper, not because they must, by such a defect, be a cause of suffering and loss of time to all within their sphere, but because all other women will laugh at them if they are so. Here is the vice — for want of a high motive there can be no truly good action.

We have seen a woman, otherwise noble and magnanimous in a high degree, so insane on this point as to weep bitterly because she found a little dust on her picture-frames, and torment her guests all dinner-time with excuses for the way in which the dinner was cooked.

We have known others to join with their servants to backbite the best and noblest friends for trifling derelictions against the accustomed order of the house. The broom swept out the memory of much sweet counsel and

loving-kindness, and spots on the table-cloth were more regarded than those they made on their own loyalty and honor in the most intimate relations.

“The worst of furies is a woman scorned,” and the sex, so lively, mobile, impassioned, when passion is aroused at all, are in danger of frightful error, under great temptation. The angel can give place to a more subtle and treacherous demon, though one, generally, of less tantalising influence, than in the breast of man. In great crises, Woman needs the highest reason to restrain her; but her besetting sin is that of littleness. Just because nature and society unite to call on her for such fineness and finish, she can be so petty, so fretful, so vain, envious and base! O, women, see your danger! See how much you need a great object in all your little actions. You cannot be fair, nor can your homes be fair, unless you are holy and noble. Will you sweep and garnish the house, only that it may be ready for a legion of evil spirits to enter in—for imps and demons of gossip, frivolity, detraction and a restless fever about small ills? What is the house for, if good spirits cannot peacefully abide there? Lo! they are asking for the bill in more than one well-garnished mansion. They sought a home and found a work-house. Martha! it was thy fault!

OUR SUPERSTITIONS. — We are amazed, when we hear of the superstitious multitudes in a foreign town flocking, from the circuit of a thousand miles, in crowds, one endless procession, to see an ancient coat exhibited under the pretence of its being actually the garment once worn by Christ. But, if we trust in any way to external services and ceremonies, or to our peculiarity of these alone, for our salvation, our amazement had better be turned to ourselves.

BOOK NOTICES.

WOMAN IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, AND KINDRED PAPERS RELATING TO THE SPHERE, CONDITION, AND DUTIES OF WOMAN. By Margaret Fuller O'ssoli. Boston: Jewett & Co. Sold by Booksellers generally.

IN this volume we have a collection of essays on a subject which is gradually securing a hold on the consideration of thoughtful persons. To those who are acquainted with the genius and character of Margaret Fuller, it is hardly needful to say that these pieces come from an original, vigorous, and eminently candid mind. Even where her conclusions are not accepted, we are constrained to respect her utterance. The subject of Woman's training and position is imperfectly understood. On the announcement of a lecture on this topic in Montreal, we happen to know that many persons attended in the expectation of hearing "Bloomerism" advocated. The popular thought is confused on this matter by the gibing of a certain class of newspaper writers. The more candid and discriminating, however, are willing to separate the substance of the subject from the extravagance sometimes connected with it. The thoroughly dependent position of woman is one of the crying social evils of our age — a prolific source of sorrow, suffering, and sin. We welcome every attempt to draw attention to this matter, and should be glad to see this book generally read. In saying this we do not mean to endorse every page, but simply to commend a generous and discriminating perusal. Noble truths will be found here, and vigorously stated. The first essay — "Woman in the Nineteenth Century" — is by far the most lengthened, but there is no tediousness or mere common place in it. There is a brief Introduction by Horace Greeley, and a Preface by the Editor, Rev. A. B. Fuller of Boston, who takes occasion to vindicate his sister's religious faith against the attacks of some sectarian reviewers of her Memoir, published a few years since. He affirms, from the experience of most intimate intercourse

with her, that "in outward life, and in mind and heart she was a Christian." One of the briefer essays—"Household Nobleness"—will be found on page 214 of our present number.

MILESTONES IN OUR LIFE-JOURNEY. By Samuel Osgood. New York: D. Appleton & Co. For Sale, in Montreal, by H. & G. M. Rose, 44 Great St. James Street.

WE transcribe the titles of the essays which Mr. Osgood gives us in this very genial Christian volume. Those who have read the author's former books will desire to procure this one also.

CONTENTS.—Companions by the Way. An Introductory Sketch. 1. School Days. 2. College Life. 3. A Village Church. God's Blessing on the Journey. Childhood. The Song that Never Tires. Youth. The True Fire. Manhood and its Business. Losses and Anxieties. The True Rest. Middle-Age. Cloud and Fire. Old Age. Prospect and Retrospect. Death. Immortality as Fact. Immortality as Motive. Home Evermore. The Great Cycle.

CHANNING'S WORKS, AND MEMOIR.

WE could hardly name any writer who has exerted a wider influence upon our age than Dr. Channing. His writings are known and read, not only in America and Great Britain, but on the continent of Europe, and even in the remote region of Eastern India. The Boston publishers have, for some years past, put his entire works and the Memoir at very low prices, so as to give all persons an opportunity of possessing them. The American Unitarian Association has recently published a selection from his writings in a single volume, for which we cannot but anticipate a wide-spread sale and distribution. This volume, as well as the entire Works, and Memoir, together with a variety of other Books and Tracts, illustrative of Unitarian Christianity, may be found at the office of our publishers—Messrs. H. & G. M. Rose, Great St. James Street. See advertisement on 3rd and 4th pages of cover.

INTELLIGENCE.

BOSTON ANNIVERSARIES.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.—The annual meeting of this Association, for business, was held in the Freeman Place Chapel, on Tuesday morning, May 29, at 9 o'clock. Prayer was offered by Rev. C. Palfrey, of Belfast, Maine. The Record of the last Annual Meeting was read, the Report of the Treasurer, and an abstract of the Executive Committee's Report. The following officers of the Association were elected for the ensuing year:—Rev. S. K. Lothrop, D.D., President; Hon. S. Fairbanks and Rev. E. B. Hall, Vice-Presidents; Hon. A. Fearing, Rev. G. W. Briggs, G. Callender, Esq., Rev. W. R. Alger, and Rev. C. Lincoln, to constitute with the other officers the Executive Committee; Calvin W. Clark, Esq. Treasurer; Rev. Henry A. Miles, D.D., Secretary. That portion of the Executive Committee's Report, which proposes the appointment of local agents by districts, to present the claims of the Association to the churches forming those districts, and, in conjunction with the pastors and committees that may be appointed in each society, to collect an annual contribution to the association in a regular and systematic manner, was called for, read, and discussed. Hon. Mr. Prentiss, of Keene, N. H., Rev. Dr. Lothrop, Hon. S. Fairbanks, Rev. Mr. Palfrey, Rev. Dr. Miles, Rev. Mr. Thurston, Rev. Mr. Haley, of Illinois, Rev. Mr. Casewell, of England, Hon. A. Fearing, Wm. Kent, Esq., of Concord, N. H., Rev. J. N. Bellows, and Rev. B. Frost, expressed their views on the subject, and, for the most part, in terms of strong commendation. The subject of the Books and the Book Fund also elicited remarks from the same gentlemen.

The Annual Unitarian Festival in connection with these meetings came off at 2 o'clock, P.M., in Faneuil Hall, on the same day. The arrangements were every way so satisfactory that some 900 persons of both sexes

were comfortably accommodated at the tables on the floor and in the gallery. Hon. T. D. Elliot of New York presided on the occasion. After an introductory address by the Chairman, and the singing of an original hymn written for the occasion by Rev. John Pierpont, the following gentlemen spoke to the different sentiments proposed on the occasion, viz: Rev. Dr. Farley of Brooklyn, N.Y., Francis E. Parker, Esq., Rev. Mr. Conway of Washington, Rev. Mr. Haley and Rev. Mr. Shippen of Chicago, Rev. James Freeman Clarke, Rev. Dr. Bellows and Rev. S. Osgood of New York, Hon. Benjamin Seaver, Rev. Mr. Sanger, Rev. Mr. Brigham, Rev. Mr. Casewell of England, and Rev. Mr. Holland.

The public Anniversary of this Association took place in the evening at the Federal Street Church, commencing at half-past seven o'clock, with singing, and the offering of prayer by Rev. Dr. Hall of Providence. The Secretary, Rev. Dr. Miles, then read a portion of the Executive Committee's Report, setting forth a plan already adopted for the publication of a series of libraries. The Report gave a minute account of the establishment of three missionary stations during the past year. These missionary fields are the new territory of Kansas, the Chippawa Indians, and the far off region of India. The reading of the Report was followed by a few earnest words from the Rev. Dr. Lothrop, the presiding officer, who spoke of the pleasant auspices under which they were assembled to celebrate the Thirtieth Anniversary of this association. The other speakers on this occasion were the Rev. Dr. Gannet, Rev. Charles T. Brooks of Newport, R. I., Rev. Mr. Hill of Waltham, Rev. Mr. Hale of Worcester.

MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE.

The Ministerial Conference, an association of ministers, met in the vestry of the church in Bedford Street the same morning at 9 o'clock, and listened to an address from the Rev. Ephraim Peabody, D.D., whose subject was "The relation of Christianity and the Christian Minister

to the secular activity of the times". On Wednesday afternoon the usual address on Social Reform was given by Rev. Samuel J. May of Syracuse, N. Y., before the Ministerial Conference.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The Anniversary of the Sunday School Society was held in the church in Bedford Street, on Wednesday evening. Prayer was offered by Rev. A. B. Muzzey, of Concord, N. H. The President of the Society, Hon. A. Fearing, introduced the services of the evening with some appropriate remarks, and stated that the officers of the Society had induced the Rev. Mr. Huntington to prepare and read a report, as the Society had, until recently, been without a Secretary. Rev. Mr. Huntington was introduced and read a very interesting paper, in which he gave a sketch of the organization of this Society last summer at Worcester, stating that it was not the Society that had been accustomed to meet on the same evening of the last week in May, but a new one, with a new organization and enlarged plans of usefulness, the prominent feature of which is the appointment of a Secretary, or General Agent, to devote his whole time to the interests of the Sunday-school cause, to give his personal attention to the selection and preparation of books, to edit a paper for the young, to visit and address Sunday-schools, confer with pastors, superintendents, and teachers, and promote the general interests of Sabbath-school instruction. The Report mentioned the appointment of the late Rev. F. T. Gray to this trust, and the disappointment in his sudden death, from whose labors so much had been anticipated; the appointment of Mr. Jared M. Heard to succeed him, and his withdrawal on account of infirmities of health; and lastly, the appointment of Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, who has recently accepted the office, with the understanding that he is not required to relinquish his pastoral charge, and that he is to take charge of such interests of the Society as require immediate and constant care, until either himself shall be able and willing to give his whole time to the work, or another person can be found who is able to do this. Besides these statements the Report set forth the purposes and principles of the Society at considerable length. Several ministers and others also addressed the meeting.

THE CHILDREN'S MISSION.

The Sixth Anniversary of the Children's Mission to the Destitute was celebrated, by a public meeting, on Thursday, the 31st May, in the Church of the Savior, in Bedford Street. Hon. Albert Fearing, President of the Mission, occupied the chair. The exercises were commenced by the singing of a hymn by the children, and prayer by the Rev. Mr. Mumford of Detroit. The Reports of the Secretary and Treasurer were then read. The Report of the Secretary, Mr. Merrill, contained an interesting account of the labors which have been conducted under the auspices of the mission during the year. Rev. C. Brooks, of Medford, Rev. Mr. Mumford, of Detroit, Rev. R. Ellis, of Boston, Rev. Mr. Haley, Rev. Mr. Coolidge, of Boston, Rev. Mr. Morrison, of Milton, Rev. Mr. Cudworth, of East Boston, and Rev. Mr. Winkly, of Boston, addressed the meeting. Several beautiful hymns were sung by the children during the exercises of the meeting. This was one of the most interesting meetings of Anniversary Week.

There was a Conference and Prayer Meeting every morning during the week, commencing at 8 o'clock, which were well attended.

On Thursday evening, the affecting and beautiful service of Communion was held in the Federal Street Church. The introductory services and sermon were by Rev. Mr. Clapp of Salem: text, Galatians iv. 4,5. — "God sent forth his son to redeem them that were under the law." The sacrament was administered by Rev. Dr. Farley, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE.

THIS body convened at 9 A.M. on Thursday morning, June 14th, at the Unitarian Church on Niagara Street, Buffalo. There were a large number of Delegates present, and the gathering was an unusually interesting one. The delegates from the different sections of the West described the progress of liberal Christianity everywhere as extremely encouraging. We will give a more extended notice of this Conference in our next.

BOOK FUND OF AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.—In a recent list of the American Unitarian Association, there is an acknowledgment of \$300 in aid of the Book Fund, from "Friends in Montreal."