

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1846.

No. I.

ART. I.—*A Discourse on the Moral Tendencies and Results of Human History*, delivered before the Society of Alumni in Yale College, on Wednesday, August 16, 1843. By Horace Bushnell. Published by request of the Society. New Haven, 1843.

It is proper to explain for what reason we make this speech the subject of a review, and with painful endeavour attempt to resuscitate and bring again into notice what, to judge by the usual fate of such productions, Time something like two years since should have put into his wallet as alms for Oblivion. Indignation perhaps may be kindled in some breast respectful for the dead, and surprise in others, that in the case of such an evident "relictum," such a ghost as a speech becomes when disembodied of speaker, audience, and elocution, we should seek

"To offer it the show of violence;
For that 'tis as the air, invulnerable."

It should indeed have been permitted to die where it fell,

"Trojæ sub mœnibus altis
. . . . ubi tot Simois correpta sub undis
Scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora volvit,"

But since it was taken up, we must believe by no friendly deities, and driven on a hostile shore, it is incumbent on us to say that for our own part we notice it, first, for the double cause of

ART. VI.--*The Record of St. John concerning the Raising of Lazarus from the Dead.* JOHN xi. 1—46.

IN tracing the mediatorial course of Jesus Christ, we begin with the original, uncreated, unapproachable glory which he had "in the beginning with God." In the midst of that glory he dwelt "in the bosom of the Father." We next observe him invested with our nature as a temporary inhabitant of the earth; submitting with amazing condescension to the humble and straitened conditions of our earthly life, and to a degree of shame and suffering unparalleled in the history of human violence and injustice. We then see him returning to heaven, to be re-invested with the spiritual glory of the Godhead; raising the human nature to the same majesty with the divine; and challenging, in his two-fold personal constitution, God and Man, universal worship, as the sole representative of divine authority, power and grace.

The records of the earthly life of our Lord represent him in a state of humiliation intermediate between two extremes of exaltation. The period of his personal and visible residence in this world must be viewed in its inseparable connexion with his antecedent and consequent glory. "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go to the Father." His earthly course was an issue from the eternal life of God, and in that again it terminated; and except when viewed in its relation to the eternal life it was intended to reveal, it cannot be understood.

The two classes of facts, those belonging to his existence and works as God in heaven, and those belonging to his human life on earth, appear to us, when taken together, so irreconcilable with all the known facts and laws of the life of other beings, that, on no other testimony than that which we must receive as absolutely and entirely infallible, could we be constrained to believe them. It is hard for men, free from superstition and guided by reason, to believe in any deviation from the course of nature as they have understood it. Our first struggle with a marvellous event is to reduce its marvellous features to mere appearance, and then to place the fact under a law already known. Should we sud-

denly hear a human voice, seeming to speak to us from the air, and see no man in the direction of the voice, we should first inquire whether our organs of hearing were not in some unusual state, or whether what seemed to us a human voice were not in reality something else ; or whether the direction of the voice might not be accounted for by the known laws of reflected sound ; and when, after exhausting the shifts of incredibility, we are compelled to admit the fact as supernatural, we are prepared by the very contention of reason against it to receive the mystery with the profounder submission and wonder.

It is after this manner that reason handles the mystery of God in Christ. The facts of the Messiah pre-existent and incarnate, lie entirely out of the known and general course of created things, and derive from the course of nature, no probability at all. We observe also the same concerning the facts of his earthly life alone. From the time of his conception, he appears subject in all respects, so far as human eye can discern, to the laws which govern the birth, the growth, and the action of a man. He represented, in the most natural and simple way, all the properties of the human nature, except only the infirmity of sin. The growth of his frame in childhood and youth is not known to have varied, in any particular, from that of any other child of good health and habits. His bodily motions were, in general, so invariably human, that the most familiar witnesses of his life ascribed to him, in their common speech concerning him, the proper attributes of humanity. He accepted the hospitality of friends ; and in his use of bed and board, he betrayed no distinction between himself and other men. When he sought retirement, he did not vanish, but withdrew from the multitude, after the manner of a man. When he would take a position on the water, to address the multitude on the shore, he sat in a boat. To cross the lake, he entered a boat, and was carried as other men ; and if weary, refreshed himself with sleep. For aught that appears, his signs of bodily maturity kept pace with his years ; and his bodily health was maintained by the process of nourishment, exercise and rest, common to the healthy condition of the human frame. And when the hand of violence was laid upon him, its effects, the bleeding and the thirst, the suffering in all its variety and its results, and the death itself,

occurred in acknowledged conformity to the laws of the bodily nature of man, and as clearly met the expectations of the witnesses, as did the effects of similar violence upon the men who suffered with him.

He lived, moreover, in obedience to the laws of the human mind. So far as his mental operations could be observed, they evidently followed the ordinary course of human thought and feeling. His mental development came with the growth of his body. Although in the temple at twelve years of age, he gave proof of extraordinary intellectual virtue, perhaps of superhuman knowledge, yet the tenor of his mental movements agreed with the laws of human thought. His discourses gave the ordinary signs of logical connection which appear in the natural processes of well regulated human minds. His conceptions came in such succession as holds in human minds by the laws of association; and when he spoke as never man spoke, his peculiarity arose from the nature of his doctrine, and not from the method of his thought. His instructions were largely suggested by occasions. His trains of thought, like those of man, often took their direction from objects of sense. When he heard of the massacre of certain Galileans, he called up the analogous case of the eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell, and gave the instructions naturally suggested by those events. When he hears his disciples strive for places of honour, he gives general instructions on humility. When he sees a rich man who loves his possessions, he says to his disciples, take heed and beware of covetousness. He felt compassion for an unhappy youth when he saw him; for the erring multitude while looking around upon them. He wept for Jerusalem while he beheld the city. He went near to a fig-tree to see whether it bore fruit. He commended his mother and John to one another, when he saw them standing by the cross. He rejected the bitter draught when he had tasted its bitterness.

These simple, unobtrusive signs of humanity in our Saviour are to be coupled, in our conception of his person, with another class of facts which we have seen in no other case associated with the human nature, and which we, therefore, hold to be entirely diverse. Among these are the supernatural conception, and perhaps, the exhibition of superhuman understand-

ing while yet a child. He knew the thoughts of men without their natural expression. He sent for the animal he wished to use, knowing where the messenger would find it, and that the owner would let it go. He sent to engage a particular room for his use, the proprietor of which "shall meet you," says he, "bearing a pitcher of water." He silenced the storm with a word. He healed the sick at his pleasure, cured the lame, gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, and speech to the dumb; and with a word restored the raving demoniae. In his hands, the five barley eakes and two small fishes of a lad in the throng, became an abundant meal for more than five thousand people. Such facts as these are reported of him by the same authority which gives us the facts of his human nature; and we know not how to contradict one part of the report, and believe the other.

Shut up to the admission of both the classes of phenomena, we take the natural course of reason in assigning to the person of Christ, those principles which we conceive to be the natural and appropriate source of such facts. One class we have already designated as human, the other we have designated as divine. The human nature is the recognized fountain of the one, the divine nature, of the other; and since the same person is observed and believed by us to represent the two kinds of facts, the same person is conceived by us as possessing the two natures. And Jesus becomes to us God and man. He is the only being of his kind within our knowledge; *the man Christ Jesus*. We have no common name for him, because we have no class of persons like him to designate by a common name. We may call him Jesus, Christ, Son of Man, Son of God; whatever name he applies to himself, whatever name we choose as the sign of our conception of his person. We need no common name for that which does not belong to any class.

Out of the perplexity of some minds with these signs of two incompatible natures in Christ has arisen a struggle of unbelief against one class of facts or the other, according to the circumstances and the bias of the disputant. The Deity in his person is rejected by one and the humanity by another, because it is so hard to believe that he is both God and man. But why so hard? Not at all on account of any lack of testimony; for so far as our observation has reached over the field of this controversy,

we have heard the incredulity reckon its own descent, never from the character of the testimony, but always from the incredibility of the doctrine, *per se*. But why so incredible? Not at all on account of the unsearchableness of the mystery; but solely on account of its singleness. Let it admonish us to observe how readily we are reconciled to mysteries by seeing them repeated till they become common facts. Mere familiarity with the phenomena takes the place of explanation, and we cease to feel perplexity concerning a mystery by having it as matter of common observation. Witness the incompatible phenomena of matter and spirit conjoined in the person of every man; the living, sympathizing union of that which thinks and feels with that which does not think and feel, of the incorruptible with the corruptible, of a substance which knows no subjection to the conditions of space and time with a substance which unites space and time with the representation of all its phenomena; and such a union of these substances, that both concur in action, each determines the condition of the other, and the changes of both from the experience of the same person, and are embraced in the single consciousness of individual existence and activity. Could any thing be more incredible, *à priori*? Can any thing be more inconceivable? Who knows the ground of its possibility? Yet being familiar with the phenomena, we insert it on our list of natural and ordinary facts; we conceive it as one of the links in the chain of nature, and feel little concern with either its present mysteriousness or its previous improbability.

With the single example of its kind before us, in the person of the God-man Jesus, we fail to distinguish between its singularity and its rank as supernatural. We call it supernatural, only because it is singular. Whether such a union of natures be possible, we are not otherwise competent to judge, than as we learn from the scriptures, that all things are possible with God; and supposing it thus to be possible, we should only need to become acquainted with a race of beings like Christ, to obtain full relief from our perplexity, and feel prepared to place the whole, as we now do the race of angels and the race of men, under the laws of nature. It would then rank in mysteriousness with the human and angelic mysteries. It would be no more a stumbling block to our philosophy. What then? Shall we

resist the testimony in favour of a mysterious fact, only because there are not a multitude of others like it? Shall the doctrine of one such Mediator between God and man meet with ungracious reception, only because it asserts but one?

Nothing possible is *à priori* improbable. Testimony derives none of its proper power over a reasonable mind from the previous probability of the fact; nor does testimony lose any of its proper power over a reasonable mind from the previous improbability of the fact. Confidence in testimony reposes on the character of the witness previously known, not on the probability of the things attested. Hume assumed the fallibility of all possible testimony, and then denied that any testimony could sustain rational belief in a supernatural event. His conclusion comes fairly out of his assumed premises; but his assumption is false. To assert the impossibility of infallible testimony is atheistical, and therefore absurd. Against a witness then, whom we understand, and fully trust from a previous knowledge of his veracity, no knowledge from the previous laws of nature, nor confidence in their uniformity, nothing except the contradiction of a witness equally intelligible and equally trustworthy, can have any weight. But the first witness being supposed infallible, contradictory testimony equally trustworthy is impossible. We are left, therefore, under the power of our infallible witness, free of all disturbance from the strange or mysterious nature of his facts, and prepared to submit our thoughts and feelings to the direction and impulse of his doctrines.

It is from this delightful position that we contemplate the scene in which Jesus is represented by the first six and forty verses of the eleventh chapter of John. We recollect no part of the history of our Saviour, which, with so copious and so captivating matter for the edification of the believer, contains less in itself to disturb a settled infidelity. The minuteness of the narrative multiplies inviting points of attack for incredulous criticism; while the narrative of some of the things related stands in such contrast with the leading facts of the narrative, that we cease to wonder at the zeal, the perseverance, and the comparative plausibility, with which this portion of the New Testament has been assailed. It is true indeed of all the inspired record, but it seems to us to hold with peculiar

force of this part, that to derive the proper benefit from reading it, one must believe beforehand, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The passage itself seems less adapted and less intended to convince the reader that he was a divine person, than to show how that divine person appeared in given circumstances. It give us a near view of the actions and manner of our Lord in one of the memorable scenes of his earthly life. It introduces us to his private circle. We hear his familiar conversation with his friends. We see him unbent from official dignity and precision, and giving freedom to the tendencies of that complex nature, which made him the "great mystery of Godliness."

As to the act itself of raising Lazarus, together with the acts immediately connected with it, we judge it unlikely to carry conviction of the proper divinity of Christ to a mind capable of resisting the force of his other miracles. The whole air of this remarkable narrative shows that the writer was not constructing his facts into an argument for the divinity of the Saviour, nor even presenting them as the basis of any conviction of his own respecting the doctrine. He appears only as a narrator of the facts. The most disinterested witness could not give such information with a greater evidence of candour. The most single-hearted individual could not state them with greater simplicity. He seems to aim at nothing but to tell the story; to repeat the things which he saw and heard. He does not even betray the slightest wariness or caution in his expressions, or in the selection of his facts, to prevent the cavils of scepticism; but gives us every thing in the words and actions of his Lord which disclosed any personal characteristic on that occasion, and which might assist the reader in conceiving what manner of person he was.

This, then, first we here assume: that the other works ascribed to Christ by the sacred writers, establish the truth of what those writers assert concerning the divinity of his character and mission; and that the reader may be expected to come to this part of the history with his convictions settled, and his mind at rest on that fundamental question. We then proceed to the fair and natural interpretation of the words and acts of the Saviour in the case before us, with a firm and

pleasing confidence that such an explanation will be fruitful of confirmation and joy to the Christian reader.

We next premise that nothing in this narrative can be shown to be inconsistent, in the smallest degree, with the doctrines elsewhere asserted and proved in the scriptures, concerning both the deity and the humanity of the Saviour. On the contrary, every fact, every circumstance, agrees with those doctrines, is by means of them capable of complete explanation, and can be clearly explained on no other principle. While, therefore, without the clear and firm conception of the theanthropy of Christ, the reader of this chapter must become bewildered amidst the group of heterogeneous and unaccountable phenomena, with that conception he finds himself surrounded with light and order, and is entertained and edified with the beauty and harmony of truth. If the record of itself do not call up that conception in his mind, it can yet give him no repose in any other. He must either deny, with an arbitrary election, a part of the facts, or leave them unexplained, and "abide in darkness."

We feel great satisfaction with the *logical office which this part of the record of John seems thus intended to serve. It agrees with all which we elsewhere learn of the genius and mental habits of the author. It accords with the scope and tenor of his book. It is even recommended by the relation which the gospel according to John is commonly conceived to hold to the books of the other evangelists; rather as a supplement to them than as a record complete in itself; prepared for the friends of the Redeemer, to confirm and illuminate their faith in him as the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing they might have life through his name.

At the time of the sickness and death of Lazarus, it appears from the most obvious view of the record, that Jesus was "away beyond Jordan, where John at first baptized." He was probably at Bethabara. "There he abode." There many resorted to him, saw his works, compared his works with those of John, and his course with the testimony of John, and believed on him. He was there employed in the work of his mission with great success. The message from the afflicted family found him there. His disciples, of course, after the reception of those tidings, would expect in him the natural

and characteristic signs of his tender interest in the affliction, and of his readiness to afford relief. They would expect either that he would heal Lazarus instantly, and give the messenger some satisfactory sign of the act, all which they knew he had the power to do, or that he would go in haste to Bethany. The fact of the message shows the urgency of the case. He, however, does neither; yet he accommodates himself to their expectation by telling them that the sickness is not unto death.

It was well understood by them all, that there existed between him and the family at Bethany a very intimate mutual acquaintance and affection. "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister and Lazarus." "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick." His known love for the family and theirs for him, was a natural ground of presumption that he would afford them immediate relief. Such a presumption in them is fairly implied by his conciliatory suggestion that the sickness was not mortal. And we especially note that Jesus did not rebuke their expectation, as inconsistent with his character and office, but shaped an apology to it, as though he deemed it worthy of both himself and them. It was not literally true, that, according to the common meaning of the words, the sickness was not unto death. Lazarus actually died, and, for aught that appears in the history, by the natural course of his sickness. Yet our Lord, without any breach of propriety, uses that language to his disciples, and leaves them to take the comfort of its apparent meaning at the time, and to learn its true meaning afterwards; both meanings, however, be it remembered, being agreeable to his present aim of relieving their apprehensions for Lazarus, and their disappointment in himself. He tacitly concedes the propriety of their expectation that the love he cherished for that family would lead him to interpose without delay in their behalf, or to show them that their fears for their friend were groundless.

Here, then, at the beginning of this narrative, we discern in Christ the features of a complete and undisguised humanity. He is represented as peculiarly bound to a particular family in Bethany, and by the affectionate ties of a human heart. He had enjoyed their hospitality. He was at home in their house. They had expressed their sincere and generous devotion to him, by their care and trouble to provide for him and

promote his comfort ; by the reverential act of Mary, in anointing his feet with costly ointments and wiping them with the hair of her head, and by her respectful and docile attention while she sat at his feet and heard his words. He promptly and tenderly returns love for love. How significant is the message of the sisters on that point : " He whom thou lovest is sick." The entire texture of the expression comes from the reciprocal movement of affection between human friends. The Saviour loved that family with the love of a man. It was a grateful feeling which arose in his bosom, as a response to their free and cordial hospitality ; it proves him a partaker of those sentiments of mutual dependence and obligation by which all men are beholden to one another. If it was entirely original with himself, going forth in unprovoked and spontaneous beneficence towards its own elect, it shows how exquisitely his whole nature locked itself in with the reciprocal powers and movements of the human soul ; insomuch that in dispensing his enlightening and purifying virtue amongst men, he joined them upon himself by the attachment of a mutual sympathy, and breathed his heavenly love into their hearts through the channels of their own social constitution.

It was no insignificant characteristic of our Saviour's communion with men, that he adopted the proper manners of a man ; that he adopted the human manners so clearly from an inward principle that they seemed to all observers to come from his nature ; that he used the language of his countrymen as his own vernacular ; that he employed all their conventional signs of thought and feeling, as his medium of communication with their understandings and hearts. His dependence on them was not necessary. He condescended to use them. He had the power, and often exerted it, and exerts it still, to awaken thought and feeling in men by means which are silent and unseen. But he communed with men on earth as a man. He instructed his people by intelligible speech. He tenderly stooped to the ear of human sorrow, and breathed his heavenly consolation through lips of flesh and blood. And to complete the climax of these wonders, he appears, in his human garb and manners, to be entirely at home. There is no apparent effort after conformity by circumspection and self-restraint ; no occasional deviation from the line of human habits, in an un-

guarded moment, nor ever, except for an obvious purpose; no watchful repression of divine motions to give a studied and feigned predominance to the characteristics of the man. Humanity was in him as a native quality. It had been born with him. It had grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength. Nay, its growth in him was his growth. It was that which constituted his increase "in knowledge and in stature and in favour with God and man." Having been born a man, his personal appearance and acts, throughout his earthly life, never raised a doubt amongst his acquaintance, that his human form and manner came altogether, as in other men, from the genuine fountain of vitality in the human constitution.

Such considerations help us to appreciate the mystery of that wonderful person, who appeared amongst men as the manifestation of God. We look with amazement and awe upon the death-scene of the Saviour as though the natural phenomena of the cross were pre-eminently incompatible with the acknowledged Godhead of the sufferer; and we are wont to receive from that scene our most vivid impressions of the unsearchable constitution of the Mediator. This fact is easily explained. We are attracted and moved by the thrilling nature of the transaction. The human features of the phenomena are thrust forth into overwhelming prominence, and the mysteriousness of the facts is felt the more, for the greater interest they awaken. But the mystery of the death of Christ is only an illustration of the mystery of his whole earthly life. How could the Eternal, the All-knowing, the Almighty, contract and shape himself to a human and an earthly world? How combine so intimately with the elements of a human constitution? We assert an inscrutable mystery when we assert that the Son of God lived on earth as a man; and it is only by means of discriminating meditation upon the facts of his life, that the power of this mystery is felt.

"This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby." We have dwelt the longer, here on the working of humanity in him, for the sake of the suggestion thus given of the manner in which the Son of God was to be glorified by this event. It will readily occur to a reflecting reader of the chapter before us, that the glory of God had been frequently shown

already in miracles quite as indisputable in fact, and as convincing in power as the one now in contemplation; that the disciples, for whose sakes, at least in part, (see verse 15) the occasion was intended, had respecting his power for such works, no doubt which it needed another miracle to remove; and that the additional impression to be made on the public mind merely by the raising of the dead man, above that which would result from the miraculous healing of his sickness, would seem hardly worth the cost of the dying pains of the sufferer, the long and bitter sorrow of the family, and the unusual preparation and formality on the part of Christ, with which the proceeding was introduced and conducted. The following view then presents itself as the preferable alternative: That by the sickness and death of one of his intimate and faithful friends, and the grief of a family whom he was known to love, he had just and worthy occasion to re-appear in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and amongst his persecutors; that his love for the deceased and sympathy with the bereaved, would afford an impressive and winning illustration of the man who held and so often exerted and would now again exert the power of God; that there his friends would witness a memorable demonstration of his human sensibility, from which so much of the joy of their faith was to be thenceforward derived; while his enemies would seize the opportunity, under the fresh impulse of the indisputable miracle wrought before their eyes, and of his growing and resistless popularity, to glorify the Son of God by resolving to put him to death. Thus the chief end of the transactions here recorded would be the manifestation, on a public and solemn occasion, of the human nature of the great Mediator; "to the intent ye (the disciples) may believe;" that after he should be received to heaven out of their sight, and they should thenceforth witness only the spiritual manifestations of his divine glory, they might remember, from what they should now see, that their High Priest had a human heart which could be touched with the feeling of their infirmities.

Against the plausible suggestions of the sceptical critic on this assertion of Jesus concerning the disease of Lazarus, we have to submit our previous convictions respecting Christ. He said "this sickness is not unto death;" yet Lazarus died. Why should this language be taken to signify any thing else than

the impression received from the messenger's description of the case, that the malady of Lazarus was not mortal? Why not presume (with Paulus) 'that Jesus did not foresee the death of Lazarus,' and (with Gabler) 'that he was disappointed and surprised by a messenger who informed him that his friend was dead?' It is true, indeed, that upon the face of the record there is nothing to forbid the supposition that the messenger gave the Saviour a description of the case, and that another messenger afterwards informed him, contrary to his expectation, that Lazarus was dead. But, then, first, there is no intimation that such was the fact; secondly, if such had been the fact, we could not account for its omission in a narrative so minutely particular as to mention one message, and so many other less important things; thirdly, the well known opinion of the writer respecting the intelligence of Jesus, (see John ii. 24, 25: i. 48: iv. 17, 18: et passim,) is ground of presumption that he intended to give this as an instance of superhuman knowledge; and fourthly, what need of supposing such a message and such a disappointment on the part of Jesus, if we believe that he saw Nathaniel under the fig-tree; that he knew the history of the Samaritan woman whom he met at the well; that he knew where the colt was tied in a distant village, and whether it would willingly be granted for his use; that he knew his disciples would meet the owner of the guest chamber bearing a pitcher of water at a specified time and place; that he knew the fish with the piece of money in its mouth, and the fishes which would fill the net of Peter when he should "cast it on the other side of the ship?" With one who does not believe these facts, we should use an argument which, as we have intimated, is not furnished in the passage itself before us; but to one who believes them, the supposition that Christ was informed of the death of Lazarus by a message not mentioned in the record, and that he was disappointed and surprised at the event, is repugnant to every reasonable view of the whole body of facts in the case, and of the author's manner of stating them. Why imagine that Christ did not know, of himself, all the particulars concerning Lazarus, while from his known power of knowledge in other cases, we must have considered his ignorance in this as unaccountable?

Coming then to the perusal of this history with a previous

knowledge of the superhuman intelligence of our Lord, we are prepared to discern, in this portraiture, some of his most interesting characteristics. We see his disposition towards his friends. He removes the apprehensions of his disciples for the safety of Lazarus. He intimates his purpose of turning the event to the account of his mission and the glory of God ; yet with adorable kindness and wisdom, he conducts the course of his official fidelity in perfect coincidence with the highest comfort of his friends. He did not sacrifice so much as the temporal interest of those who loved him to the economy of his public ministry. No one suffered a pang on his account without a manifold compensation. He is about to suffer Lazarus to die ; but will he not an hundred-fold compensate the pains of that death by the joy of the intended resurrection ? He is about to permit the affectionate sisters to endure a four days bereavement ; but what was that, when compared with the "far more exceeding" joy of their brother's restoration ? He was about to take occasion from their affliction to reveal the manly tenderness of his heart, as well as the power of God ; but those tears which were to flow for the instruction of the world would first serve as a balm for their wounded hearts. The sorrow would be bitter, but it was to be abundantly repaid by the joy. They would have joy in the resurrection of their brother, and they would have joy in their enlivened faith in the Saviour, and in their more accurate knowledge of his character.

In the light of the entire history of these transactions, the words of Jesus, "this sickness is not unto death" receive this interpretation : This sickness is not mortal, in the sense in which men commonly speak of death. It will not terminate in the final removal of Lazarus from the world. His friends are not now to lose him. The aim of the expression was to indicate his knowledge of the coming events, and his intention to make all conduce to the benefit of his friends through faith in him.

While our Saviour was uttering these words, Lazarus was probably dying. The minds of the disciples were at rest about Lazarus, and apparently undisturbed by the course of their Master respecting him. During the two days which he spent "in the same place where he was," the disciples evidently entertained no expectation of his going into Judea on account of

the sickness of Lazarus or for any other purpose ; and when on the third day after he had pronounced his judgment in the case of Lazarus, he said, "let us go into Judea again," he seemed to his disciples to be risking his safety without due cause. He first assures them, by the use of a vivid figure, that he walks in clear light, with his eyes open, and is therefore safe ; and then recalls their attention to Lazarus, and opens to them by degrees his reasons for returning to Judea. "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth ; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep." They would naturally detect enough of disagreement between his description of the state of Lazarus, and his purpose of going, on his account, all the way into Judea, to make them somewhat uncertain whether he meant literally sleep, or figuratively death. But taking up the literal sense of his words, they respectfully said, "Lord, if he sleep, it is well with him." And surely, any one would ask, why go so far to wake a man from sleep. He therefore tells them plainly "Lazarus is dead."

But even with this announcement, he reveals the motions of a human mind. With the eye of a superhuman knowledge upon a distant scene, he states to his disciples the fact which he thus sees, while he glows, at the moment, with the emotions of a human friendship for his disciples. "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." A most beautiful feature of the character of Christ, disclosed by his attitude before us at this moment, appears through this brief but significant expression. We must remember that He could have confirmed their conviction of his mere power to raise the dead, as well by means of any other of the deaths which were constantly taking place around him, as by the death of his beloved friend. He might thus have saved the sorrow of those who were dear to him. But the case of Lazarus was caused to occur because, of all cases within the range of natural events, it would best serve his purpose. He was not, therefore, glad merely for an opportunity to show his power. There was another and more glorious reason for his gladness. He had come into the world to manifest, not only power over human misery, but sympathy in it ; to show the friends of God that he could feel, as well as act for them. He was glad of an opportunity to make his disciples acquainted

with his inmost heart. By the workings of his spirit in view of human sorrow, he would show them how it is possible for God to love the world. He would have them believe in his brotherly affection, while they trusted in his divine power. By such language he binds his disciples to himself with the cords of a man, and calls forth their natural affections in unison with the divine love which he awakens within them by his Holy Spirit.

Lazarus is dead ; “nevertheless,” says the Saviour, “let us go unto him.” From what had already passed at Jerusalem between the Jews and Jesus, the disciples presumed that his return thither would be the signal for an assault upon him, and perhaps upon his friends with him. They apprehend violence, and it is not without a struggle that they resolve to go, “that they may die with him.”

Our Lord now goes to meet two very different states of mind, to which he proposes to address his deportment in Bethany ; the enmity of his persecutors, and the affectionate regrets and sorrow of a bereaved family. His meek composure respecting the one is equalled only by his delicacy towards the other. He throws himself again into the midst of his enemies, considering, doubtless, the advantage he would have from the solemnity of the scene at Bethany, and the sympathy of so many of the Jews with the mourners ; but trusting chiefly to the impression about to be made upon the people by his own character and works. Towards his mourning friends his delicate and prudent deportment was admirable. Their house was thronged with acquaintances from the city who had come “to comfort them concerning their brother.” He stops on the border of the town. He had so long delayed coming that they had probably ceased to look for him ; and the sick one being now long dead, they had ceased to hope for help from him, even should he come. Under these peculiar circumstances he approaches them without haste, and suffers the report of his coming to go before him, that they may prepare for his reception agreeably to their own feelings. He does not surprise and embarrass them and their mourning friends by a sudden and unexpected entrance amongst them. He rather invites their approach to him, waits the movement of their feelings towards him, and instead of taking the lead of their

mournful exercises, he rather tenders his own thoughts and feelings in sympathizing correspondence with theirs.

Martha, with a disposition rather for the active than the contemplative, no sooner hears of the arrival of Jesus than she hastens out to meet him. Her esteem for him is unabated. She is grieved at his delay in coming to them; and gently intimates that it has cost them the life of their brother. A more exquisite blending of the simple and natural language of confidence and of regret, of esteem and of disappointed and wounded friendship than is given in this salutation of Martha, is rarely found. "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." Thou hast the power and the disposition to have saved him, and spared us this sorrow, if thou hadst been here; and he is gone because thou wast not here.

The ensuing conversation with Martha is variously understood by persons whose views differ respecting the character and powers of Christ; and even interpreters who are of one mind on these points do not receive from the particular expressions of the parties in this conversation the same impression. The general facts relative to the persons, and to be taken as the natural safe guides to the right understanding of the language, are these three: First, that Martha was an ingenious single minded person, incapable of artifice or subtlety in speech, (see Luke x. 40,) and withal now deeply agitated with the conflicting emotions of sorrow for the death of her brother and of joy for the presence of her Lord. Second, that Christ was accustomed to give general instruction suggested by particular occurrences. Thirdly, that his remark and questions were often intended to provoke the remarks and interrogatories of others, and furnish the dialogical occasions for the statement and exposition of his doctrine. See Mark x. 17—27, Matt., xxii. 41—45. John iv. 16. Luke xxiv. 17 and onward.

Did Martha cherish and express the hope that Lazarus would now be raised from the dead! "I know that even now whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." That she did not, is argued by Morus, Rosenmüller, Paulus and others, on the ground of her words v. 24. "I know that he shall rise again at the last day." The sense of the passage is then taken to be: "I know that even now,

whatsoever consolation thou shalt ask God to bestow upon us, on account of the death of our brother, God will grant." But the context and the whole force of the circumstances commend the supposition that Martha was not without hope of the immediate resurrection of Lazarus. She knew his power for such a work, by report at least, and probably by having seen that very kind of miracle. She knew his love for the family, and had expressed her confidence in it, by her message to the Saviour, concerning her brother's sickness, and now again since he had come. She must have learned, with great comfort, and remembered with hope, what he said in Bethabara, when the tidings of the sickness reached him; "This sickness is not unto death; but for the glory of God; that the Son of God may be glorified thereby," and since no glory had been wrought out of the sickness, she had yet the whole force of those words to support her hope of her brother's recovery from death. While Jesus delayed coming to them, she may, indeed, have begun to hesitate about the meaning of his words, and even may have doubted now that he had come, whether it was to be by the raising of her brother that the Son of God would be glorified or not. But that, under all the circumstances, she hoped he would restore Lazarus, is irresistibly suggested to us by her overflowing joy upon his arrival, and the confidence and ardour of her salutation.

Our Lord evidently discerned in Martha's language and manner, an appeal to his regard for her comfort and that of her sister and an expectation that he would do for their benefit what they knew he could. Knowing her heart, he takes her language according to her intention. His reply was tentative. It was really ambiguous. "Thy brother shall rise again." Intent as she was, and anxious to get from him a distinct indication of his purpose, she was dissatisfied with his ambiguity, and betrayed quite as much that appeared like vexation as was consistent with the proprieties of the occasion. "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." The reply, however, prepared the way for some instruction respecting the resurrection of the dead, and his connexion with it as its author. This was the Saviour's aim. She needed this instruction, for though she believed in the doctrine of a final resurrection, she did not fully recognize him as its author, and

even if she did, the spiritual turn which he immediately gave to his instruction made it seasonable both for her and all others then present.

To Martha, the Saviour's expression now became as speech in an unknown tongue. Her spiritual discernment was not yet developed. She had seen the miracles of her Lord. She had heard his attestations of his divine authority, and had long entertained them with cordial submission. Her heart had been awed by his frequent and impressive presence in her house, had been won by his gentleness and condescension, and even renewed by his heavenly power; but it was yet the heart of spiritual infancy. She could not yet receive strong meat, but must be fed with milk; and must be addressed not as spiritual, but as carnal, even as a babe in Christ. Yet the Lord, in a few words addressed to her, spiritualizes the doctrine of resurrection, as if to give her a momentary experience of the confusion of her religious ideas, and the extreme weakness of her spiritual understanding. He knew her habit of carefulness and trouble about many things, and how she was now swallowed up with sorrow for her brother's death, and with a rising anxious hope for his restoration. He felt most tenderly for her disconsolate condition; his tears were even ready in a few moments to mingle with hers, and his sighs with her sighs; and he is even on the point of turning all her carnal sorrow into joy, by calling back her departed brother to her embraces. But first he would place to her lip the cup of true spiritual consolation. He would give her a hint of her own deficiency, and leave an impression on her mind, which, though it might avail little in the tumult of her present distress, would serve her well in some future hour of calm and more intelligent reflection. He thus deals out to the agitated and afflicted woman a portion of that blessed truth which he had uttered on another occasion in Capernaum, and in a figure not widely different, (see John vi. 28, and onward) and which was even too hard a saying for many of the disciples who heard it to receive.

"I am the resurrection and the life." Let his thought expand before us, and explain itself in the light of the circumstances, and of the same doctrine elsewhere given more at large. He that believeth in me has true life; a spiritual

life, which has no end. Even those believers who have departed this earthly life, are not lost to existence or to happiness, but are still going on in the enjoyment of their fellowship and union with God, and with me, his Son Jesus Christ. And so also of believers who are alive in this world, they have a living principle within them which holds upon God by faith, and that life will never cease. It reveals itself in present joy and peace. Whoever hath this life is safe against disconsolate sorrow, and absorbing anxiety about the affairs of this life and about this life itself.

"Believest thou this?" We ask, what did she understand about it? If her heart tasted a drop of that spiritual consolation, it would be natural for her to say, Yea, Lord, I believe it, I see it. My brother believed on thee, and is now blessed. We have no cause to wish any more that thou hadst been here, and that he had not died. We cannot wish to have him raised again from the dead, and brought back to this world of imperfection and trouble. He is with our Father in heaven, and we hope soon to be with him. For ourselves, we may rather rejoice than mourn. We have the acquaintance and friendship of one who can forgive and cure this worldliness, and fickleness, and waywardness of ours, and make us understand the truth, and follow the way of life. We are, therefore, blessed. Our affliction has wrought great good for us by furnishing the occasion, and preparing the way for this instruction and comfort.

Though yet incapable of conceiving the spiritual sense of the words of her Lord, and unsupplied with any just notion of an eternal life arising out of faith in him, Martha had the subdued affection for Christ, and the confidence in his wisdom and truth, which belong to the true disciple. She loved him better than she knew him. All she could comprehend of his character she admired and honoured; and she was delighted and edified with all she could understand of his doctrine. There was enough intelligible to win her heart, though not enough to complete her symmetry in knowledge. Her imperfections were great and not obscure; and she was admonished of them; and she received the reproofs with a meekness, and docility, and submission, which afford the best of all proofs of sincere esteem for the faithful reprover. It is with reverence

unfeigned that she listens to all his words. But what shall she answer now? She hears from her Master some profound propositions of Christian truth, which are altogether beyond her depth, and she is asked whether she believes them. What must she say?

During that wonderful incipency of the new dispensation, which began at the baptism of Christ and ended on the day of Pentecost, the obscurity and confusion which prevailed in the views of believers seem sometimes hard to be accounted for. The Saviour's own disciples manifested what now appears an amazing obtuseness of discernment for men of common sense, even though almost uneducated. For a part of their dulness, they were without apology. For that they deserved the censure of the Lord, and they received it. "Have I been so long with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, show us the Father?" But abating all this inexcusable stupidity, which those disciples need only be supposed to have shared in due proportion with other men, there remains what, at least comparatively speaking, must be called a blameless incapacity to discern the spiritual doctrines of Christ; an incapacity consistent altogether with faith in him, and a hope of divine favour through him; and sufficiently accounted for by the fact that "the Holy Ghost was not yet given because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

Here then stood Martha between the death of religious conceptions under the old dispensation and their complete resurrection under the new; with the eye of earnest and anxious inquiry fixed upon her Master, and trying to catch a glimpse of his mysterious idea of an "eternal life by faith;" struggling in a conflict between her childlike, submissive docility, and the natural repugnance of the human mind for unintelligible speech. She was not repelled; and here appears her virtue and felicity. "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me!" She did not break out, like some equally ignorant, but less subdued disciples at Capernaum, "This is an hard saying, who can hear it?" It took more than a few dark sayings, indicating what she did not yet know of Jesus, to quench her glowing reverence and love for him. A few obscurities in her Master she could endure with unshaken confidence, by

the power of her love for what was clearly discernible in him. And yet when called upon now to answer publicly to something which she did not understand, she must speak, and what will she say? A mere assent by a monosyllable would not be true to her heart; and we challenge admiration here for this example of the working of an ingenuous spirit. With an unconscious presumption that her venerated and beloved instructor could conceal, in his unintelligible language, nothing contrary to what she knew and believed of him and his doctrine, assured that, whatever his words might mean, they could not contradict her short and simple creed, having heard him through with an attention, not the less fixed and reverential for being fruitless at the time to her own thoughts, she answers, "Yea Lord," (and we interpret her words by the considerations presented above,) I believe what I presume thou meanest. I believe what thou hast often asserted, and what others have asserted concerning thee, and what thy works and words prove to me to be true, that thou art the Son of God, the Messiah foretold by the scriptures. And if what thou hast now said belongs to the doctrine of thy Messiahship, that also must be true. I believe that thou art the Christ the Son of God, which should come into the world; and as I said before, I know, that if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died, and that even now whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee. I am not therefore without hope that thou wilt raise up my brother Lazarus now, while at the same time I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Having given the natural expression of her state of mind, of which the language above may be taken as a fair description, she hastens into town to call her sister.

It is reasonable to regard this exposure of the temper and intelligence of Martha as one of the incidental aims of the Lord's conversation with her. The disclosure is certainly instructive. It unfolds to our view the germ of faith. It throws up into open sight, from amidst the intricate and confounding complexity of our mental operations, that temper which, combined even with the very minimum of knowledge in a proper human soul, constitutes the "faith unto salvation." To know any thing rightly of God, however little, is, in the sense of scripture, to know God. To know ever so little of Jesus

rightly, is to know Jesus Christ whom God hath sent. And this is true on this account ; that all true conceptions of God, and of Jesus Christ his Son, repose upon a spiritual basis in the soul, and from that derive their spiritual virtue. This basis is a temper of the mind, and is fitly represented by the temper of Martha. No state of mind purely intellectual is Christian faith. That faith is confidence. It is the rest of the soul in God. It is the acquiescence of the soul in every influence of God upon it, through whatever medium that influence is communicated ; whether through the works or the word of Christ. Knowledge, an exercise of thought, belongs with it, and is one of its inseparable conditions. But its essence is a temper of the mind, and not a form or method of thought. Here is the hope of the humble sinner, whom a wise and righteous Providence has left in mental poverty in this world, and who cannot aspire to the eminence of extensive knowledge. He suffers, indeed, a privation. The waters of deep and various knowledge are sweet to the healthy soul. But they are not indispensable to the enjoyment of the fellowship and love of God. Faith in God is not the actual and intelligent reception of any particular article of knowledge, or of any system of doctrine ; but the disposition to receive as true, whatever God may reveal, and approve as right and just whatever he does. This was the faith of Abraham, and when it embraces Christ as the God whose words and deeds it is ready to believe and approve, it becomes in full the faith of the gospel. The soul is then in the new world. Old things are passed away. The eye of the mind is turned in the right direction. It is fixed on Christ, the way, the truth and the life ; and as the mysteries of his wonderful person, his sacrifice, his resurrection, and his intercession, are gradually opened before it, the soul advances towards the integrity of virtue, the stature of the perfect spiritual man. Having tasted the good word of God, it longs for it with a confirmed appetite, and grows in the graciously-imparted knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mary, at the call of Martha hastens out to meet Jesus at the place where Martha left him. She is followed by her neighbours and by her friends from the city, who were paying her their visits of condolence. The collection at the spot

has become numerous, and the proceedings assume increasing publicity. Both the sisters seem averse to this publicity; for Mary received the signal of Martha in private, and went privately out; a sufficient indication that Martha felt little complacency in being publicly examined by the Master as to her spiritual knowledge, and that neither Martha nor Mary feel as yet the exultation of assured hope respecting the restoration of Lazarus.

The scene has now greatly augmented its importance, and its power over the feelings of all the actors. The other sister has come with her mourning retinue, and lies in tears at the feet of Jesus, exclaiming, "Lord if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." What an appeal to a tender heart, from the unanimous longing of the two sisters for his arrival before their brother died. And this was Mary. "It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair." It was that Mary who once sat at the feet of Jesus and heard his words, and who had chosen the good part which should not be taken away from her. Even Mary, under the weight of this bereavement, has lost her balance. The suspended animation of her faith has left her in unmingled sorrow. It is a moving spectacle. Mary is dissolved in grief. The friends around are weeping; and as our Lord surveys the scene, and considers how inefficient would be any natural means of occupying their attention with any other subject than his own intentions concerning the lamented dead, he surrenders himself to the power of what he sees and hears around him.

We are now beginning to witness the revelation of Jesus, for which we have supposed the whole of these remarkable transactions to have been appointed, and which was certainly worthy to hold all the other parts of the scene in subserviency to it. Indeed, all the other parts of the scene do most brilliantly illustrate this. We feel at first a slight embarrassment from the particular word by which the writer designates the rising emotions of the Saviour, but we are soon relieved. Ἐμ-βριμᾶσθαι denotes, if we mistake not, in all the writers who use it except those of the New Testament, the indulgence of vehement displeasure; and even in the New Testament, it is used of the indignation of Judas at what he considered the waste of

costly ointment on the person of the Saviour. It is, however, divested of the sense of indignation or displeasure, when used by the Saviour in "charging vehemently" the leper not to publish the miracle, Mark i. 43, and the two blind men, Mat. ix. 30, where it seems quite clearly to let go the notion of displeasure, and to retain the residual meaning of earnestness and vehemence. We therefore escape the necessity either of searching among the circumstances of this case for some proper occasion of strong displeasure and indignation, which might be supposed to have suggested this word to the writer; or of attributing to Christ a feeling not strictly congenial with the attending facts. The provocatives of indignation are certainly not obvious. No violence was attempted against him; none was threatened. Nothing was said by any one which need be construed into disrespect or reproach. The mournful paroxysm of Mary, and her want of that faith which would have preserved her equanimity, we have no reason, from the habitual temper of Jesus, or from his particular feelings towards that family, or from any other cause than this one word of the narrator, to suppose were regarded by Jesus with any feelings but those of allowance and compassion. We will therefore pursue our meditations upon this amazing phenomenon, with the presumption that the writer means, by the intenseness of this word, to signify to us the profound sympathetic agitation of the Saviour's bosom.

The facts of this part of the history, then, are in our apprehension these. When Jesus saw Mary at his feet in the agony of grief, and her friends weeping around him, he gave way to the simple and strong motions of sympathy. His heart was deeply agitated by the signs of sorrow which he saw and heard. He grieved for the grief of others. But with a full view of all that was about to be done, and of all the considerations which, in such scenes, are wont to repress the rising emotions of intelligent and reflecting minds, his high and large views restrained the sudden effusion of tears, and allowed his feelings to reveal themselves at first only by the natural signs of an inward struggle. "He groaned in spirit and was troubled." Under the impulse of his feelings he begins to indicate his design, and asks, where have ye laid him? And he follows along towards the place of burial, and the sorrow

of the mourners at the sight of the sepulchre becomes overwhelming, "Jesus wept." The Jews who witnessed his groaning and tears evidently discerned nothing in his words or manner denoting indignation, but imputed his grief to his love for Lazarus. "Behold how he loved him." And they wondered, that able as he was to cure infirmity and disease, he should have suffered his friend to die. He "groans again in himself" as he comes to the grave.

Several considerations unite to render these emotions of our Saviour inexplicable, except on principles peculiar to him as God and man. This lively sensibility in view of the sufferings of others, co-existed in him with the full power and purpose to relieve the sorrow in an instant and fill the mourners with joy; and we cannot conceive it possible that the consciousness of this purpose should be at any moment wanting to him. He could not be taken by surprise, and deprived, by a shock, of the exercise of deliberate thought. He perfectly knew that the sorrow would continue only till he should come to the sepulchre, and that from that moment all hearts would be filled with surprise and gladness. He perfectly knew, what benefit all these sufferers would derive from their momentary sorrow, when their views of himself as their Saviour should be enlarged and corrected, and they should learn the mystery of his spiritual kingdom. Now the possibility of so lively sympathy in a mere man with the sufferings of other men, while he knows such facts as these concerning the course and end of the affliction, is hardly conceivable; especially if the sympathizing person be supposed himself to be the agent on whose power and pleasure all these beneficent results depend. The two mental states are as nearly incompatible with one another as any two states of the human mind can be. The only condition of their co-existence would be that extreme tenderness of sensibility, which, like the subtile medium for the transmission of light, presents no conceivable resistance to the moving impulse, and receives, with an infinite susceptibility, the impression of its object.

Such was the sensibility of Christ; and we hence derive a suggestion of an infirmity in human nature from which he is shown by the fact before us to have been exempt. We call it an infirmity, though it may be reckoned among the general

characteristics of finite intelligent being. Whatever be its name, it invites attention to the contrast which, in this particular, may be drawn between the conditions of the Saviour's emotions on this occasion, and the ordinary conditions of similar emotions in the human mind. We offer this train of reflection here as a part of the process by which our own reason rejoices to illustrate to itself the unsearchable and adorable mystery of this bodily manifestation of the Godhead.

The laws of human nature place vehement feeling and clear intelligent deliberate reflection, in something like mutual antagonism. This fact is indicated on a large and systematic scale by the design and effects of the ancient stoical philosophy, and is the only ground on which the stoical phenomena are possible. It is indicated by the tendency of cultivated intellect to chasten, subdue, and regulate the motions of sensibility. It is even suggested by the prevailing impression, that extensive knowledge, and the active and rigid exercise of reason on religious subjects, are unfavourable to the manifestation of ardent piety, a fact which some theologians think sufficiently obvious to need to be accounted for. The same fact is also evinced by the theory of consolation itself, which rests on intellectual occupation as its fundamental principle. In all these cases the thoughts are supposed to be occupied with appropriate objects. The stoic hardens under his false philosophical speculations upon the causes and circumstances of affliction. Cultivation of intellect chastens and regulates feeling by subjecting the sensibility to the conditions of more extensive and various thought, by which continued and exclusive attention to the exciting object is prevented. If intellectual exercise quenches the ardour of piety, it is by so exclusive attention to the philosophical relations of truth, as to prevent the contemplation of the glory of truth itself. It hence becomes a maxim, as true as most of our maxims relating to human phenomena, that the habit of steady and enlightened reflection is unfriendly to sudden and vehement emotion; and in a case where the maxim seems not to hold, we are struck with the temperament as peculiar and extraordinary.

The useful office of this law of human nature, we are all able to estimate with some degree of satisfaction. We find that very few of the high ends of human life can, in an im-

proved condition of the human race, be answered by violent feeling. In a state of barbarism, and in proportion as the barbarian element of mutual antagonism among men lingers in the composition of society, the sudden and violent feeling by which an individual is roused to apply his whole force in a struggle with a momentary exigency, or by which a community is moved in sympathetic agitation, has its obvious and acknowledged use. But improvement diminishes the occasions on which such excitements can be useful. Social advancement consists largely in the gradual displacement of the antagonistic feature of the system, and the substitution of mutual acquiescence and harmony amongst the members of the human family. The necessity of high and transient excitement to accomplish desirable objects in human affairs lies in the imperfection of our condition. We may even say that in this lies the ground of its possibility. Such is the fact at least in all the excitements which are painful, and which the laws of our constitution forbid to be permanent. Violent and absorbing sorrow is possible in human minds, only when they are imperfectly regulated in their sensibilities and in regard to the objects of their contemplation. No human mind can feel a paroxysm of emotion, while, with all the knowledge proper to its nature it holds the objects of its knowledge in complete and uniform subserviency to the chief end of its existence. Equanimity we universally recognise as belonging to the perfection of intelligence and purity in man. Hence the passionate excitement of an individual mind though often so effective to a valuable purpose in the actual exigency must nevertheless be allowed to have found its exigency in evil. Hence too the vehement excitement of communities in religion, politics, commerce, in any of the affairs of life, though often so greatly to be desired and perhaps seldom to be deprecated in the existing circumstances, are yet so many manifestations of imperfect humanity. Hence also the Christian of close and calm intellectual occupation, and contemplative habit, though perhaps disqualified for those fields of activity where the gross imperfections of human nature are to be encountered by the direct and personal application of reforming influence, is nevertheless an example, in his degree, of that character and habit towards which the true advancement of the race must tend. These considerations will readily

occur to any one who reflects on this subject, as proof that the perfection of reason, intelligence and purity in man would be expected, by the laws of human nature, to preserve a perfect equanimity.

Now the first class of facts belonging to the mysterious manifestation at Bethany were these :—The real sympathetic distress of Christ in view of the grief of his friends. That it was feigned or factitious, and not an issue from the genuine fountain of feeling in his soul, were irreconcilable with all that we elsewhere learn of his character ; and equally irreconcilable with the views and declarations of his inspired disciples, who represent him as able to be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. For the case then before him, the excitement of his sympathy was extreme ; we do not say excessive, but deep and strong as the most delicate human sensibility would have revealed on that occasion. He groaned in spirit and was troubled. He groaned deeply. He expressed a vehement inward agitation. We think it requisite to admit, to this extent, at least, the natural force of the writer's peculiar word ; and if we admit the thought of indignant grief, which, perhaps, is not easily separated altogether from the language of the record, it will rather strengthen than weaken the force of our entire train of remark. Besides groaning inwardly, he shed tears ; and his tears were not the tears of a superficial excitement ; they were not facilitated by habitual or effeminate weeping, the ready and fluent expression of feeble emotion. They appear upon his manly countenance as the index of in-suppressible feeling. He seems so fully absorbed with his emotions as to move towards his intended object under their impulse. It is while groaning in himself, and giving this extorted expression of his inward trouble, that he first gives the sisters a decided indication of his design, and asks to be led to the grave ; and in his appearance and words alone, there is nothing to forbid the supposition that he afterwards performed his mighty work under the sole impulse of compassion for the mourners and love for the dead.

The other class of facts combined in this spectacle of the weeping Saviour are these : He was perfectly alive to all the common motives which would dissuade a trusted and honoured friend of the afflicted, of whom so much would be expected in

the way of relief, from giving the rein to the sympathies of nature, and yielding that apparent concession of the necessity and propriety of the distress in which he sympathizes. He had the power to turn their sorrow immediately into joy, and had come to them for that very purpose. But above all this, we cannot refrain from ascribing to him the perfection of humanity. As he was a lamb without blemish and without spot for sacrifice, so he was unblemished as a model of the human nature. There was the perfect human power of discerning truth. There was the perfection of human intelligence, in its promptness, accuracy, and comprehension. There too must have been the complete submission of the sensibility under the control of reason. And there was the perfection of purity, which is the great preservative of harmony among the faculties of the human soul. But these as we have seen above, are the conditions of freedom from vehement excitements in the minds of men. They are the characteristics of a mind which would be expected to possess itself in tranquillity, and not submit to the violence of any overruling emotion.

Admitting then for the moment that Jesus was a mere man, yet holding, as we must, that he was a perfect man, his feelings and deportment on this occasion are extraordinary. He manifested extreme excitement of mind. No man, in the same circumstances, would be expected to indulge in stronger emotion than his. It would seem therefore that his perfect knowledge, the perfect harmony of his mental powers, and that due subjection of the emotions to reason which must be one of the conditions of human perfection, had in him, at the time, none of that influence which belongs to them, according to the laws of human nature. Here is one part of this great mystery. Our knowledge of man supplies no principle by which we can explain the phenomena before us. An exceeding tenderness of sensibility, taken by itself, would account for the mental excitement; but in his case, it cannot be taken by itself. It must be invested with its intellectual and moral conditions; and no human sensibility under such conditions would be expected to present such facts. In the present state of most human minds, a gentle, kind and tender heart would manifest itself in such emotions. But each step in the true improvement of human nature infuses more of reflection into the com-

position of the mental state, and gives out a nobler form of virtue; the result of a more extensive and harmonious combination of the principles of true humanity. Yet here was a perfect man presenting the appearances of imperfection; a man having exact knowledge of all that belongs to the case before him, and having all his knowledge always at command; but now acting upon partial and contracted views and affected by only part of what he knows; feeling and acting according to only part of the facts which are present to his mind. If a momentary forgetfulness concealed a part of his knowledge, it was by a voluntary intellectual remissness letting drop certain things as unfit for present use. If his knowledge was all in clear view, then certain of his intellectual views had not their appropriate effect upon his mind. Either horn of this dilemma carries the case beyond the range of the known laws of human nature; and we are left to explain the facts before us by some principle peculiar to the case itself.

But the case is rendered far more mysterious and wonderful when we add to his perfect humanity our acknowledged doctrine of his divinity. We have then to admit into our conceptions of the scene the ideas of Omnipotence and Omniscience. We are compelled to find the place of divinity among the causes of this sympathy of our Lord, and to inquire how divine properties had their share in this phenomenon. We must suppose that the Deity was there, and that its functions were somehow performed; that Jesus was as really God in his tears, as in uttering his life-giving call to the dead. Whatever theory we form concerning the union of the two natures in Christ, we cannot conceive a separation of the one from the other in his personal and voluntary acts. We are unable to explain, by any known law of rational and moral being, such a temporary divorce of the two classes of properties united in his person, as would leave either alone in any portion of the acts or experience of his life. The doctrine of such a separation would be as inexplicable as the mystery it would be employed to solve. We gain nothing by this substitution of one mystery for another; while we should increase by means of it, the confusion of our ideas of the Saviour's personal constitution. With the very excitement of his bosom, then, there was mingled, in some mysterious manner, the influence of the

attributes of God. Here was a mind of infinite knowledge, of infinite power, and of infinite purity, manifesting its motions in the natural signs of human feeling; in the groans and the tears of a man. There was the perfection of a mortal man and the perfection of God. The spiritual powers of both natures were joined together, forming one peculiar soul, as the living, thinking, feeling, acting principle; and with all its blended properties, it communicated, like the soul of a man, with every part of the body. Whatever was expressed by the heaving bosom and the flowing tears, was the state of that complex soul.

We have now the depth and height and sublimity of this mystery before us. Our thoughts cannot separate the Deity from any act or from any part of the experience of the Saviour incarnate. We cannot dissect the divine from the human in that wonderful person, and trace, at one time, the human impulse through the nerves and the various organs of the body, and at another, the divine. We have no alternative, except that of an arbitrary and gratuitous assumption, to relieve the supposition that in every motion of the man Christ Jesus there was the presence and consent and action of his entire spirit. What then shall we say of that wonder at Bethany? Did those sighs and tears express the sensibility of God, or the sensibility of man? Neither, we answer, for he was not God alone, nor man alone; but God and man together. They were the sighs and tears of Jesus Christ our Saviour, our merciful and faithful High Priest, who was revealing his own proper heart to his disciples "to the intent that they might believe."

In our most devout amazement at this sight, we naturally ask, how can these things be? And when we are urged to such utterance to our profound and humble astonishment, it is well. It proves that the mystery has taken effect. It is a sign of our conviction that God is not such an one as ourselves. We then manifest some sense of the divine glory, and have one of the fundamental peculiarities for intelligent adoration. We ask, therefore, not in the temper of dissatisfaction and incredulity, but in the rapture of holy wonder, nothing doubting of the fact, though we cannot explain it, nay, with inexpressible delight in the mystery itself, we ask, how can these things be?

How could the perfect humanity in Christ, so exquisitely balanced in its powers of thought and feeling, and so thoroughly furnished to every occasion, put forth such forms of development as the fruit of its perfect exercises? How could that perfect heart, healthy itself, and fulfilling its office in a system of perfect health, force itself into violent and irregular palpitations? Had it been an imperfect humanity, susceptible of addition to its own virtue from the opportunity to "weep with them that weep, and to rejoice with them that do rejoice," we could have reduced its action under the laws of our own spiritual convalescence. Had it been an inefficient humanity which could do nothing better for those who weep than to weep with them, and nothing better for those who rejoice than to rejoice with them, we could place these its tears and sighs in the reciprocal movements by which we, in our imperfect state, are commanded to elaborate comfort and improvement amongst ourselves. But here is health presenting the symptoms of disease. Here is power putting forth the struggles of weakness. Here is perfection bearing the fruits of imperfection. Here is the blessed and only potentate, with a soul of unblemished purity and of boundless power, and of all-containing and unclouded knowledge, overwhelmed in a violence of mental commotion which has its natural place only in the degeneracy of the human soul. He wept with the sorrowful as if he either could not otherwise help them, or must be moved to the friendly office by the sorrowful sympathy of his own spirit. He groaned within himself and was troubled at the grief of his friends, as if the experience of temporal sorrow by himself were the only condition on which he could relieve it in others. With all his excellence as the pattern of humanity to which his people are to be conformed in the perfection of their glory, he becomes a partaker of that experience, which he pities in them and from which he came to deliver them.

To the inquiry, then, how can these things be? we have no answer. We expect none. Still we urge the question, and keep it in agitation whenever we turn our thoughts to the subject; and so far as our reflections strengthen the disposition to repeat this expression of wonder, they have gained their valuable end. Our course thus leads us to the line of separation between the finite and the infinite, between the creature and

the creator, and we can go no farther. There the light of philosophy fails us, and we must walk by the light of the scriptures alone. We meet him whose ways are not our ways, and whose thoughts are not our thoughts; the pious emotion which, till now, followed in the path of reason, has a broader and brighter field for its exercise, and kindles and expands in the light of the face of God.

The end of this wonderful revelation of Christ is gained by its conciliating power over the hearts of his people. This way of providing comfort for believers, belongs to the method, so extensively employed in the kingdom of Christ, of communicating divine influence by means accommodated to the laws of human nature. It is part of the system by which he became a man, and associated with men, and communicated with them by sensible signs. Though fully able to secure their steadfast attachment and their unwavering confidence by an immediate impression on their hearts, he preferred, for reasons entirely remaining with himself, the plan of approaching them by the sensible steps which they employ in their intercourse with one another. No matter what supernatural power must be employed to prepare the way; no matter how mysterious, or how expensive, in the view of men, the arrangement by which such means may be applied, and rendered effectual, he chose the method, in his wisdom and goodness; and this is one of the instances of its application. The disciples of the Saviour heard his groans; they witnessed all the signs of his inward trouble; they saw his tears. They were left to impute his sorrow to his lively sympathy with the afflicted. And they could associate this sympathy of their Lord, with his tender and well known affection for those afflicted friends. They can see the signs of that love with which he regarded his friends; and they are expected to take these signs of tender feeling as a sensible proof of the spirit in which he consults their welfare. They are then drawn towards Christ by a divine power operating through the medium of the natural affections; these affections being the instruments, the Spirit of God being the agent. It is not a mere natural affection which Christ awakens in the hearts of his people. Far be the thought from any mind, that this humanity of Jesus, transfused even as it was, and saturated with the uncreated

essence, does all the work of God on the hearts of his people. But in the dispensation of the new creating power, he acts through the organization of the old creation, and uses nature as a minister of grace. He wins by the tenderness of his heart, and through the channel of the social affections which belong to his disciples as men, he communicates to their hearts the influence which makes them saints and heirs of glory. This is a pervading feature of the scheme of salvation by Christ. It is this characteristic of the scheme which produced the scene at Bethany; and the tears of Jesus then shed, the groans which then heaved his bosom, the words of forbearance and love which then fell from his lips, will prepare the way of the Spirit to the hearts of men in every generation to the end of time.

It was not unworthy of the Redeemer to hold, as he evidently did, this opportunity of glorifying God, in high estimation. We say this with no pretence of sitting in judgment on the absolute fitness of this case to advance the glory of God, or even the particular ends of the mediation of Christ. We judge only of its relative fitness. It was so like many other things which Jesus did, it seems so exquisite in its adaptation to accomplish ends which he aimed at on other occasions, by means which bore a general resemblance to this, that it harmonizes with the views we have formed of him from other sources. It was worthy of him who was in the habit of expressing the love of God for sinners from a heart overflowing with the kindness of a man. It was worthy of him who felt a glow of generous affection towards the rich young ruler whom he was teaching in the way of life; of him who called Zaccheus down from the sycamore tree, and, as a way of bringing salvation to him and his household, went with him to his house and his table, to be a guest with a man that was a sinner. No Christian can set lightly by the human heart in Jesus, which so limited and regulated the motions of the Godhead in him as to render those motions comprehensible and persuasive to our minds.

We must hasten to a close. We find our Lord standing by the cave, and directing the covering of the entrance to be removed. The mention of so unimportant a matter as the remark of Martha, that the body having been four days dead, was now offensive, shows us the faithfulness of the narrator in

giving every fact connected with the case which could be considered of any consequence at all. It also adds to the data on which we may judge of the consistency of the narrative; while it furnishes an additional hint of the thoughts of Martha, and of the feelings of Jesus as expressed in his reply. But on this we will not now dwell.

Our Lord introduces his act of resurrection by a prayer to the Father, remarkable for its manner and its matter. With his eyes lifted towards heaven, he gives utterance to his devout emotions in the way of thanksgiving first, and then of apology. "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me." We are struck, at first, by this preterite of his verb, and seem, at the moment, to have occasion to ask how he came to employ it. But surely, any serious and candid reader would regard as altogether a curiosity in its way, that intellectual obliquity which can draw from the tense of this verb a suggestion like this of Gabler and Paulus: That Jesus, having upon the opening of the cave, either gone in, or looked in and perceived signs of reviving animation in the body, saw instantly and unexpectedly that the case was about to turn to his advantage, and in the simplicity and extasy of his pious joy, breaks out in this ejaculation of thanksgiving. Such minds must be allowed to have a facility of invention equal to any emergency. To extract such a thought from the mere tense of a word used on such an occasion, by such a person, in connexion with the remarkable conversation previously held with Martha, and with the facts which took place immediately after, evinces a prodigious intellectual power, of a peculiar sort. Especially when that tense is distinguished by usage, and even by its grammatical name, for an indefinite reference to time. Not a word is said, in the narrative, of his going into the cave, or of his having looked into it; and no reason is given by the ingenious critic, why others should not have gone or looked in as well as he, and have seen the same that he saw. But to carry out this monstrous supposition, we have to represent Jesus as proceeding, from the time he announced in Bethabara the death of Lazarus, to the opening of the cave before his eyes, on the presumption that possibly Lazarus was after all not dead, but only in a state of suspended animation, which by the time of his arrival might pass off and afford him

an opportunity of making a favourable public impression respecting himself; "that the Son of God may be glorified thereby." Let this be supposed and it will account, in one way, for his giving no plainer hint to Martha and her friends, respecting his intentions to recover their lost one. But how will it account for his saying to his disciples, "I go that I may awaken Lazarus out of sleep," and afterwards saying unto them plainly, "Lazarus is dead?" This supposed surmise that possibly the case would turn out so and so, is vehemently repugnant to his expression of confidence about his safety in returning to Judea; I am walking in clear daylight and have no fear of stumbling. Then think of the state of his mind while, with this supposed uncertainty as to what he might do in the case, he declared to Martha that her brother should rise again; and tempted her hope of an immediate resurrection, by asserting that he was the resurrection and the life. Through all the gradual and slow development of his thoughts concerning Lazarus, through the scene of groaning and tears, in which he seemed for the time to be swallowed up in the sorrow of his mourning friends, we are to suppose him in trembling suspense respecting the actual condition of the body. If this be the true import of the language and all the circumstances of that history, we still say with the utmost assurance, it is not the natural import, but is one which it requires great genius to discover, and which not one reader in ten thousand would think to be expressible by such words.

How agreeable with our view of the entire spirit and tenor of the Saviour's proceedings at Bethany is the natural and familiar signification of the Saviour's indefinite tense. Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me; that such has heretofore been thy uniform course with me; that in the critical moments of public scrutiny and suspense, when so much depended on my success, in 'working the works of my Father,' for which I have all along stood fully committed before the world, it has not been thy pleasure to disappoint and mortify me in any case. And I knew that thou hearest me always. I have now no anxiety for the event of this case. I know that though I were silently to exert my will thy work would follow. "Doch ich weiss," translates Martin Luther with his admirable tact in seizing and expressing the sense of the original, "dass du

mich allezeit hörest ; sondern um des Volkes willen, das umher stehet, sage ich es ;” using throughout the present tense. “But because of the people which stand by I say it,” that they may not only think of me as able to do this miracle but that they may turn their thoughts also to thee, as the Father who hast sent me. Here is an expression of his confidence that the body now lying lifeless before him will come forth at his word. And his address to the Father is in perfect keeping with the spirit of his whole course, in which he made it his object throughout to reveal the Father, and to do his will.

The miracle of raising the dead, which was now performed, was addressed to the Jews around him, who as yet remained unconvinced of his divinity. On many of them it had its desired effect. To their minds, the way of the miracle had been prepared by the winning gentleness of Jesus in his tears, which the Jews regarded as the signs of his love for Lazarus and the sisters. But the disciples had nothing new to learn of their Master from the miracle itself ; nor did they need any new impressions from that source. To them the scene at Bethany addressed itself as a whole ; but more especially the sympathetic sorrow of their Lord. “*Jesus wept.*” These two words, standing where they do in the history of one of the most interesting scenes of the earthly life of our Saviour, illuminate more clearly the depths of his mysterious constitution, than any other single stroke of the pen of inspiration in all the Bible. These emotions of Jesus were a fountain of light to the minds of the disciples. The remembrance of that scene went with them into their subsequent labours and sufferings for Christ’s sake. And Paul, who was not of the twelve, but was “born out of due time,” received from personal communications with the Lord, the same impression of his susceptibility of sympathy with his people. He could assure his brethren that we “have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin.”

We do not reckon this sympathizing suffering of our Saviour to be any part of the proper expiation for sin. Neither himself nor the apostles any where so represent it. The atonement was not made by weeping and groaning at the sight of human sorrow, but by the sinking of the soul of the Son of

God under the weight of the Father's displeasure against sin. The atonement was by his death. Still while our sins are expiated by his dying agonies, our affections are drawn towards him by the bonds of his tender heart. We love him because he first loved us. We love him first and chiefly because he died for us. We feel the constraining power of that love which he expressed in his self-sacrifice for our redemption; and we live not unto ourselves, but unto Him who died for us and rose again. But while, under the constraining power of his dying appeal to our hearts, we render him an exclusive devotion, we make that devotion the more affectionate under the power of his manly sympathy. We let fall the natural tear of hearty friendship while we behold him weeping the overflowings of his sympathizing heart at Bethany.

The path of our thoughts through this exhilarating scene has led us in clear light to the spot where the blended attributes of God and man come forth to our view, invested with the proper glory of the incarnate Mediator. We have had these united attributes in view from the first. We combine them in those clear and steady conceptions of his constitution, which we had formed from the records of his other deeds; and we now contemplate the series of phenomena before us in the light of our pre-established theory of his character. We feel no disturbance from the most plausible suggestion of a sceptical criticism. Why should we, how can we attach any value to the mere possibility that Lazarus was not dead; that his life had departed only in appearance, and was latent till the moment when the cave was opened? Such was not the impression of John; or if it was, he has strangely expressed it. Such a thought was evidently far from the minds of the Jews who believed on Jesus on account of what they then saw. Nothing appears in the history of the transaction, (and it is from this history that we have to learn all we can know about it,) to suggest such an explanation of the fact. The suggestion comes solely from the exigency of the critic. We feel no such exigency. We know beforehand that if Jesus did not raise Lazarus from real death, he could have done it, for he had repeatedly done similar and equivalent things before; and we are unable to feel the least motive for elaborating so ingenious an evasion of the true and proper meaning

of an eminently simple and honest writer. But besides all this, reason revolts at the insinuation that Jesus and John and the friends of Lazarus and other spectators could have spoken as they did of Lazarus, if in their judgment, he had not, beyond all question been dead; and if not any or all of these witnesses were competent judges of so palpable a fact as that, who would be? If we may believe any thing in the Bible, we may believe this story concerning Lazarus. And we may believe it just as it is written. And with the eye of this faith we see the body of Lazarus now four days dead. We see Jesus, for a moment, with uplifted eyes, addressing the Father, and then, with the tear of human infirmity upon his cheek, and the energy of divine omnipotence in his will, recalling the dead to life and commending him to his friends.

Alas for the perverse ingenuity which can frame a plausible apology for disbelieving such a record as the one before us! It is an art which could turn all history into a dream. Let genius take such liberty with all writings which pretend to be faithful records of facts, and it could with no lack of plausibility, create doubts concerning any recorded fact whatever. That difficulties can be raised respecting the meaning and the truth of the evangelical history, is unquestionable; but it is equally unquestionable that it requires genius and learning to raise them, and that they do not occur to unsophisticated minds. It is not the manner nor the matter of the record that awakens in the mind of the reader the suspicion that Jesus Christ was only a well-meaning man; that his reputed miracles were either illusions or fortunate concurrences; that his life was merely an extraordinary allotment of the common Providence, and his death an attestation of his adherence to truth and virtue. This doctrine comes out of the struggle of the mind with the plain and natural sense of the record, and not from the ready submission of the thoughts to its power. It is an unsound organ of mental vision which does not see in Jesus Christ the attributes of God. If his doctrines and his works, taken in connexion with the explicit declarations of himself and his followers, were not to be received as proof that the divine attributes belonged to him, it must be admitted that to prove to men the existence of those attributes in any personal being whatever would be impossible.

But our faith here stands in clear light. If the sacred record raises no rebellion in the heart, it presents no stumbling block to the reason. If we feel no aversion to the doctrine of God in Christ, we shall feel no provocation to torture the language of the history into a denial or a withholding of it. We can then see in Jesus, as he is delineated on the inspired page, the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. We behold the power and love of God personally resident and active in him. Having fairly found the doctrine of his divinity in the scriptures, we love it. We rejoice in the service which it renders to our hope in God. As we believe in God, we believe also in Jesus; and this our confidence in him is inexpressibly enlivened, while we see the Deity mysteriously concurring with humanity, to utter his tender compassion for his friends in sighs and tears.

ART. VII.—*Puritanism: or a Churchman's Defence against its Aspersions, by an appeal to its own history.* By Thomas W. Coit, D.D. Rector of Trinity Church, New Rochelle, N. Y., and a member of the New York Historical Society. New York: Appleton. 1845. pp. 527, 12mo.

IN no field of knowledge has the march of mind been more conspicuous than in that of history. Niebuhr has taught us to regard a large part of the Roman annals as mere fables, and a glance at Bishop Thirlwall's recent work will show what improvements of the same kind have been made by the Germans in the history of Greece. Some worthy people were at first displeased with this disturbance of their old associations, and believed, or affected to believe, that such speculations must eventually shake the credit of all history. But in spite of these alarmists, the good work has gone on, and its effect begins to be perceptible in modern no less than in ancient history. More than one audacious hand has been laid upon the cherished traditions of the leading states of Europe, and the volume now before us is a pleasing proof that our own myths and legends are about to undergo the same severe but salutary process. The beginning, though imperfect, is auspicious, and already entitles Dr. Coit to be re-